

Applied Leadership and Management in the Workplace

Module Assignment Submission

Student Name:	Nicky-J Paton-Lewis
Student Number:	2315603
Module No:	BMSK6012
Module Title:	Developing Creativity And Innovation For Competitive Advantage.

Statement of Confirmation of Authenticity

By the act of making this submission, the student declares that this is the work of the student named above. The work has not, in whole or in part, been knowingly presented elsewhere for assessment, or where assessment has been built on a previous assessment, this has been identified. Where materials have been used from other sources it has been properly acknowledged. If this statement is untrue, the student acknowledges that an assessment offence has been committed.

Attention is drawn to the plagiarism and unfair practice policies of both the University and of ILM.

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Using at least two recognised models of innovation, critically examine the ability of the organisation to innovate effectively.</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Evaluate the organisation's ability to harness creativity and foster a creative culture in the workplace.</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Conclusion</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>References</u>	<u>5</u>

Introduction

This assignment critically explains the ability of a small property management organisation to innovate effectively and foster a creative workplace culture. The business is run by two partners with different levels of experience and different attitudes towards change, which creates both opportunities and challenges for innovation. The discussion applies Rogers Diffusion of Innovations, Cooper's Stage Gate model and Christensen's disruptive Innovation theory to assess how new ideas are considered, tested and adopted. It also evaluates how creativity is influenced by expertise, motivation, psychological safety, leadership, organisational culture and constructive conflict. Particular attention is given to digital systems, automation, maintenance processes and decision making between the partners. The assignment argues that the organisation has strong potential to innovate because the partners bring different perspectives, but this potential is weakened when disagreements become personal or decisions rely more on preference than evidence.

Using at least two recognised models of innovation, critically examine the ability of the organisation to innovate effectively.

Innovation within property management does not necessarily involve creating something completely new. It may involve improving existing services through digital maintenance reporting, cloud based records, automated communication, property management software or better use of market information. However, introducing new technology should not automatically be treated as successful innovation. A system may appear modern while creating additional costs or making the service less personal. The organisation's ability to innovate should therefore be judged by whether it identifies genuine problems, selects appropriate solutions and turns those ideas into improvements that create lasting value.

The organisation is a small property management business run by two business partners. One partner is 27 and is generally more interested in digital systems, automation and trying different approaches. The other is in his 50s, has greater experience in the sector and is usually more cautious about changing methods that already work. It would be easy to explain their disagreement as a generational issue, but this would be too simplistic. Age does not automatically make someone innovative or resistant to change. Their different approaches may instead reflect experience, confidence with technology, attitudes towards financial risk and different views about what landlords and tenants value.

Their disagreement can actually strengthen innovation if it remains constructive. The younger partner may challenge outdated processes, while the older partner may identify risks or practical problems that enthusiasm for technology overlooks. However, this advantage disappears when disagreement becomes personal. The organisation's innovation capability therefore depends not only on generating ideas but on whether the partners can evaluate those ideas without treating different opinions as a threat.

Roger's Diffusion of Innovations model is useful for understanding why the partners may react differently to the same idea. Rogers (2003) argues that adoption is influenced by relative advantage, compatibility, complexity and reliability. In practical terms, an innovation is more likely to be adopted if it appears better than the current method, fits existing needs, is understandable, can be tested and produces visible benefits.

A digital maintenance reporting system demonstrates this clearly. The younger partner may see a strong relative advantage because tenants could report problems quickly, upload photographs and receive progress updates. The older partner may question whether software is necessary when tenants can already telephone or send messages. Neither position is automatically correct. One partner could confuse novelty with improvement, while the older partner could underestimate the hidden cost of existing processes such as time spent chasing contractors, searching through messages or dealing with missed requests.

Roger's model therefore provides a useful way of moving the discussion away from personal preference. Instead of debating whether technology is good or bad, the partners can ask whether it produces a genuine advantage over the current system. Goppinger et al. (2024), for example, found performance benefits from property management technology within the short term rental market. This suggests that PropTech can create measurable value. However, the findings cannot be generalised to every property business or every digital product. The important question is not whether property technology works in general, but whether a particular system solves a problem within this organisation.

Compatibility is equally important. A highly automated system may improve efficiency but reduce the personal contact that some landlords and tenants value. The older partner's concern about losing this relationship should not automatically be dismissed as resistance. The most effective solution may involve automating routine communication while retaining direct contact for complicated issues. Innovation does not have to involve replacing everything that came before it.

Trialability may be particularly valuable because the partners often disagree. Rogers (2003) suggests that innovations are easier to adopt when they can be tested. Instead of arguing about a new maintenance platform in theory, the organisation could trial it with a small number of properties and measure response times, missed requests, cost and customer feedback. This changes the disagreement from an argument about opinion into a discussion based on evidence.

However, Rogers' model has an important limitation. Diffusion theory can create a pro innovation bias where rapid adoption appears desirable and slower adopters appear to be the problem. In this organisation, that could encourage the younger partner to interpret caution as a weakness. Yet resistance can sometimes improve innovation. Questions about security, cost or customer experience may prevent the business investing in an unsuitable system. Innovation capability should therefore not

be measured by how quickly the organisation adopts new ideas, but by how well it decides which ideas deserve adoption.

Cooper's Stage Gate model provides a stronger framework for making these decisions. Cooper (1990) divides innovation into stages with decision points or gates between them. Ideas are gradually assessed for feasibility, value, risk and resources before full implementation. Although the model was originally developed around product innovation, the basic principle can be adapted to a small service organisation.

For example, if the partners wanted to introduce new property management software, the first stage should involve defining the problem rather than immediately choosing a product. Is the issue missed maintenance requests, slow rent reporting, duplicated administration or poor communication? The next stage could compare possible solutions, cost and compatibility. A small trial could then test the preferred option before wider implementation.

Stage Gate could help the organisation because disagreements currently risk becoming discussions about personal preferences. A clear process would require both partners to explain why an idea should progress. At each gate they could consider cost, time saved, landlord satisfaction, tenant experience, security and practical reliability. This gives the organisation a more objective basis for decision making.

However, Stage Gate also has limitations. A very small property business does not need the bureaucracy associated with a large product development organisation. Requiring formal meetings, documents and approval processes for every minor change would slow the business down and remove one of its main advantages is flexibility. Stage Gate should therefore be applied proportionately. A major software purchase may justify structured testing, while changing the wording of an automated tenant message clearly does not.

There is also a risk that Stage Gate could reinforce the existing power difference between the partners. If the older partner has greater informal authority because of experience, controlling the gates could simply provide a formal reason to reject ideas he already dislikes. The model only improves innovation if decision criteria are agreed before the outcome is known. Otherwise, structure may give the appearance of objective decision making while personal preferences continue to determine what progresses.

Christensen's disruptive theory provides a different perspective. Bower and Christensen (1995) originally used disruption to explain why successful organisations can struggle when technologies or business models change markets in unexpected ways. Christensen (1997) later developed the argument further. The theory is relevant because the property sector has been affected by online platforms, digital communication and changing customer expectations.

However, the term disruption is often overused. Moving from spreadsheets to property management software may improve efficiency, but this is more likely to be incremental innovation than genuine disruption. Automated emails and online maintenance forms improve existing services without necessarily changing who the business serves or how the market operates. Describing every digital improvement as disruptive would exaggerate the organisation's innovation activity.

The difference between incremental and disruptive innovation is useful because the business does not necessarily need radical change. Small improvements to communication, maintenance reporting or

administration may create more value than an expensive attempt to completely transform the business. This is an important criticism of the assumption that the most dramatic innovation is always the best innovation.

Nevertheless, Christensen's theory provides a useful warning against becoming too comfortable with existing success. The older partner may reasonably argue that current methods have worked for years. However, past success does not guarantee future relevance. Landlords increasingly exposed to digital services elsewhere may begin expecting faster communication, online documents or real time information. Waiting until customers complain could mean the organisation responds only after competitors have already moved ahead.

At the same time, the younger partner could misuse the same argument. Fear of being disrupted may encourage constant investment in new systems simply because they appear modern. Al-haimi et al, (2025) identify potential benefits of digital transformation within real estate but also highlight barriers including cost, integration, security and resistance. Technology therefore creates opportunities but also creates new risks. Effective innovation requires judgement rather than simply choosing the newest option.

This raises the broader question of whether technology is driving strategy or supporting it. The organisation should start with the problem rather than the product. If maintenance requests are being missed, management should ask why. Software may solve the problem, but clearer responsibilities or better use of an existing system might achieve the same result at lower cost. Buying technology first and identifying its purpose afterwards is not strong innovation management.

Christensen's model is also less directly applicable to this organisation because it was designed mainly to explain wider market disruption and the failure of established firms. A two partner property management business operates on a much smaller scale. The model is therefore more useful as a warning against complacency than as a practical process for deciding whether to introduce everyday improvements. Stage Gate is stronger for managing individual innovations, while Rogers is stronger for understanding why the partners perceive the same innovation differently.

O'Reilly and Tushman's (2013) concept of organisational ambidexterity helps connect these perspectives. Ambidexterity involves exploring new possibilities while continuing to use existing strengths. This describes the central challenge facing the organisation particularly well.

The older partner brings experience, established contractor relationships and knowledge of methods that have worked reliably. These should not be discarded simply because they are traditional. The younger partner contributes greater interest in digital systems and alternative ways of working. The business potentially needs both. A company focused entirely on existing strengths may eventually become outdated, while one constantly experimenting may never develop stable processes.

This interpretation is stronger than reducing the conflict to age. Wang and Duan (2025) suggest that generational diversity can contribute to both useful cognitive conflict and damaging interpersonal conflict. Different viewpoints may improve innovation when people challenge ideas, but performance

can suffer when disagreement becomes personal. The problem is therefore not that the two partners think differently. Their difference may actually be one of the organisation's main innovation resources.

The organisation should therefore distinguish task disagreement from personal disagreement. If one partner argues that software will save time and the other challenges its reliability, both are contributing to evaluation. If the discussion becomes "you are stuck in the past" against "you do not have enough experience", neither is evaluating the innovation anymore. Age becomes a way of dismissing the other person's knowledge.

The small size of the organisation also creates a contradiction. With only two main decision makers, it can potentially innovate quickly because there are few layers of approval. However, if those two people cannot agree, the same structure can stop innovation completely. Small size therefore creates flexibility without necessarily creating effective decision making.

Financial limitations make careful selection even more important. A larger property business may be able to absorb the cost of a failed system. A smaller organisation has less room for unnecessary spending. Caution is therefore not automatically evidence of resistance. The key distinction is whether caution leads to testing and evidence or whether it becomes a permanent reason to avoid change.

When the models are compared, each explains a different weakness. Rogers helps explain why the partners perceive innovations differently but can overvalue adoption. Stage Gate provides a practical way to test and select ideas but could become unnecessarily bureaucratic or reinforce existing power. Christensen encourages the organisation to consider wider market change but is less useful for everyday incremental innovation. O'Reilly and Tushman provide perhaps the most useful overall principle because they show why the business should not choose between traditional experience and new approaches.

The organisation can therefore be judged as having good innovative potential but an inconsistent ability to manage innovation effectively. Its different viewpoints, small size and willingness to consider technology provide strong foundations. However, disagreements can become too dependent on personal preference, and the business risks either adopting technology too quickly or rejecting it because existing methods remain comfortable. A proportionate Stage Gate process could improve this by requiring important ideas to be defined, tested and measured before full adoption. Ultimately, the organisation does not need the younger partner to win every argument or the older partner to protect every established method. Its strongest innovation capability would come from combining experience with experimentation and using evidence to decide which changes genuinely create value.

Evaluate the organisation's ability to harness creativity and foster a creative culture in the workplace.

Creativity in a small property management business is unlikely to involve major inventions. More often, it appears through finding better ways to communicate with tenants, organise maintenance, manage contractors, advertise properties or reduce unnecessary administration. Anderson et al. (2014) distinguish creativity from innovation by linking creativity with the generation of useful ideas and innovation with putting those ideas into practice. This distinction is important because the organisation may be good at discussing different ways of working without necessarily agreeing on which ideas should progress. Its creative ability should therefore be judged by whether ideas lead to useful changes rather than simply by how often the partners suggest alternatives.

The organisation has a potential advantage because its two partners approach problems differently. The younger partner is generally more willing to question existing methods and consider digital solutions, while the older partner brings greater practical experience and tends to question whether change is necessary. This difference can create conflict, but disagreement is not automatically negative. In some cases, opposing views may improve creativity because both partners are forced to explain their reasoning rather than accepting the first idea that appears sensible.

De Dreu (2006) found that task conflict can support innovation when it remains at a moderate level. Too little disagreement may mean weak ideas are not challenged, while too much can damage collaboration. This fits the organisation closely. If one partner proposes a new maintenance reporting system and the other questions its cost, reliability or effect on tenants, the disagreement may strengthen the final decision. The problem begins when the discussion shifts from the idea to the person. Comments suggesting that one partner is “stuck in the past” or that the other “does not have enough experience” turn task conflict into personal conflict. At that point, the age difference stops being a useful source of knowledge and becomes a barrier.

This is particularly important because there are only two main decision makers. In a larger organisation, disagreement may be balanced by other managers or team members. Here, if the two partners cannot agree, a potentially useful idea can stop immediately. The small size of the organisation therefore creates both flexibility and vulnerability. Decisions can be made quickly, but there is also a greater risk of deadlock.

Amabile (1988) argues that organisational creativity depends on expertise, creative thinking and motivation. The organisation has a clear strength in expertise, although the partners possess different types of it. The older partner has more experience with landlords, tenants, contractors and recurring property issues, while the younger partner may have greater confidence with digital systems and newer ways of working. Combining these forms of knowledge could improve creative problem solving because neither partner sees the business in exactly the same way.

However, experience is not automatically an advantage. Oldham and Cummings (1996) found that creativity is shaped by both personal characteristics and the work environment. Experience can help someone recognise what is realistic, but it can also reinforce familiar ways of thinking. A method that has worked successfully for many years may feel safe even when customer expectations have changed. The opposite problem may apply to the younger partner. Confidence with technology can reveal opportunities, but it can also encourage the assumption that a new system is better simply because it is new.

The organisation should therefore avoid labelling either partner as naturally more creative. The more important question is whether each is willing to reconsider their own assumptions. Experience without curiosity may protect outdated practice, while enthusiasm without judgement may lead to unnecessary change.

Amabile (1998) also argues that managers can unintentionally damage creativity through practices intended to improve control and productivity. This is relevant even in a very small business. If every suggestion is judged immediately on short term cost or whether it disrupts existing routines, ideas may be rejected before they are properly explored. However, complete freedom would also be unrealistic. Property management involves contracts, tenant information, client money and financial risk. Creativity therefore has to operate within sensible boundaries.

The real issue is not freedom versus control, but whether control is proportionate. The younger partner may see caution as restriction, while the older partner may see it as responsible management. Neither view is automatically correct. A creative culture does not mean saying yes to every suggestion. It means ideas receive a fair assessment based on their value rather than being accepted or rejected according to who proposed them.

Motivation also affects creativity. Ryan and Deci (2000) argue that autonomy and competence can strengthen motivation. Both partners have greater autonomy than employees in a larger organisation because they can make decisions without several management levels. In theory, this should make creativity easier.

However, shared ownership does not necessarily mean equal influence. One partner may have greater informal authority because of experience, financial contribution or confidence. If this regularly gives him the final say, the other partner may eventually stop suggesting ideas. Equally, if the younger partner repeatedly pushes digital change without listening to concerns, the older partner may become defensive. Formal equality therefore matters less than whether both partners feel their views genuinely influence decisions.

Zhou and George (2001) challenge the idea that creativity only comes from positive experiences. Their research suggests that dissatisfaction can sometimes encourage creativity when people are supported in expressing concerns. This is useful within the property business because frustration can reveal problems. Repetitive administration, missed maintenance messages or slow contractor responses may create dissatisfaction that encourages better ways of working.

However, frustration does not automatically become creativity. Without support, it may simply become an argument or disengagement. Complaining that an existing process is outdated achieves little unless a realistic alternative is developed. Similarly, dismissing criticism because a method has always worked wastes information that could reveal a genuine problem. The organisation therefore needs to treat dissatisfaction as evidence to investigate rather than something to suppress or automatically accept.

Psychological safety is particularly important in this relationship. Edmondson (1999) argues that teams learn more effectively when people feel able to question decisions, admit mistakes and suggest alternatives without fear of embarrassment or punishment. In a two partner business this may seem less important because both individuals have senior status, but equal job titles do not remove interpersonal risk.

If previous disagreements have become heated, either partner may start avoiding certain topics because raising them feels more trouble than it is worth. This can create the appearance of improved teamwork when one person has actually stopped contributing. A quiet partnership is therefore not necessarily a creative one.

Baer and Frese (2003) strengthen this point by showing that process innovation is more effective when organisations combine initiative with psychological safety. A new property management system may be technically useful, but implementation could still fail if one partner quietly disagrees and continues using the old method. Creativity is therefore not only about generating the idea. It also depends on whether people feel able to raise problems during implementation.

At the same time, psychological safety should not mean protecting every idea from criticism. Creativity requires challenge. If suggestions cannot be questioned because criticism may upset someone, weak ideas may survive. The organisation needs a culture where criticism is directed at the proposal rather than at the person behind it.

Anderson and West (1998) identify shared vision, participative safety, task orientation and support for innovation as important parts of an innovative team climate. Shared vision may be particularly important because the organisation's underlying problem may not be a lack of ideas but different views about what the business should become.

The younger partner may define progress through efficiency, automation and growth, while the older partner may prioritise personal relationships, reliability and financial caution. Neither vision is necessarily wrong. However, technology decisions will continue becoming arguments if the partners have not agreed on the wider direction of the business.

Hulsheger et al. (2009) provide strong support for this argument. Their meta analysis found that support for innovation, shared vision, task orientation and external communication were important predictors of innovation. This suggests the organisation may benefit more from agreeing clear priorities than simply encouraging more ideas. Creativity without direction can produce discussion but little meaningful change.

Organisational culture also affects whether creative behaviour becomes normal. Schein (2010) argues that culture develops through visible practices, stated values and deeper assumptions. A small business

may not have formal values or policies about creativity, but culture still develops through repeated behaviour.

If suggestions are routinely met with “we have always done it this way”, the underlying assumption may be that existing practice is automatically safer. However, the opposite culture can be equally weak. If every new technology is treated as progress, the underlying assumption becomes that newer is automatically better. Neither encourages careful creativity.

McLean (2005) argues that organisational culture can support or restrict creativity through encouragement, autonomy and control. However, culture can become an overly convenient explanation for every problem. If all disagreements are blamed on culture, practical issues such as workload, money or unclear responsibility may be overlooked. The organisation should therefore consider culture alongside structure and resources rather than treating it as the only cause.

Leadership is also complicated because there is no single obvious leader. Hunter and Cushenbery (2011) argue that leaders influence creativity both directly and through the environment they create. In this business, both partners therefore influence whether the other feels able to challenge assumptions and test alternatives.

Shared leadership could appear ideal because both individuals bring useful expertise. However, Liu and Gu (2024) show that shared leadership may also create role conflict and, under some circumstances, reduce creativity. This is highly relevant to a two partner business. Equal authority can become confusing if both believe they have the final say over spending, technology or working processes.

The organisation may therefore need shared influence rather than completely shared control over every decision. Clear responsibility could improve creativity by agreeing who researches an idea, who tests it and how the final decision will be reached. Without this clarity, shared leadership risks becoming repeated negotiation rather than collaboration.

Transformational leadership also offers some insight. Shin and Zhou (2003) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and creativity, partly through intrinsic motivation. However, directly applying this model is difficult because the partners do not have a simple leader follower relationship. Each can influence the other.

The more useful lesson is that creative leadership involves explaining why change matters. If the younger partner wants a new digital platform, enthusiasm alone is not enough. He should explain how it supports wider business goals. If the older partner rejects it, experience alone should not end the discussion. He should be able to identify the value that the current method protects and the risks created by the alternative.

The organisation must also decide how ideas will be evaluated. A small business cannot afford to test every suggestion indefinitely. Time and money are limited, so some ideas have to be rejected. However, immediate financial return should not be the only measure. Improvements to tenant experience, fewer errors or faster contractor responses may create value even if the benefit is not immediately visible as profit.

This connects to task orientation. Creativity should ultimately solve a problem. Either partner proposing a change could be expected to define the problem, explain the alternative, identify risks and decide how success will be measured. This simple approach would make discussions more evidence based and reduce the likelihood that disagreements become battles of personal preference.

The organisation's small size is again both an advantage and a weakness. It does not need large creativity programmes or formal suggestion schemes. The partners can identify a problem and test a solution quickly. However, informality also means ideas may be forgotten when daily property issues become urgent. Without a simple way of recording and reviewing suggestions, creativity may depend too heavily on memory and enthusiasm. The organisation's main weakness is not necessarily creativity because both partners generate and challenge ideas. Its weakness lies between evaluation and implementation, where disagreement, unclear authority and personal preference can prevent potentially useful ideas progressing.

The organisation has strong creative potential but an uneven creative culture. Its two partners bring different experience, assumptions and ways of solving problems, which can widen the range of ideas available. However, difference only becomes valuable when it creates constructive task conflict rather than personal conflict. De Dreu (2006) explains why some disagreement can support innovation, while Edmondson (1999) shows why psychological safety is still necessary for people to challenge each other openly.

Amabile's work also demonstrates that expertise and motivation are not enough if the environment restricts creative behaviour. Liu and Gu (2024) add an important counterargument by showing that shared leadership can create its own problems when roles become unclear. The organisation therefore needs neither complete agreement nor unrestricted freedom.

The organisation would benefit from a culture where both partners can challenge ideas without making disagreements personal. Clearer responsibilities and a shared direction would help turn different viewpoints into stronger decisions. The organisation is not short of creativity its main weakness is converting ideas into action.

Conclusion

The organisation has strong potential to innovate, but this depends on how well the partners manage disagreement. Rogers explains why they may judge the same idea differently, while Stage Gate provides a structured way to test changes before implementation. Christensen also highlights the risk of relying too heavily on methods that worked in the past, although most changes in this business are likely to be incremental rather than disruptive. The partner's different experience and attitudes towards risk can strengthen innovation, but only when disagreement stays focused on the idea rather than becoming personal. Overall, the organisation does not need more ideas. It needs clearer responsibilities, better evaluation and a consistent way of testing useful changes. If the partners combine experience with experimentation and rely on evidence rather than preference, their differences could become a genuine advantage.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organisations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 123–167.

Amabile, T. M. (1998). How to kill creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(5), 76–87.

Al-haimi, B., Khalid, H., Zakaria, N. H., & Jasimin, T. H. (2025). Digital transformation in the real estate industry: A systematic literature review of current technologies, benefits, and challenges. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 5(1), 100340.

Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333.

Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the Team Climate Inventory. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 19(3), 235–258.

Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 24(1), 45–68.

Bower, J. L., & Christensen, C. M. (1995). Disruptive technologies: Catching the wave. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(1), 43–53.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Harvard Business School Press.

Cooper, R. G. (1990). Stage-gate systems: A new tool for managing new products. *Business Horizons*, 33(3), 44–54.

De Dreu, C. K. W. (2006). When too little or too much hurts: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship between task conflict and innovation in teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 83–107.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

Goppinger, S., Luque, J., & Marcato, G. (2024). Property management technology adoption in the short-term housing rental market. *Real Estate Economics*, 52(5), 1197–1225.

Hulsheger, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. (2009). Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1128–1145.

Hunter, S. T., & Cushenbery, L. (2011). Leading for innovation: Direct and indirect influences. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(3), 248–265.

Liu, M., & Gu, Q. (2024). Does shared leadership always have positive effects on employee creativity? A role conflict perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 31(4), 420–432.

McLean, L. D. (2005). Organisational culture's influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(2), 226–246.

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 607–634.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organisational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 324–338.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 703–714.

Wang, L., & Duan, X. (2025). Generational diversity and team innovation: The roles of conflict and shared leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1501633.

Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 682–696.