Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Vol. 74, 2023, 172–178
https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1003319

Fashion Designers' a Creativity Inside Organizations & Job Satisfaction – A Case Study

João Barata[1] and Rui Miguel[2]

[1]CICANT, Lusófona University, Lisbon, Portugal
[2]Fiber Materials and Environmental Technologies (FibEnTech-UBI), Universidade da Beira Interior, R. Marquês de D'A'vila e Bolama, 6201–001 Covilhã, Portugal

ABSTRACT

Creativity leads to innovation hence to new ways to be more competitive in the current economic situation. Fashion brands and organizations have been improving this magic formula since decades and studies on organizational creativity have bloomed. Originally published in 1939, the Hawthorne experience from Roethlisberger and William (2003), highlighted the importance of the workers' job satisfaction (JS) to augment the levels of productivity inside organizations (Judge et al., 2001; Őnday, 2016). Regardless of how satisfied a given fashion designer is, one cannot deny that the level of JS will provoke a wave of behaviors and attitudes which will influence every element within the organizational system. In this study, validated correlations are presented to prove and showcase the importance of the fashion designers' JS, and how it is connected to micro and macro contexts inside the workplace. The 114 (n = 114) valid answers to an enquiry aiming to understand the role of different variables influencing the fashion designers' self-perceived creativity (SPC) inside the organizations, unveiled several and statistical relevant correlations connecting different organizational contexts with workers' JS. Organizational climate and culture (OCC) and SPC showcased strong correlations with JS (Barata & Miguel, 2022) as well as individual motivation (IM), as suggested by Amabile (1997) when referring that creativity has much to do with loving the work one does and Judge et al., (2001) regarding the role of passion to predict JS. The group climate (GC) presented a moderate influence in the JS rates (R_s=0,547) once group climate can influence trust, autonomy, safety, behaviors, workflow, among other topics within the working teams. As stated in the theory, models and instruments to measure organizational creative climate and innovation (e.g., Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Blomberg & Kallio, 2017; Ekvall, 1996), well defined goals and criteria for excellence (GCE) are correlated to JS in a positive moderate sense (R_s=0,472). The existence of resources (RE) within the workplace are directly linked to increased JS; they are correlated in a moderate and positive way (R_s=0,514) as they are tied to the perception and feeling of how far one's creative developments may reach (T. M. Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2010; Epstein et al., 2013; Woodman et al., 1993). Considering the positive correlations (0 to 1), the study provides clear evidence of unidirectional symbiotic ratio between JS, IM, SPC, OCC, GC, GCE and RE.

Keywords: Fashion designer, Creativity, Organization, Job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to showcase A clear evidence that Job Satisfaction (JS) is correlated in different levels with the organization structures according to a study developed in 2020, analyzing the SPC in the Portuguese textile and apparel scenario (Barata, 2020); JS is relevant for creativity once the latter is responsible for new developments, hence one's performance, passion, fulfilment, and productivity at work (T. M. Amabile, 1997; Judge et al., 2001; Roethlisberger & William, 2003).

General theory indicates competitive organizations are driven by successful implementation of new and useful ideas (creative ideas). This process is called innovation. In this sense, organizational creativity as a topic of research increased in number of publications over the years (Blomberg & Kallio, 2017; Von Stamm, 2008).

Creative outcomes in textile and apparel companies and brands depend on the human imagination, skills, knowledge, interactions (among other variables) inside organizations (T. M. Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Creativity is a reflex of the subject activity and its surroundings (Glaveanu, 2010).

The empirical findings ahead are from a 2019 survey with 114 ($n = 114$) valid answers from textile and apparel designers working in the fashion sectors in Portugal. This study aimes to understand the role of different variables influencing the fashion designers' self-perceived creativity (SPC).

Constructs were developed and approved according to literature to determine IM, SPC, OCC, GC, GCE and RE for statistical significance. This work demonstrates tested correlations for a better scope of what could influence Fashion Designers' JS.

CREATIVE BEHAVOUR & JOB SATISFACTION

Considering that the levels of innovativeness are closely associated to the organizational competitiveness, studies regarding the employees' behaviors at work are fundamental once they fuel the innovation pipeline (Von Stamm, 2008). This is why studies on organizational creativity and innovation have grown over time (Blomberg & Kallio, 2017).

Several Instruments have been developed aiming to study organizations' perceived support for innovation (e.g., Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978), climate and culture for creative responses and innovation (e.g., Ekvall, 1996), working groups' climate (e.g., Anderson & West, 1996, 1998) and employees' perception of the climate for creativity (e.g., T. Amabile et al., 1996), different theoretical models have suggested the interconnection between variables to foster or block creative outcomes (e.g.,T. Amabile, 1988; T. M. Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Ford, 1996; Glaveanu, 2010; Woodman et al., 1993) as well as several empirical studies (e.g., Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2010; Epstein et al., 2013).

A highly connected net of correlations can be found when studying the SPC once it is co-dependent from the surrounding variables, from macro to micro contexts (e.g., Barata, 2020).

Given that the organizational structures are dependent from individuals, either in terms of his/hers creative outcomes either their levels of productivity,

the study of Job Satisfaction arises as fundamental amongst scholars and industrial/management knowledge & practices. The Hawthorne experience from Roethlisberger and William (2003), highlighted the importance of the workers' JS to augment the levels of productivity inside the organizations (Judge et al., 2001; Őnday, 2016). The same level of satisfaction is highlighted when it comes to creative endeavor, as is it is related to passion for the task (T. M. Amabile, 1997; Judge et al., 2001). In theory, JS is related to motivation for creativity as initially stated on the work of Teresa Amabile. Regarding the 2020 study (Barata, 2020), data has indicated a very strong correlation (R_s=0,801) between IM and the entire culture and climate for creativity inside the Portuguese textile and apparel industries (Barata & Miguel, 2021, p. 582); In the current article, a correlation will be tested between IM and JS.

The OCC and the SPC are connected to JS in a strong way, as shown in previous publication from 2022, OCC and JS have a Spearman (Rs) correlation (R_s=0,715) as well as SPC and JS (R_s=0,665) (Barata & Miguel, 2022, p. 521).

According the exiting theory and empirical findings (e.g.,T. M. Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2010; Epstein et al., 2013; Woodman et al., 1993), a connection between resources (RE) within the workplace and the levels of JS is presumed to exist once RE might indicate the length of possibilities for creativity.

When it comes to managing innovation, setting well defined objectives is determinant for a clear path for the workers inside the organizations (T. Amabile, 1988), and this will help in the definition of goals and promote a good work flow (T. Amabile et al., 1996) and guidance for the tasks for innovation (Anderson & West, 1998). Inside the groups, designers should feel trust and safe in sharing their visions; they should share the group goals for excellence and the behaviors should be in accordance to GC (Andriopoulos, 2001; Egan, 2005; Elsbach & Hargadon, 2006; Hemlin, 2009; Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010; West & Anderson, 1996).

Once the fashion design creation inside organizations correspond to group and teamwork, and according to the literature review, the group climate (GC) will influence the JS, the same happens in the case of well-defined objectives and criteria for work excellence (GCE); their existence is expected to enhance JC for creative outcomes.

ANALYSIS

Unlike the JS, measured by asking designers to rate from 1-Totally Unsatisfied to 5-Totally Satisfied, their level of satisfaction with their work (Barata & Miguel, 2022, p. 521) or RE, where designers where asked if they could obtain enough resources inside their workplace (Barata, 2020), IM, SPC, OCC, GC and GCE were not measured in a direct way. Constructs were developed in order to analyze variables formed by a set of questions about behaviors, feelings, believes, etc. (Kerlinger, 1986).

Using data from the 114 (n = 114) answers, several tests were applied using SPSS 23th version, to ensure the validation of the constructs according to the

literature (Cattell, 1966; Comrey & Lee, 1992; Cortina, 1993; Cronbach, 1951; Damásio, 2012; Hair et al., 2006; Hoyle & Duvall, 2004; Kaiser, 1974; Ledesma et al., 2015; Lorenzo-Seva et al., 2011), first the analysis of the components and afterwards the internal consistency of the items, as shown in Table 1, with constructs in columns and the tests in the table lines; some constructs were previously presented in Barata & Miguel (2022, 2021).

Table 1. Tests for analysis of the construct components and internal consistency.

	IM[2]	**SPC**[1]	**OCC**[1/2]	**GC**	**GCE**
Scree plot (Number of components extracted)	1	1	1	1	1
KMO	0,849	0,903	0,943	0,933	0,889
Bartlett test	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*
Cronbach α	0,900	0,927	0,963	0,954	0,897

1(Barata & Miguel, 2022, p. 521)

2(Barata & Miguel, 2021, p. 581)

*Rejects Ho/ there is statistical significance.

Tests proved the possibility for constructs formation.

Afterwards a Kolomogorov-Smirnov normality test showcased normality of distribution on OCC and GC (p>0, 05) and all the other constructs indicated p<0, 05. This indicates Spearman Correlation (Rs) test should be applied.

RESULTS

As expected in the studied literature, correlations were found amongst different variables and constructs regarding JS from designers working in Portugal (n = 114). Table 2 summarizes the correlations with statistical significance (p<0, 05) in different strengths according to Evans (1996).

Table 2. Correlations.

	IM	**SPC**[1]	**OCC**[1]	**GC**	**GCE**	**RE**
Job Satisfaction	R_s=0,704	R_s=0.665	R_s=0.715	R_s=0,547	R_s=0,472	R_s=0,514
Sig.	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*	p<0,05*
strength (Evans, 1996)	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1(Barata & Miguel, 2022, p. 521)

*Rejects Ho/ there is statistical significance.

Considering its strength, IM, SPC and OCC have a strong correlation to the JS. GC, GCE and the existence of resources have a moderate correlation. The positive correlation (from 0 to 1) indicates a unidirectional and symbiotic connection between all contexts; JS levels may augment when other constructs and variable (RE) improve their rates.

CONCLUSION

This study provides clear evidence of a unidirectional symbiotic ratio between JS, IM, GC, SPC, OCC, GCE and RE in the Portuguese Textile and Apparel Industries' designers (n = 114).

Results are in concordance to the literature and empirical studies analyzed for the investigation.

Job Satisfaction and creative endeavors are fundamental for the organizational structure as they ignite the occurrence of new and useful innovations, hence competitiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are very grateful for the support given by research unit Fiber Materials and Environmental Technologies (FibEnTech-UBI), on the extent of the project reference UIDB/00195/2020, funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, IP/MCTES through national funds (PIDDAC).

REFERENCES

Amabile, T. (1988). A Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *10*, 123–167.

Amabile, T., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the Work Environment for Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(5), 1154–1184.

Amabile, T. M. (1997). Motivating Creativity in Organizations: On Doing What You Love and Loving What You Do. *California Review Management*, *40*(1), 39–58.

Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 157–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001

Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1996). The team climate inventory: Development of the tci and its applications in teambuilding for innovativeness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(1), 53–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414840

Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring Climate for Work Group Innovation: Development and Validation of the Team Climate Inventory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *19*(3), 235–258.

Andriopoulos, C. (2001). Determinants of organisational creativity: A literature review. *Management Decision*, *39*(10), 834–841. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740110402328

Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2010). Managing Innovation Paradoxes: Ambidexterity Lessons from Leading Product Design Companies. *Long Range Planning*, *43*(1), 104–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.08.003

Barata, J. (2020). *Estudo da influência dos contextos na criatividade dos Designers de Moda da Indústria Têxtil e do Vestuário*. Universidade da Beira Interior & Universidade do Minho (Associação).

Barata, J., & Miguel, R. (2021). *Individual Motivation to Create Can Boost the Apparel and Textile Company's Culture and Climate for Innovation: A Case Study BT - Advances in Industrial Design* (C. S. Shin, G. Di Bucchianico, S. Fukuda, Y.-G. Ghim, G. Montagna, & C. Carvalho (eds.); pp. 579–584). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80829-7_72

Barata, J., & Miguel, R. (2022). ORGANIZATIONS, CREATIVITY AND JOB SATISFACTION – SYMBIOSIS IN A PORTUGUESE CASE STUDY. In W. Textile, C. Autex, & P. Passion (Eds.), *AUTEX 2022 - Passion for Innovation* (pp. 520–523). https://doi.org/10.34658/9788366741751.110

Blomberg, A., & Kallio, T. (2017). Antecedents of organizational creativity : drivers, barriers or both? *Journal of Innovation Management*, *1*, 78–104.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *1*(2), 245–276. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What Is Coefficient Alpha? An Examination of Theory and Applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(1), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Damásio, B. F. (2012). Uso da análise fatorial exploratória em psicologia. *Avaliação Psicológica*, *11*(2), 213–227.

Egan, T. M. (2005). Creativity in the Context of Team Diversity: Team Leader Perspectives. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *7*(2), 207–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422305274526

Ekvall, G. (1996). Organizational Climate for Creativity and Innovation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(1985), 105–123.

Elsbach, K. D., & Hargadon, A. B. (2006). Enhancing Creativity Through "Mindless" Work: A Framework of Workday Design. *Organization Science*, *17*(4), 470–483. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1060.0193

Epstein, R., Kaminaka, K., Phan, V., & Uda, R. (2013). How is creativity best managed? Some empirical and theoretical guidelines. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *22*(4), 359–374. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12042

Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Ford, C. (1996). A Theory of Creative Action Individual of Individual Creative Theory Action in in Tiple Social Domains Multiple Social Domains. *The Academy of Management Review*, *21*(4), 1112–1142. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1996. 9704071865

Glaveanu, V. (2010). New Ideas in Psychology Paradigms in the study of creativity : Introducing the perspective of cultural psychology veanu. *New Ideas in Psychology*, *28*(1), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2009.07.007

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6a ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hemlin, S. (2009). Creative knowledge environments: An interview study with group members and group leaders of university and industry r&d groups in biotechnology. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *18*(4), 278–285. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00533.x

Hoyle, R. H., & Duvall, J. L. (2004). Determining the Number of Factors in Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In D. Kaplan (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Quantitative Methodology for the Social Sciences* (pp. 301–315).

Isaksen, S. G., & Ekvall, G. (2010). Managing for innovation: The two faces of tension in creative climates. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *19*(2), 73–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00558.x

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(3), 376–407.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (3rd ed.). Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ledesma, R. D., Valero-Mora, P., & Macbeth, G. (2015). The Scree Test and the Number of Factors: a Dynamic Graphics Approach. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *18*(June), E11. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2015.13

Lorenzo-Seva, U., Timmerman, M. E., & Kiers, H. A. L. (2011). The hull method for selecting the number of common factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *46*(2), 340–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.564527

Őnday, Ő. (2016). Human Resource Theory: From Hawthorne Experiments of Mayo To Groupthink of Janis. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, *4*(1), 95–110.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & William, J. D. (2003). *Management and the Worker* (K. Thompson (ed.)). Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group.

Siegel, S. M., & Kaemmerer, W. F. (1978). Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*(5), 553–562. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.5.553

Von Stamm, B. (2008). *Managing innovation, design and creativity* (2º). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

West, M. A., & Anderson, N. R. (1996). Innovation in top management teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(6), 680–693. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.680

Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a Theory of Organizational Creativity. *The Academy of Management Review*, *18*(2), 293. https://doi.org/10.2307/258761