Being creative while playing safe: The Role of Leaders' Regulatory Focus on Fostering Creative and Safety Ambidextrous Behaviours

Munirah Sarhan Alqahtani (PhD)

College of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Imam, Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU),

Riyadh, KSA

Mail MSALQahtanii@imamu.edu.sa

Correspondence address:	College of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Imam, Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Riyadh, KSA

Abstract

Most research has explored ambidexterity at the organisational level and very limited research is available on individual ambidextrous behaviours. This research paper reviews the role of leaders' regulatory focus in promoting individual ambidexterity in the form of creativity and safety. The main aim is to contribute to ambidexterity and self-regulatory literature by examining the role of leaders' regulatory focus in managing ambidextrous behaviours. Ambidexterity is the ability to manage conflicting task demands, which poses a fundamental self-regulatory and motivational challenge in the process of pursuing different goals.

Keywords: Ambidexterity, Self-regulatory focus (SRF), Creativity, Safety.

Introduction

This section discusses the main concepts of the study, the value of creativity and safety and how they have been investigated by scholars. These study streams have evolved separately and it is proposed that a better understanding of how to simultaneously promote both is possible by drawing on ambidexterity research (March, 1991), a construct which also refers to the perusal of contradictory goals and on self-regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997). Finally, it presents the rationale behind the study and its value and expected contributions

Nowadays, creativity and safety are valued in a wide range of tasks, jobs, and industries. Today, almost all organisations face a dynamic work environment characterised by rapid environmental and technological change. Leaders realise that to stay competitive they need their employees to be effectively engaged in their work, trying to produce new and suitable products and procedures (Amabile, 1996; Ford, 1996; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley, 1991; Zhou, 1998; Zohar, 2000). Organisations, especially industrially driven ones, need to be more creative and safer to compete, develop, and lead (Jung et al., 2003; Tierney et al., 1999). One important question is how leaders may strike a balance between safety and creativity. Unfortunately, there is no research so far has investigated creativity and safety simultaneously.

Much of the experimental research has viewed creativity as producing a new and useful idea relating to products, services, processes, and procedures (Amabile, 1996; Ford, 1996; Shalley, 1991; Zhou, 1998). Creativity plays an important role in technological change, in social science, in the arts and human behaviours. Creativity has become the key concern of business and organisations because it is a source of flexibility and enables them to effectively cope with changes and challenges. (Runco, 2004) As Sacramento, Fay and West (2013) and However et al. (2012) suggest, creativity is a key skill for solving organisational problems which have major impact on many organisations.

There are several antecedents of creativity that have examined by many studies. These include such aspects as social factors, individual differences, reward systems, work climate, autonomy, leadership and encouragement to take risks (Amabile, 1996; Ford, 1996; Shalley, 1991; Zhou, 1998).

Safety research has focused on understanding the antecedents of safety, such as the values of the organisation regarding safety, the role of organisational norms and social influences on safety behaviour and safety outcomes (Mearns & Flin, 1999; Mullen, 2004), psychological safety climate (i.e., employees' perceptions of work environment traits (Seo, Torabi, Blair, &

Ellis, 2004) and the role of the leader. Recently, the critical role that leadership can play with regard to enhancing the safety climate, safety behaviour and preventing accidents has been of great concern (Hofmann, Jacobs & Landy, 1995; Hofmann & Morgeson, 1999; Neal, Griffin & Hart, 2000; Zohar, 2000)

Zohar (2003) defined safety climate as employees' perceptions of safety policies, practices and procedures all have a significant role to play with regard to workplace safety. Past meta-analytic studies has confirmed that supporting safety climates in the workplace leads to fewer occupational injuries and accidents than safety climates that are not supported. Therefore, many organisations recently have been concerned with improving safety in the work environment (Christian, Bradley, Wallace & Burke, 2009; Clarke, 2006a; Beus et al., 2010)

Based on the previous review, creativity can be defined as the extent to which employees generate new and useful knowledge (Amabile, 1983), and safety as the extent to which employees perform accurately with safety-related rules and regulations (Zohar, 2000). Although both are desirable behaviours in organisations, these two elements might be thought of as being at odds, as employees who follow work rules and procedures accurately are more likely to perform safely (Zohar, 2000) but will arguably also be less likely to be creative, as creativity often requires to go off the beaten track (Hirst, van Knippenberg, Chen, & Sacramento, 2011).

Safety and creativity have both become important goals because of the human and financial costs related to unsafe behaviour, injuries and solving problems creatively, especially in oil organisations. As a practical example, we can think of the BP oil spill disaster in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 when there were 11 workers killed, 17 injured and the costs of these injuries included $7.8 billion in settlements with workers and costs to the businesses affected. As reported by safety board managing director Daniel Horowitz, this disaster happened because of insufficient safety systems and material that was poorly designed and not properly tested. On the other hand, in order to solve the problem BP had to rely upon the creativity of its workforce to develop a unique and tailored solution that would stop the leakage. The British Petroleum case, for example, shows the safety practices and creative solution that would be used to avoid or deal with the problems.

Safety literature proposes that leaders often focus on producing more and new products and services, and only subsequently focus on safety (Janssens, Brett & Smith, 1995; Wallace, Chen & Kanfer, 2005; Zohar, 2000). Even though several organisations promote safety in formal policies and strategies, it is often creation rather than safety that is emphasised in daily work activities (Zohar, 2003). As Pate-Cornell (1990) argues, job estimation procedures emphasise

creation over safety, and leaders stress creation over performance safety, which is the fundamental element responsible for poor safety records. Likewise, Kaminski (2001) states that although performance systems help to increase productivity, they also lead to high injury rates in organisations. For this reason, as work safety becomes conditional on creativity, workers may notice that less attention is paid to safety. So, there is a possible tradeoff between creativity and safety in the workplace (Wallace & Chen, 2006). Thus, the literature recognises the importance of leadership in enhancing positive safety outputs while increasing creative performance.

Recently, many organisations have faced a critical problem in managing these different aspects. Without exploring new knowledge, and generating climate for safety, in the face of change an organisation is more likely to fail (Cleveland, 2010). Based on the idea that different structures are required for creativity and safety, organisations needed to manage both for long-term survival and for change over decades. Thus, I argue that creativity and safety are both necessary in the workplace because of having to cope with today's dynamic work environment by avoiding injuries and faults and developing innovative technologies. Therefore, it is important for leaders to know how to manage and embrace these distinct aspects.

Management studies (e.g., Benner & Tushman, 2003; Gupta, Smith & Shalley, 2006; He & Wong, 2004; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996) started to use the term 'ambidexterity' to describe the ability of organisations to manage and balance both exploration activities such as searching for new ideas (March, 1991) and exploitation activities such as implementation (March, 1991). The term ambidexterity actually means the ability to use both hands equally (Zacher& Rosing, in press). In management studies, ambidexterity is the term used to refer to the dynamic management of exploration and exploitation. Exploration includes such things as search, pursuit, risk taking, investigation, flexibility, finding or innovation, whereas exploitation includes things such as improvement, production, efficiency, execution and implementation. (March, 1991) It is possible to draw a parallelism between exploration/exploitation and creativity/safety. Creativity refers to the exploration and generation of new ideas and knowledge, and therefore shares elements in common with the notion of exploration, also related with the development of new opportunities. Safety, on the other hand, refers to employees' capacity to effectively perform their work while following an existent process and code of procedures in order to avoid errors, which can be linked to the idea of focusing on the existent resources associated with exploitation (Raisch & Birkinshaw 2008; Jasmend, Blazevic & Ruyter, 2012).Recent research proposes leadership behaviours, contextual factors and organisational structures that might create important antecedents to ambidexterity (Beckman,

2006; Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997; Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004; Smith & Tushman, 2005; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996). Various studies have been conducted on the role of leadership traits, such as paradoxical capacity (Smith & Tushman, 2005), and behaviours (Lubatkin, Simsek, Ling, & Veiga, 2006). Birkinshaw and Gibson's (2004) study, describes ambidextrous individuals are allocating time for exploration and exploitation activities when they are thriving under leaders who motivate them to deal for the good quality in the organisation, promoting adaptive behaviour and providing effective strategy. A study by Nemanich and Vera (2009) shows that there is a positive impact of the role of transformational leadership on ambidexterity, although how this effect unfolds is not fully known.

Most ambidexterity research has so far focused on the organisational level, and is therefore not able to provide a solution to the problem outlined earlier, which pertains the promotion of ambidextrous behaviours at the individual level. I will extent this literature by examining the role of leadership in promoting individual ambidexterity in the form of creativity and safety. Research is needed to link the role of leadership and ambidexterity for three logical reasons. First, the complicated demands of dynamic work environments signify the need to emphasise the combining of exploration and exploitation (Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). Second, there is a little research on ambidexterity at individual level; most of studies have focused on the organisational level. The little research that exists on individual ambidexterity, such as Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst and Tushman (2009) and O'Reilly and Tushman (2013), calls for more research on boundary conditions, individual and team levels of analysis to help further to understanding contextual ambidexterity in shaping individuals and team level behaviours. Third, the role of leadership behaviours remains unclear in attending to the conflicting demands of exploration and exploitation. Previous research provides only scattered evidence of the combining between leadership and ambidexterity in dynamic contexts, especially at lower organizational levels (Berson, Nemanich, Waldman, Galvin, & Keller, 2006). For example, there is only one study examining this issue, and indicates the existence of a positive relationship between transformational leadership and ambidexterity (Nemanich & Vera, 2009). So, we know very little about the relation between role of leadership and exploration and exploitation and about how leaders can simultaneously enable the two behaviours.

There is no study has examined the role of leadership in enhancing creativity and safety simultaneously. This is surprising given that providing a creative and safe work environment through effective leadership is key goal of most modern organisations. Where they can be affected by management practices and the role of leadership, they have a great potential to

motivate employees. Therefore, I will examine the role of leaders' Self-Regulatory Focus on fostering ambidextrous behaviours creative and safety. Because Self-Regulatory Focus has distinct aspects, such as promotion and prevention and it is more likely to be effective in a dynamic work environment.

I argue that a self-regulatory focus theory offers a useful framework to the understanding of ambidextrous behaviours, in terms of creativity and safety. First, this type of theory has different aspects (promotion focus) and (prevention focus) and these concepts are consistent with ambidexterity theory to manage exploration and exploitation (Raisch & Birkinshaw 2008; Jasmend, Blazevic & Ruyter, 2012). So, self-regulated individuals are focused on achieving different goals (Higgins, Kruglanski & Pierro 2003) and ambidextrous individuals focus on performing conflicting activities towards different goals (Crossan, Vera & Nanjad, 2008). Second, as suggested by Sacramento et al. (2013) ''that regulatory focus is key to the way leadership skills are applied, but do not fully explain what these leadership skills are'' Thus, we need to examine these skills of SRF which are more likely to be effective in dynamic work environments in order to promote both team ambidexterity behaviours, in the form of creativity and safety. Third, regulatory focus theory has the potential to enhance our understanding of the mechanisms through which individual difference and situational factors influence safety and creativity (Higgins, 1997). Certainly, Wallace et al.'s (2005) initial studies on regulatory focus at work has revealed that employees' regulatory focus can clarify the relations of motivational traits (general self-efficacy and trait anxiety) and work goal orientations with creativity and safety

2.Literature review

In this section, first I will provide a comprehensive review of ambidexterity in organisations. Second, creativity and climate for creativity will be reviewed, and then I will discuss the impact of leadership on creativity. Third, safety in terms of the climate for safety and leadership for safety will be discussed. Finally, self-regulatory theory will be presented.

2.1. Ambidexterity in organisations

The ambidexterity notion has attracted attention of scholars from various fields, as organisational learning, strategic management and innovation. Ambidexterity is the term used to refer to the dynamic management of exploration and exploitation, which are both needed for organisational effectiveness. Tushman and O'Reilly (1996) define ambidexterity as the "ability to simultaneously pursue both incremental and discontinuous innovation" (p.8). Exploration

refers to learning and innovation (i.e. the search and attainment of new knowledge), whereas, exploitation refers to the use of existing knowledge. Baum, Li, and Usher (2000) argue that "…exploitation refers to learning gained via local search, experiential refinement, and selection and reuse of existing routines. Exploration refers to learning gained through processes of concerted variation, planned experimentation, and play" (p. 768). Vermeulen and Barkema (2001) define exploration as the "search for new knowledge" and exploitation as the "ongoing use of a firm's knowledge base" (p. 459).

The main idea of ambidextrous leadership is that the complexity of exploration and exploitation activities needs to be managed by an equally complex leadership approach. The ambidexterity theory of leadership therefore suggests that the interaction between two opposite leadership behaviours—Combining both types of leadership behaviours, ambidextrous leadership was defined by Rosing et al. (2011) as "the ability to foster both explorative and exploitative behaviours in followers by increasing or reducing variance in their behaviour and flexibly switching between those behaviours" (p. 957). Creativity and safety behaviours can also be seen, in the light of ambidexterity theory, as ambidextrous behaviours. Ambidextrous behaviours refer to the engagement in both safety behaviour and creativity behaviours; these behavioural demands must simultaneously perform safety and creativity activities and/or quickly switch between them to show ambidextrous behaviours.

In a seminal article, March (1991) states that the basic challenge confronting organisations is the need to exploit available resources and abilities, in order to obtain adequate exploration and to avoid disconnection between environmental and technological changes and organisational change. In his opinion, exploitation was about control, assessment and certainty, while exploration was about pursuit, exploring, autonomy and creativity. In March's opinion, "The fundamental problem confronting an organisation is to engage in sufficient exploitation to ensure its current viability and, at the same time, devote enough energy to exploration to ensure its future viability" (p. 105). The challenges in balancing exploration and exploitation are that exploitation has a great certainty of short-term achievement, while exploration, by its nature, is associated with an uncertain increase in the number of new ideas. Based on this logic, excessively exploring ideas at the expense of safety can be costly and can lead to , as the tangible outcomes of exploration will only be recognized in the long term, and then only with significant uncertainty. On the other hand, a concentration on assessing safety without exploration discourages the organisation from pursuing development and creativity. This can direct firms to focus only on the short term and miss out on long term advantages (Levinthal and March, 1993). Therefore, the recommendation of a balanced combination of the two should come as

no surprise (Auh & Menguc, 2005) Related studies of organisational ambidexterity suggest that rather than emphasising one at the expense of the other, a balance between the two strategies is needed. This is because organizational ambidexterity can be defined as a range of behaviour from exploration on the one hand to exploitation on the other. Therefore, it is important to distinguish between the ambidexterity as a result of which exploration and exploitation are achieved respectively, and the ambidexterity by which exploration and exploitation are achieved simultaneously (Gupta et al., 2006). Long-ago, organisations used to cope with internal change and shifting from one change to another, but after rapid change in technologies and the development of the dynamic workplace, the challenge is switched to managing exploration and exploitation approaches simultaneously. The best method for successfully managing these approaches simultaneously is by leaders who are adopting effective strategies for achieving ambidextrous organisations (Gupta et al., 2006).

Research has shown that to manage these aspects leaders are needed who can balance the challenging stress of different organisational strategies. For example, Jansen, Vera and Crossan (2009) explore the ways that transformational leaders are more likely to be related to exploration, and that transactional leadership is closer to exploitation. Other studies relating leadership and ambidexterity confirm that the balanced achievement of exploration and exploitation can be influenced by leadership behaviours (e.g., Alexiev, Jansen, Van den Bosch & Volberda, 2010; Carmeli & Halevi, 2009; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2011).

2.2. Creativity

As discussed earlier, creativity refers to the generation of novel and useful ideas, products, processes, or services (e.g., Amabile, 1988; Oldham & Cummings, 1996 Shalley, 1991; Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin, 1993). Recently, there have been two important models developed for focusing on identifying the antecedents of creativity (Amabile, 1983, 1988, 1996; Woodman,el al,1993). These models can be divided into two groups: first, componential theories that test human behaviours and abilities to perform creatively. Second, interactionist approach to organisational creativity, which states creativity as individual level that can be influenced by conditional variables. These models provide a logical framework for the field of employee creativity, while similarities and differences between these models also occur. Remarkably, both models address the impact of the work climate or organisational context while also describing a wide range of elements that may enhance or restrict creativity in employees' work. Amabile's (1988) componential model of creativity climates identifies critical contextual factors, such as support of creativity, autonomy, freedom, resources, stress,

and environmental obstacles to creativity (Yun Lin & Chuan Liu, 2012). According to Woodman, et al (1993) the intearctionist model of creativity, creativity occurs at individual, team and organisational levels and is influenced by factors pertaining to all these three levels. What is more, individual and contextual features interact to predict creativity.

2.3. Climate for creativity

An important antecedent of creativity acknowledged by most creativity researchers is organisational climate, in particular the existence of a climate that supports creativity and innovation (Amabile, 1983, Ekvall, 1996; Anderson & West, 1998). Ekvall and Ryhammar (1999) argue that a creative climate combines challenges, freedom, support, and promotes openness and uncertainty. Many studies show a relation between climate and creativity related outcomes (Baer & Frese, 2003; Ekvall & Ryhammar, 1999). In particular, some studies suggest that the creativity climate is an important predictor of high performance (Amabile et al., 1996; Ekvall, 1996). Ismail (2005) argues that creative climates impact on organisations' innovation. Thus, climate for creativity could facilitate interventions to promote innovation within organisations. Woodman et al. (1993) identified personal and organisational or environmental factors that influence creativity climate at cross different levels; organisational, team and individuals. These factors can interact to affect cross level analysis to enhance or inhibit creative behaviour in complex social systems.

2.4. Leadership for creativity

Numerous studies have examined the role of leadership in augmenting creative behaviours (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003; Jung et al., 2003; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Shin & Zhou, 2003; Tierney et al., 1999). The findings of these studies suggest that the single factor that has more substantial impact on creativity in the workplace is leadership (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange, 2002; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Redmond, Mumford & Teach, 1993; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Shin & Zhou, in press; Tierney et al., 1999; Zhou, 2003).

The role of leaders is important to make sure that the construction of the work environment and the human resource practices (e.g., goal setting, incomes, rewards and evaluations) promote creativity (e.g., Drazin, Glynn & Kazanjian, 1999; Mumford, 2000; Mumford et al., 2002; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley et al., 2000). Effective leaders are aware of the different creative problem solving style at cross levels in terms of individuals, teams, and organisations. The most successful leaders will support creative employees and teams when it comes to managing and dealing with challenges through applying creativity process. Managing creative problem solving will enable leaders to have a significant influence on performance (Shalley et al., 2000). Volmer, Spurk& Niessen (2012) found a positive relationship between LMX and

creative performance was stronger when employees have greater work autonomy. Their findings show to the significance of considering the interplay of both, the leader–member relationship and work environment issues for increasing employees' creative work.

2.5. Safety

Safety is defined by Zohar (2000) as employees' perceptions of safety policies, practices, and procedures and all have significant roles in workplace safety. Christiania et al. (2009) stated that safety antecedents focused on either personal factors or situational factors but rarely both; each of these factors includes more direct antecedents to safety, such as safety knowledge, and safety motivation as proximal antecedents to safety behaviours and safety performance.

2.6. Climate for safety

Kines et al. (2011) defines safety climate as group members' shared perceptions of manager safety policies, procedures and practices. Safety climate reflects employees' perception of the true value of safety in the workplace, as a causal element in reducing accidental injuries. Wiegman et al. (2002) also defines safety climate as the temporary state to evaluate safety culture and issue commonalities among peoples' perceptions of the work society. Neal et al. (2000) define safety climate as a particular shape of organisational climate that describes peoples' perceptions of the safety value in the work setting. This shared perception shows that safety perceptions in a particular work environment are shared among employees (Neal & Griffin, 2004). Safety climate directly affects employees' safety motivation and safety knowledge, which, in turn, affects safety performance behaviours associated directly with safety results, such as low accidents and injuries (Neal & Griffin, 2004). Taylor (2005) indicates that having an appropriate safety climate in an organisation can bring many benefits, such as avoiding injury that decreases downtime and ultimately leads to cost savings. The organisation also can build a good reputation for itself, in addition to creating job satisfaction for their employees, poor safety climate. As Probst and Estrada (2010) argue, leads to increased accidents, some of which are under- reported. When employees view the safety climate in an organisation as poor or weak, it leads to lower levels of safety. (Probst, Brubaker & Barsotti, 2008). With regard to safety outcomes, all of the antecedents operate indirectly through safety performance behaviours.

2.7. Leadership for safety

Andriessen (1978) notes that while leaders are a crucial factor in the safety behaviour of workers, it is management that sets the leader's goals, objectives and concerns. Therefore higher-level management have a greater level of influence on workers' safety behaviour than

leaders (Griffin & Neal, 2000; Zohar & Luria, 2004). However, leadership has both direct and indirect influences on safety climate. The direct influence connects to managers' patterns of safe and unsafe behaviours, and to their support of followers' behaviour through monitoring and control. The indirect influence of leadership styles connects to the establishing norms related to policies, practices and procedures that make a particular safety environment or climate. Both directly and indirectly, these leader actions influence workers' expectations and motivation, thus influencing the likelihood of particular behaviours (Flin & Yule, 2004).

Prior studies investigating antecedents of safety-related behaviour and injuries focus on the role of leadership and safety climates. For example, (Zohar 2002) highlight the role of leadership and other management practices in improving safety. Occupational safety researchers also pay attention to the role of safety climates in supporting safety behaviours (Griffin & Neal, 2000; Mearns et al., 2003; Zohar & Luria, 2004). Safety literature also shows that leadership quality is directly related to work safety and safety outcomes (Hofmann & Morgeson, 2003; Zohar, 2002a; Zohar & Luria, 2003). Further, Hofmann and Morgeson (2003) state that high quality LMX relationships are related to increased safety communication, improved subordinate safety commitment, and lower accidents and injuries.

2.8. Self-regulatory theory

Before presenting the conceptual model proposed, it is important to provide an overview of the key underlying theoretical framework, self-regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997). People are motivated to achieve a variety of basic needs that are essential to their survival through both their physical and social environment. By considering these needs, many studies often distinguish between those concerned with innovation, such as nourishment, growth, and advancement, and those concerned with safety, such as security, shelter, and protection (Bowlby, 1969; Maslow, 1955). Previous studies on these goals and motivational orientations point out that in combination, they direct to greater self-regulation in difficult and hard activities, for instance, they demand ambidextrous behaviours (Kruglanski et al. 2000; Pierro, Kruglanski &Higgins 2006).

Self-regulation is a socio-cognitive notion depends on the principle that an individual seeks pleasure and avoids pain (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins, 2000; Sacramento et al, 2013). One of the most important self-regulation theories is regulatory focus theory (RFT) (Higgins, 1998). This theory suggests that individuals regulate their own behaviour in two different ways. According to Higgins (1997), the two self-regulatory systems are promotion focus and prevention focus, both of which affect individuals' behavioural preferences. These two systems describe two different socio-cognitive styles that are distinguished in many dimensions

(Higgins, 1998; Higgins & Silverman, 1998; Sacramento et al 2013). For Higgins et al. (2001), "both promotion and prevention involve motivation to approach or attain a new task goal, but they differ in their orientations towards how to successfully attain the goal" (p. 21). Therefore, promotion-focused individuals are motivated via needs of development and progression, while prevention-focused individuals are motivated via the needs of ensuring security and safety. These motivational differences are based on individuals' objectives and principles. Consequently, individuals employ orientation of promotion focus into their ideals, for example, wishes or hopes, and goals to achieve these. Regulatory focus is measured by the behavioural manifestations of these motivations and how and why individuals involve in absolute goal desiring behaviours. (Forster et al., 2003; Wallace et al., 2005). Therefore, the emphasis for promotion-focused individuals is on striving for their ideals by enhancing the existence of positive outcomes. In comparison, individuals who adopt prevention focus are more likely to view their goals or objectives as duties or obligations to be achieved. Thus, the emphasis is on ensuring the presence of positive outcomes (Higgins, 1998; 2000). Individuals achieve such dissimilar standards and goals through implementing different kinds of activities or resources to achieve a specific goal Individuals. In other words, activities that are intended to ensure successes. In comparison, prevention-focused individuals implement vigilance incomes, in other words they ensure right rejections and avoid task mistakes. Explicitly, they try to make sure that they do not have any errors of task (i.e. making a mistake) by increasing the salience of possible barriers to shun negative outputs, such as performing safely to avoid injury or mistakes. Consequently prevention focus increases when employees work in the most hazardous environments (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins, 1998, 2000; Wallace & Chen, 2006). In most jobs, workers' situational challenges change over time, so it is important to accurately adopt promotion and prevention focus interchangeably to sustain organisational effectiveness.

As a result, some individuals are able to use either principle, or switch between the two principles over time, in consonance with an individual's exposure to particular changes in leadership, work environment and job demands. For example, when leaders emphasise creativity, employees' promotion-focus may increase and prevention-focus decrease. Consequently, employees are more likely to shift between these focuses over time (Forster et al., 2003; Higgins, 1997, 2000; Wallace & Chen, 2006). Therefore, a given employee's level of promotion and prevention focus may be more likely to change as situational stimuli change, such as changes in leadership style, workplace environment, or job task demands.

Several studies indicate the significant role of leadership in shaping the regulatory focus that employees experience in the work environment through role modeling, despite the employees' chronic regulatory focus (Simonton, 1984; Zuckerman, 1977; Bloom and Sosniak, 1981; Wu, McMullen, Neubert & Yi.,2007). While researchers have so far examined the role of the leader's regulatory focus in influencing employee's regulatory focus, there is evidence that confirms that individual's motivation can be affected positively by leaders' promotion-focus, or affected negatively by leaders' prevention-focused over time. (Lockwood et al., 2002; Higgins and Silberman, 1998).

Conclusion

To sum up, this research focuses on reviewing the effect of leader's regulatory focus on promoting ambidexterity in the workplace. As suggested by many scholars, there is a need to understand the role of the self-regulatory focused leader. Thus, the main contribution of this research is built on self-regulatory theory to develop a conceptual model accounting for how leaders' regulatory theory can be used to simultaneously foster creativity and safety at the individual and team levels. Moreover, it will provide managers with practical recommendations on how to create a climate that fosters both creativity and safety behaviours within individuals.

References:

Abbey, A. & Dickson, J.W. (1983). R&D work climate and innovation in semiconductors, Academy of Management Journal, 26 (2), 362-8.

Alexiev, A.S., Jansen, J.J.P., Van Den Bosch, Frans, A.J. & Volberda, H.W. (2010). Top management team advice seeking and exploratory innovation: the moderating role of TMT heterogeneity. Journal of Management Studies, 47(7), 1343-1364.

Allen, J., Baran, B. & Scott, C. (2010) After-action reviews: A venue for the promotion of safety climate. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 42(2), 750-757.

Amabile, T. (2006). How to kill creativity. Harvard Business Review, September, 77–87.

Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B. M. Stew & L. L. Cummings, (Eds.). Research in Organizational Behavior (pp. 123-167). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Amabile, T. M. & Conti, R. (1999). Changes in the work environment for creativity during downsizing. Academy of Management Journal, 42, 630-640.

Amabile, T.M, Barsade, S.G., Mueller, J.S. & Staw, B.M. (2005).Affect and creativity at work. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(3): 367–403.

Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J. & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 1154–1184.

Amabile, T.M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity. New York: Springer-Verlag

Anderson, N.R., & West, M.A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 19, 235–258.

Auh, S. & Menguc, B. (2005). Balancing exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of competitive intensity. Journal of Business Research, 58, 1652– 1661.

Auh, S and Menguc, B. (2005). "Top Management Team Diversity and Innovativeness: The Moderating Role of Inter-Functional Coordination," Industrial Marketing Management, 34(3), 249-261.

Baer, M. & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24(1), 45-66.

Baer, M. & Fres, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. Journal of Organizational Behavioral,24 (11). PAGES?

Baer, M., Oldham, G.R., Cummings, A. (2003). Rewarding creativity: when does it really matter? Leadership Quarterly 14, 569–586.

Baum, J. A. C, Li, S. X. & Usher. J. M. (2000). Making the next move: How experiential and vicarious learning shape the locations of chains' acquisitions. Administrative Science Quarterly, 45, 766-801.

Beckman, C. M. (2006). The influence of founding team company affiliations on firm behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 49(4), 741-758.

Beus, J., Payne, S., Bergman, M. & Arthur Jr. W. (2010). Safety Climate and Injuries: An Examination of Theoretical and Empirical Relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(4), 713-727.

Binyamin, G. & Carameli, A. (2010). Does structuring of human resource management processes enhance employee creativity? The mediating role of psychological availability. Human Resource Management, 49, 999-1024.

Bledow, R., Rosing, K. & Frese, M. (2013).A dynamic perspective on affect and creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 56, 432-450.

Bloom, B.S. & Sosniak, L.A. (1981). Talent development vs. schooling. Educational Leadership, 39(2), 86–94.

Bottomley, K., Burgess, S. & Fox, M. (2014). Are the Behaviors of Transformational Leaders Impacting Organizations? A Study of Transformational Leadership. International Management Review, 10(1), 5-9.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment (attachment and loss, vol. 1). New York: Basic Books.

Brockner J. & Higgins, E.T. (1997). Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 35–66.

Brockner, J. & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86 (1), 35–66.

Brown, S.L. & Eisenhardt, K. (1998). Competing on the edge: strategy as structured chaos. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Brown, S.P. & Leigh, T.W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance, Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(4), 358-68.

Burke,M., Chan-Serafin, S., Salvador, R., Smith, A., & Sarpy, S. (2008).The role of national culture and organizational climate in safety training effectiveness. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,17(1), 133 – 152.

Bryk, S&Raudenbush,W .(1992). Hierarchical linear models .Newbury Park, CA; Sage.

Carmeli, A. & Halevi, M.Y. (2009). How top management team behavioral integration and behavioral complexity enable organizational ambidexterity: The moderating role of contextual ambidexterity. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(2), 207-218.

Carver, C. S. & Scheier, M.F.(1998). On the self-regulation of behavior. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Christian, W., Bradley, J., Wallace, J. & Burke, M. (2009). Workplace safety: a meta-analysis of the roles of person and situation factors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(5), 1103–1127.

Clarke, S. (2013). Safety leadership: A meta-analytic review of transformational and transactional leadership styles as antecedents of safety behaviours. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 86(1), 22-49.

Cleveland, C. (2010). Response and clean-up technology research and development and the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill. The encyclopedia of Earth.

Coolican, H. (2004). Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology.(4th ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Cox, S.J. & Cheyne, A.J.T. (2000). Assessing safety culture in offshore environments. Safety Science, 34(1-3), 111-129. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7535(00)00009-6

Crossan, M.M., Vera, D. & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent Leadership: Strategic Leadership in Dynamic Environments. Leadership Quarterly, 19(5), 569 - 581.

Crowe, E. & Higgins, E.T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 69, 117-132.

De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., Mayer, D., Schouten, B. & Bardes, M. (2009) When does self-sacrificial leadership motivate pro-social behavior? it depends on followers' prevention focus. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(4), 887-899.

DeJoy, D., Gershon, R. & Schaffer, B. (2004) Safety climate. Professional Safety, 49(7), 50-57.

DeJoy, D. Schaffer B, Wilson M, Vandenberg R,& Butts M. (2004). Creating safer workplaces: assessing the determinants and role of safety climate. Journal of Safety Research, 35, 81-90.

Dekker S.W.A. (2002). Reconstructing human contributions to accidents: The new view on error and performance. Journal of Safety Research, 33, 371–385.

Drazin, R., Glynn, M.A. & Kazanjian, R.K. (1999). Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sense making perspective, Academy of Management Review, 24, 286−307.

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

Ekvall, G. (1996). Organizational climate for creativity and innovation, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(1), 105-123.

Ekvall, G. & Ryhammer, L.(1999). The creative climate: Its determinants and effects at a Swedish University. Creativity Research Journal, 12, 303-310

Fahlbruch, B. & Wilpert, B. (1999). System safety: An emerging field for I/O psychology. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.) International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 14, 55-93. New York: Wiley.

Feist, G.J. (1999). The influence of personality on artistic and scientific creativity, In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of creativity (pp. 273−296).Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Flin, R. & Yule, S. (2004). Leadership for safety: industrial experience Quality and Safety Health Care, 13: ii45-ii51.

Ford, C.M.(1996).A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains. Academy of Management Review, 21, 1112–1142.

Ford, C. (1996).A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains.Academy of Management Review, 21, 1112−1142.

Ford, M. & Gioia, A. (2000).Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making. Journal of Management, 26, 705-732.

Forster J., Higgins E.T. & Bianco A.T. (2003). Speed/accuracy decisions in task performance: Built in trade-off or separate strategic concerns. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90, 148–164.

Forster, J. Higgins, E. & Taylor B. A. (2003) Speed/accuracy decisions in task performance: Built-in trade-off or separate strategic concerns? Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90, 148-164.

Forster, J., Friedman, R. S. & Liberman, N. (2004). Temporal construal effects on abstract and concrete thinking: Consequences for insight and creative cognition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87(2), 177–189.

Friedman, R.S. & Förster, J. (2001).The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81, 6, 1001–1013.

Gibson, C.B. & Birkinshaw, J. (2004).The antecedents, consequences and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. Academy of Management Journal, 47, 209-226.

Gilbert, C. (2005).Unbundling the structure of inertia: Resource versus routine rigidity. Academy of Management Journal, 48, 741-763.

Gilson, L.L. & Shalley, C.E. (2004). A little creativity goes a long way: An examination of teams' engagement in creative processes. Journal of Management, 30, 453–470.

Gist, M.E. & Mitchell, T.R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. Academy of Management Review, 17, 183−211.

Gong, Y., Cheung, S., Wang, M. & Huang, J. (2012) Unfolding the Proactive Process for Creativity: Integration of the Employee Proactivity, Information Exchange, and Psychological Safety Perspectives. Journal of Management, 38(5), 1611-1633.

Gong, Y., Zhou, J. & Chang, S. (2013). Core knowledge employee creativity and firm performance: the moderating role of riskiness orientation, firm size, and realized absorptive capacity. Personnel Psychology, 66, 443–482.

Gough, H.G. (1979). A creative personality scale for the Adjective Check List. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1398−1405.

Greg, R., Oldham, G., Cummings, A. (1996). Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 39, No. 3. (Jun., 1996), pp. 607-634.

Griffin, M.A. and Neal, A. (2000), Perceptions of safety at work: a framework for linking safety

climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation, Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5(3), 347-58.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y.

S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gupta, A., Smith, K. & Shalley, C. (2006).The interplay between exploration and exploitation. Academy of Management Journal, 49(4), 693–706.

Hackman, J. R. (1992). Group influences on individuals in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M.

Hough, (Eds.) Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, (Vol. 3, pp. 199-267).

He, Z. & Wong, P. (2004). Exploration vs. Exploitation: an empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis. Organization Science, 15, 481-494.

Hoever, I., Knippenberg, D., Ginkel, W., & Barkema, H. (2012). Fostering Team Creativity: Perspective Taking as Key to Unlocking Diversity's Potential. Journal of Applied Psychology 97(5), 982–996

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain, The American Psychological Association, 52(12), 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Beyond pleasure and pain. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), Motivational science: social and personality perspectives. Key readings in social psychology. (pp. 231-255). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). From expectancies to worldviews: Regulatory focus in socialization and cognition. In J. M. Darley & J. Cooper (Eds.), Attribution and social interaction: The legacy of Edward E. Jones (pp. 243-309). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Higgins, E.T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. American Psychologist, 55, 1217–1230.

Higgins, E.T. (1998). The aboutness principle: A pervasive influence on human inference. Social Cognition, 16, 173-198.

Higgins, E.T., Bond, R.N., Klein, R. & Strauman, T. (1986). Self-discrepancies and emotional vulnerability: How magnitude, accessibility, and type of discrepancy influence affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 5–15.

Higgins, E.T., Friedman, R.S., Harlow, R.E., Idson, L.C., Ayduk, O.N. & Taylor, A. (2000). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. European Journal of Social Psychology, 30, 1–23.

Higgins, E.T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N. & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. European Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 3-23.

Higgins, E. T., Kruglanski, A. W. & Pierro, A. (2003). Regulatory mode: Locomotion and assessment as distinct orientations. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 35, 293-344. New York: Academic Press.

Higgins, E. Shah, J. & Friedman, R. (1997) Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 515-525.

Higgins, E. T. & Silberman, I. (1998). Development of regulatory focus: Promotion and prevention as ways of living. In J. Heckhausen & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), Motivation and self-regulation across the life span (pp. 78-113). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hirst, G., van Knippenberg, D., Chen, C.H. & Sacramento, C.A. (2011). How does bureaucracy impact on individual creativity? A cross-level investigation of team contextual influences on goal orientation-creativity relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 54(3), 624-641.

Hofmann, D. A., Jacobs, R. & Landy, F. L. (1995). High reliability process industries: Individual, micro, and macro organizational influences on safety. Journal of Safety Research, 26, 131–149.

Hofmann, D.A. & Morgeson, F.P. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between LMX and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 170-178.

Hofmann, D.A., & Morgeson, F.P. (1999). Safety-related behavior as a social exchange: The role of perceived organizational support and leader–member exchange. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 286–296.

Hofmann, D.A., Tetrick, L.E. (2003). The etiology of the concept of health: Implications for "organizing" individual and organizational health. In D.A. Hofmann, L.E. Tetrick, (Eds.), Health and safety in organizations: A multilevel perspective (pp. 1–26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Isaksen, S. & Ekvall, G. (2010).Managing for Innovation: The Two Faces of Tension in Creative Climates. Creativity & Innovation Management, 19(2), 73-88.

Jansen, J., Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2009).Strategic leadership and exploratory and exploitative innovation. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(1), 5-18.

Jansen, J., Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2009). Strategic leadership for exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of environmental dynamism. The Leadership Quarterly, 20, 5-18.

Janssens, M., Brett, J.M. & Smith, F.J.(1995). Confirmatory cross-cultural research: Testing the viability of a corporation-wide safety policy. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 364–382.

Jasmand, C., Blazevic, V. & Ruyter, K. (2012). Generating sales while providing service: a study of customer service representatives' ambidextrous behavior. Journal of Marketing, 76, 20–37.

Jaussi, K.S. & Dionne, S.D. (2003).Leading for creativity: The role of unconventional leader behavior. The Leadership Quarterly, 14, 475−498.

Jung, D.I., Chow, C. & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. The Leadership Quarterly, 14, 525−544.

Kaminski, M. (2001). Unintended consequences: organizational practices and their impacton workplace safety and productivity. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6, 127–138.

Kirton, M. (1994). Adaptors and innovators: styles of creativity and problem solving. New York: Routledge.

Kruglanski, A., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L. & Higgins, T. (2010). The distinct psychologies of looking and leaping: assessment and locomotion as the springs of action. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1-14, 10.

Leader, J/ (2012). "The 11 Workers Who Died During the Deepwater Horizon Explosion". Huffington Post. 15 November

Lee, Nick J. and Lings, Ian N. (2008). Doing business research : a guide to theory and practice. London: Sage.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: toward a more comprehensive guide. Academy of Management Review, 25, 760-777.

Liberman, N., Idson, L. C., Camacho, C. J. & Higgins, E. T. (1999) Promotion and prevention choices between stability and change. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 77, 1135-1145.

Lin, C. Y-Y. & Liu, F.C. (2012). A cross-level analysis of organizational creativity climate and perceived innovation: The mediating effect of work motivation, European Journal of Innovation Management, 15(1), 55 – 76.

Ling, Y., Simsek, Z., Lubatkin, M. & Veiga, J. (2008). "Transformational leadership's role in promoting corporate entrepreneurship: examining the CEO-TMT interface". Academy of Management Journal, 21 (3): 557-576.

Llopis, O., Garcia-Granero, A., Mesa, A. & Alegre, J. (2013). Managers' risk taking propensity and innovation in organizations: the mediating influence of employees' perceived risk taking climate. 35th DRUID Celebration Conference of 2013, Barcelona, Spain.

Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (1990).A theory of goal setting and task performance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C.H. & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83 (4), 854–864.

Lubatkin, M.H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y. & Veiga, J.F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance in small- to medium-sized firms: The pivotal role of top management team behavioral integration. Journal of Management, 32(5), 646-672.

McDonough, E.F. & Leifer, R. (1983). Using simultaneous structures to cope with uncertainty. Acad. Management J., 26, 727–735.

Madjar, N., Oldham, G. & Pratt, M. (2002). There's no place like home? The contributions of work and non-work sources of creativity support to employees' creative performance. Academy of Management Journal, 4, 757−767.

March, J. (1991).Exploration And Exploitation In Organizational Learning. The Institute of Management Sciences. Organization Science,2 (P.130).

March, J.G. (1987). "Learning to be risk adverse". Psychological Review, 103 (2), 309-319.

Maslow, A. (1955).Deficiency motivation and growth motivation. In M. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: 1955 (pp. 1–30). Lincoln, Nebraska: Univ. of Nebraska Press.

Mearns, K., Flin, R., Fleming, M. & Gordon, R. (1997).Human and organisational factors in offshore safety. Report (OTH 543). Offshore Safety Division, HSE Books, Suffolk.

Mearns, K. J. & Flin, R. (1999). Assessing the state of occupational safety—culture and climate. Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, and Social, 18, 5 – 17.

Mearns, K., Whitaker, S. & Flin, R. (2003). Safety climate, safety management practice and safety performance in offshore environments. Safety Science, 41, 641–680.

Molden, D., Lee, A. & Higgins, T. (In Press) Motivations for promotion and prevention. To appear in: Shah, J., & Gardner W. (Eds.), Handbook of motivation science. New York: Guilford Press.

Mullen, J. (2004).Investigating factors that influence individual safety behavior at work. Journal of Safety Research, 35, 275 – 285.

Mumford, M.D., Scott, G.M., Gaddis, B. & Strange, J.M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships, The Leadership Quarterly, 13, 705−750.

Neal, A., Griffin, M.A. & Hart, P.M. (2000).The impact of organizational climate on safety climate and individual behavior. Safety Science, 34, 99–109.

Nemanich, L. & Vera, D. (2009).Transformational leadership and ambidexterity in the context of an acquisition. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(1), 19-33.

Neubert, M.J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D.S., Chonko, L.B. & Roberts, J.A.(2008).Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(6), 1220-1233.

O'Reilly, C. (1989). Corporations, culture, and commitment: motivation and social control in organizations. California Management Review, 31, 24–38.

O'Reilly, C. & Tushman, M. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity: past, present and future, Academy of Management Perspectives, (in press). PLACE OF PUBLICATION? PUBLISHER?

O'Reilly, C.A. & Tushman, M.L. (2011). Organizational ambidexterity in action: How managers explore and exploit. California Management Review, 53, 1-18.

O'Dea, A. & Flin, R. (2003).The role of managerial leadership in determining workplace safety outcomes. PLACE OF PUBLICATION? The Health and Safety Executive. ISBN 0 7176 2609 1.

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

Pate-Cornell, M.E. (1990). Organizational aspects of engineering system safety: The case of offshore platforms. Science, 250, 1210-1217.

Pierro, A., Kruglanski, A. & Higgins.T. (2006). Progress takes work: effects of the locomotion dimension on job involvement, effort investment, and task performance in organization. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36(7), 1723–1743.

Pierro, A. Kruglanski, A.W. & Higgins, E.T. (2006). Progress takes work: Effects of the locomotion dimension on job involvement, effort investment and task performance in organizations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology.DETAILS?

Probst, M., Brubaker, T.L. & Barsotti, A. (2008). Organizational injury rate underreporting: the moderating effect of organizational safety climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 1147-1154.

Probst, M. & Estrada, A.X.(2010). Accident under-reporting among employees: testing the moderating influence of psychological safety climate and supervisor enforcement of safety practices. Accid Anal Prev. 42(5), 1438-44.

Raisch, S. & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. Journal of Management, 34(3), 375-409.

Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G. & Tushman, M.L.(2009). Organizational ambidexterity: balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. Organization Science, 20, 685-695.

Redmond, M.R., Mumford, M.D. & Teach, R.J. (1993). Putting creativity to work: leader influences on subordinate creativity. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55, 120−151.

Rosing, K., Frese, M., & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 22(5), 956-974.

Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: an evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 5–39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Runco, M. (2004). Creativity. Annu. Rev. Psychol., 55, 657–87.

Sacramento, C. A., Fay, D., & West, M. (2012). The impact of challenge stressors and regulatory focus on creativity: a dual level analysis. Conditionally accepted at Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.

Sacramento, C, Fay, D & West, MA 2013, 'Workplace duties or opportunities? Challenge stressors, regulatory focus, and creativity' Organizational behavior and human decision processes, vol 121, no. 2, pp. 141-157.

Saleh, J. Marais, K. & Favaro, F. (2014). System safety principles: A multidisciplinary engineering perspective. Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries, 29, 283-294

Scott, S.G. & Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 580−607

Seo, D., Torabi, M.R., Blari, E.H. & Ellis, N. T. (2004). A cross-validation of safety climate scale using confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Safety Research, 35, 427 – 445.

Shalley, C.E (1996). Effect of productivity goals, creativity goals and personal discretion on individual creativity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 179-185.

Shalley, C.E. & Gilson, L.L.(2004). What leaders need to know: a review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity, The Leadership Quarterly, 15(1), 33-53.

Shalley, C.E., Gilson, L.L. & Blum, T.C. (2000). Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: effects on satisfaction and intention to leave. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 215–223.

Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L. & Blum, T. C. (2000). Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 215-223.

Shalley, C.E., Zhou, J. & Oldham, G.R. (2004), The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: where should we go from here, Journal of Management, 30(6), 933-58.

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

Simonton, D.K., (1984).Artistic creativity and interpersonal relationships across and within generations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46, (4), 1273–1286.

Smith, M.J., Karsh, B., Carayon, P. & Conway, F.T. (2003). Controlling occupational safety &

health hazards. In Tetrick, L.E. & Quick, J.C. (Eds.), Handbook of occupational health psychology, (pp. 35–68). Washington DC: APA.

Smith, W.K. & Tushman, M.L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. Organization Science, 16, 522-536.

Stam, D. van Knippenberg, D. & Wisse, B. (2010). Focusing on followers: the role of regulatory focus and possible selves in visionary leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 21(3), 457-468.

Taggar, S. (2002). Individual creativity and group ability to utilize individual creative resources: a multilevel model. Academy of Management Journal, 45(2), 315–330.

Tierney, P. & Farmer, S.M. (2004). An application of the Pygmalion process to subordinate creativity. Journal of Management, 30, 413−432.

Tierney, P., Farmer, S.M. & Graen, G. B. (1999). An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relations, Personnel Psychology, 52, 591−620.

Tushman, M.L. & O'Reilly, C.A. (1996). The ambidextrous organization: managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. California Management Review, 38, 1-23.

Tushman, M.L. & O'Reilly, C.A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. California Management Review, 38, 8-30.

Vermeulen, F. & Barkema, H.G. (2001). Learning through acquisitions. Academy of Management Journal, 44, 457-476.

Volmer,J. Spurk,D.& Niessen.,C. (2012). Leader–member exchange (LMX), job autonomy, and creativework involvement. The Leadership Quarterly 23 (2012) 456–465.

Wahyuni, D. (2012) The research design maze: understanding paradigms, cases, methods and methodologies. JAMAR, Vol. 10, No. 1.

Wallace, C. & Chen, G.(2006). A multilevel integration of personality, climate, self-regulation, and performance, Personnel Psychology, 59, 529–557.

Wallace, J.C., Chen, G. & Kanfer, R. (2005). Development and validation of a work-specific measure of regulatory focus. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA. April

Wallace, J., Popp, E. & Mondore, S. (2006). Safety climate as a mediator between foundation climates and occupational accidents: a group-level investigation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(3), 681-688.

West, M.A. & Anderson, N. (1996).Innovation in top management teams. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,680–693.

West, M.A. & Richards, T. (1999). Innovation, Academic, San Diego, CA.

Woodman, R.A., Sawyer, J.E. & Griffin, R.W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity,

Academy of Management Review, 18, 293–321.

Woodman, R.W., Sawyer, J.E. & Griffin, R.W. (1993).Toward a theory of organizational creativity. Academy of Management Review, 18, 293–321.

Wright, C. (1986). Routine deaths: fatal accidents in the oil industry. The Sociological Review, 34, 265-289.

Whitford, T. & Moss, S. (2009). Transformational leadership in distributed work groups: the moderating role of follower regulatory focus and goal orientation. Communication Research, 36(6), 810-837.

Wu, C., McMullen, J., Neubert, M. & Yi, (2007). The influence of leader regulatory focus on employee creativity, Journal of Business Venturing, 23, (2008), 587–602.

Yun Lin & Chuan Liu. (2012) A cross-level analysis of organizational creativity climate and perceived innovation, the mediating effect of work motivation. European Journal of Innovation Management 15(1), 55-76, q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 1460-1060 DOI 10.1108/14601061211192834.

Zacher, H. & Rosing, K. (In Press) Ambidextrous leadership and team innovation. Leadership & Organization Development Journal.

Zhou, J. (1998). Feedback valence, feedback style, task autonomy, and achievement orientation: Interactive effects on creative performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 261–276.

Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: theoretical and applied implications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 96-102.

Zohar, D. (2000). A group-level model of safety climate: testing the effect of group climate on micro-accidents in manufacturing jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 587-596.

Zohar, D. (2002a).Modifying supervisory practices to improve sub-unit safety: A leadership-based intervention model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 156-163.

Zohar, D. (2002b).The effects of leadership dimensions, safety climate, and assigned priorities on minor injuries in work groups. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23, 75-92.

Zohar, D. (2003). Safety climate: Conceptual and measurement issues. In J.C. Quick & L. Tetrick, (Eds.), Handbook of occupational health psychology, (pp. 123–142). Washington, DC: APA.

Zohar, D. & Luria, G. (2003). The use of supervisory practices as leverage to improve safety behavior: a cross-level intervention model, Journal of Safety Research, 34, 567-577.

Zohar, D. & Luria, G. (2004). Climate as a social-cognitive construction of supervisory safety practices: scripts as proxy of behavior patterns, Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 322-333,

Zohar, D. & Luria, G. (2005) A multilevel model of safety climate: cross-level relationships between organization and group-level climates, Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 616-628.

Zuckerman, H., (1977). Scientific elite: Nobel laureates in the U.S. New York: The Free Press..