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Abstract

In this theoretical paper we go beyond other organizational creativity research attempting to find a comprehensive narrative structure of creative conditions and look instead through an antenarrative lens at more dynamic interplay of embodied practices that can bring about new discoveries. Through theorizing, contextualised in the haute cuisine industry, we demonstrate that chefs’ practices, which we collected from the literature, can help depicting ‘prototypical’ characters that chefs adopt when organizing and leading for creativity. Each character is a metaphor symbolizing a constellation of organizational constraints on entrepreneurship, play and creativity. In other words, our characters signify different ways of how the entrepreneurial space in which creativity and play happens is constrained and provide vignettes for researchers to explore actions in context and to look for evoking stories of organizational creativity.
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Introduction

Creativity is vitally important for the market attractiveness of organizations, their effectiveness, and survival, and is recognized as an important constituent of innovation (see Davenport et al., 2003, Amabile, 1988, West, 2002, Woodman et al., 1993, George, 2007, Oldham, 2003, Crossan and Apaydin, 2010). Due to the complexity of today’s problems, team or group creativity, in particular, has become a central topic for organizations. The reason for this is that organizations believe that by putting together creative individuals with diverse knowledge and skill sets (Reiter-Palmon et al., 2008, Devine et al., 1999, West et al., 2004, Paulus and Nijstad, 2003), the level of organizational creativity can become ‘more than the sum of its parts’ (see Sacramento et al., 2008). Organizational creativity is here defined as the creation of a new and useful value by people jointly working together in the complex social system of an organization (Woodman et al., 1993, p. 293).

However, being considered an individual human endeavor, creativity has predominantly been studied at the level of the individual and those studies that have focused on teams or groups have tended to investigate individuals in a collective setting (Reiter-Palmon et al., 2008, Mumford, 2003, Brophy, 1998, Mumford et al., 2003, Ward et al., 1999) or tools and techniques for facilitating collective creativity. Thus, little is known how creativity in-between people can be fostered through entrepreneurship, the organization-creation that aims to turn creative ideas into innovations (Driver, 2008, Hjorth, 2005, Hjorth, 2012).

We use the terms ‘team and group creativity’ interchangeably as a level of analysis above the ‘individual’ and as terms being descriptive of organizational creativity (see Reiter-Palmon et al., 2008) and further argue that organizational research has shown a preference for industries that appear to be serious, mature, and logical, thus ignoring those that are playful, producing fun and frivolity (see Rehn, 2004). We view creativity, in general, and organizational creativity, in particular, as processes that move in-between the intra- and interpersonal (Dinh et al., 2014, Mainemelis et al., 2015) in spaces of play in which its actors inter-subjectively share the embodied and often atheoretical (Chia, 2003) and ‘unspoken and unspeakable’ aspects of creative work (Stierand, 2015, Stierand and Dörfler, 2015) as they are thinking together (Pyrko et al., 2015).
Such processes are typically non-linear and non-algorithmic (Stierand and Dörfler, 2011, Stierand et al., 2014), bearing resemblance to Boje’s (2001, p. 1) concept of antenarrative. Being part of the larger domain of ‘storytelling’, antenarrative is not a coherent, developmental plot, but a prereflexive awareness and communicative process of wandering from an ill-structured and nebulous story, consisting of fragments that will make retrospective sense, to a future narrative with a beginning, middle and end (Boje, 2008). Hence, antenarratives are the antecedents before and towards something new that is becoming and are ‘in the middle’ and ‘in-between’ (Boje, 2001, p. 293) refusing to attach linear beginning, middle and ending (Boje, 2008, p. 28).

In this paper we apply an antenarrative lens to creative practices in organizations; meaning that we are interested in uncovering where ideas and creations are coming from and we assume that there is an antenarrative at the core of the origin of the creative process. Therefore, we frame the before-of-narrative and bets-on-the-future processes of creativity in the context of organizations that use prospective (forward looking) sensemaking rather than only retrospective (backward looking) sensemaking (Weick, 1995). More precisely, through theorizing, contextualised in the haute cuisine industry, we demonstrate that chefs’ practices, which we collected from the literature, can help depicting ‘prototypical’ characters that chefs adopt when organizing and leading for creativity.

Hence, this means that we do not adopt the antenarrative lens as the structure of the paper but rather as an assumed dynamic constellation of the initial part of the creative process that we are interested in. One of the strengths of the antenarrative approach is that the starting point of the creative process is not viewed as something static, a ‘structure’ in the traditional sense of the term, but rather as the beginning of a story, a constellation that somehow evolved and continues to evolve during the creative process, thereby this approach is essentially a process-approach. This also implies that we do not intend to break down the antenarratives into, for example elements or relationships, but rather handle them as dynamic wholes, which is signified in the term ‘constellation’. Essentially, we are looking into patterns of constellations of organizational constraints on entrepreneurship, play and creativity in order to build a metaphorical classification in form of a meta-vignette.

Based on this theorizing, we offer two contributions. First, because each character is a metaphor symbolizing a constellation of organizational constraints to entrepreneurship, play and creativity, we provide a more nuanced picture of
the different ways of how creativity and play is constrained in entrepreneurial spaces. This is in line with Weick (2012), who argues that research has underestimated the complexity of organizational constraints and their influence on the 'knowing-in-practice' (Gherardi and Strati, 2012) that characterizes the interaction between entrepreneurship, play and creativity in organizations (Hjorth et al., 2015). Second, the characters provide vignettes for researchers to explore actions in context and to look for evoking stories of organizational creativity (see Boje, 2001, Czarniawska, 1998, Gabriel, 2000, Cornelissen et al., 2005). We therefore go beyond other organizational creativity research attempting to find a comprehensive narrative structure of creative conditions and look instead through an antenarrative lens at more dynamic interplay of embodied practices that can bring about new discoveries.

We begin now with delineating the concepts of creativity in and in-betw en people. Then, we examine practices of creativity in haute cuisine, the industry context in which we frame our theorizing. This is followed by a section in which we explain how we organised the practices collected from the literature and that inform our vignettes. Lastly, we end with a critical discussion and present a meta-vignette comprising all characters. It is further important to note that in order to paint a rich picture of entrepreneurship, play and creativity in organizations, we draw on diverse knowledge backgrounds, ranging from the cognitive sciences to phenomenology and from organization studies to hospitality management, and use a metaphoric language to support intuitive understanding rather than all-in-one managerialist solutions.

Creativity in and in-between People

It is commonly assumed that creative ideas, regardless whether they come from individuals or teams, always originate from what Runco (2007) calls personal creativity, which is an asocial and individualistic process. As a result of this assumption, two main streams of studies emerged. On the one hand, there are those studies that employ a social-personality lens (Sacramento et al., 2008), primarily anchored in Amabile’s (1988, 1983, 1996) componential model of individual creativity in organizations. Their focus is largely on contextual and personality factors which may foster or hinder creativity (e.g. George and Zhou, 2001), such as resources, techniques, and motivation (e.g. Amabile, 1988). On the other hand, there are those studies that are interested in understanding the cognitive, affective and conative complexities of the processes and phenomena ‘upstream’ (Howkins, 2005, Sacramento et al., 2008).
Whilst we can see benefit in treating cognition and the social context as two separate problem domains when studying creativity at the individual level, this separation naturally causes issues when trying to understand team creativity. From a cognitive perspective, team creativity has been associated with shared internal frames of reference (Mitchell, 1986), negotiated belief structures (Walsh et al., 1988), team mental models (Klimoski and Mohammed, 1994), and team member schema similarity (Rentsch and Hall, 1994) to name just a few. The latter received considerable academic interest, presumably due to Rentsch and Klimoski’s (2001) nuanced view of team cognition. The authors argue that member schemas are similar rather than shared, because cognitive schemas reside in the individual and are not identical. In other words, team member schemas can be conceptualized as interconnected knowledge bundles (Lord and Maher, 1991) that are “characterized by incomplete agreement” (Rentsch and Klimoski, 2001, p. 108), but help team members organizing and understanding phenomena (Poole et al., 1990).

From a phenomenological perspective, this view can be substantiated through the philosophical concept of *qualia*, which describes individual instances of subjective experience that cannot be put precisely into words or reduced to impersonal objective features, because it must be treated as embedded in the context and should never be separated from the context. Yet, people who have had an experience of the same phenomenon, can discuss parts of their subjective experience inter-subjectively (Jackson, 1982, Lewis, 1929, Stierand and Dörfler, 2014).

It is precisely the phenomenological notion of context in which the creative process is embedded that seems to be neglected in the cognitive perspective, which is vital to better understand the different behaviours involved in creativity. These behaviours are multifaceted and complex, reflecting “maturity and experience” and also involve those “that are found in early childhood” (Runco, 1996, pp. 3-4). Thus, creativity in context shows that in-between and becoming creative can be over long time horizons (Boje et al., 2015, Stierand, 2015) during which creative individuals must sustain an ‘innocence-in-experience’ (Barron, 1995). This innocence-in-experience can be recalled through play (Barrett, 1998, Csikszentmihalyi and LeFevre, 1989, Glynn, 1994, Huy, 1999, Mainemelis, 2001, Mainemelis and Dionysiou, 2015), making the in-between a fore-structuring of the “cradle of creativity” that can create entrepreneurial spaces of play. In turn, this requires play to be “woven into the deep fabric of organizational life” (Mainemelis and Ronson, 2006, pp. 81-83, Miller, 1973) and fostered by entrepreneurship that actively creates spaces of play (Hjorth, 2005).
Practices and Entrepreneurial Spaces of Play in Haute Cuisine

In haute cuisine creativity is publicly evaluated by the domain’s gatekeepers, the Michelin and Gault Millau restaurant guides (Svejenova et al., 2007, Stierand, 2015, Stierand et al., 2014), and the creative progress of restaurants is typically in the hands of a leader, the ‘grand chef’ (Bouty and Gomez, 2010, Bouty and Gomez, 2013). This is different from other domains, for example science, where collaborative projects may be managed by designated administrative leaders, but teams may otherwise remain leaderless (Chompalov et al., 2002).

Whilst haute cuisine is still considered a “crafts industry composed by professional organizations” (Gomez et al., 2003, p. 107) producing high quality products, creativity is given more and more priority in the evaluations by restaurant judges and paying customers alike (Bouty and Gomez, 2013, Stierand, 2015, Stierand et al., 2014, Svejenova et al., 2007, Svejenova et al., 2010, DeFillippi et al., 2007, Messeni Petruzzelli and Savino, 2014).

Consequently, the ‘revolutionary intensity’ of chefs’ creativity is strictly guarded by external stakeholders, requiring chefs to balance their creative ideas with the ‘current practices’ in haute cuisine (Ferguson, 1998, Ferguson, 2004, Johnson et al., 2005, Karpik, 2000, Svejenova et al., 2007, Stierand et al., 2014). Practice can, therefore, be described as a domain’s nexus of interconnected practices that form its site of knowing (Nicolini, 2011), which, as we argue, is fostered and maintained through entrepreneurial spaces of play in which actions, objects, people, and meaning come together and create and organize one another (see Mainemelis and Dionysiou, 2015, Mainemelis and Ronson, 2006, Schatzki, 2005).

Value is thus created through aesthetic and symbolic work as much as through products and their use (Svejenova et al., 2007, Chaston and Sadler-Smith, 2012), demanding from chefs to bridge tradition and future through their practices in order to create something new (see Rao et al., 2005). Hence, haute cuisine chefs make use of practices from the world of art (Horng and Hu, 2008, Ferguson, 2004, Fine, 1996, Kuehn, 2005, Stierand and Lynch, 2008, Telfer, 2002) in order to “disturb, subvert, or cancel the rules of everyday communication” (Jaques, 2014, p. 66), making their creative production not only a “symbolic force but also an everyday power of revolution” (ibid., p. 66).

Hegarty and O’Mahony (1999), therefore, describe haute cuisine as a form of
cross-cultural communication aimed at attracting the human intellect through playful and essentially non-practical means of expression.

Within their teams, ‘grand chefs’ strongly influence the inter-subjective understanding of creativity through their highly developed creative voice (Stierand, 2015). They dominate the space of play but never ‘own’ it or perform solo acts. They are in-between, fore-structuring a creative process to work “the ground up” in an “amplification of understanding” where the basic conditions of cuisine can be extended, bringing things about by “working out these fore-structures” in working with the ingredients, the tools, and way in which dishes have “Being-in-the-world” (Heidegger, 1962: section #153). New dishes can therefore be seen as creative ‘bets’ in a process of ‘becoming’ that ‘never quite get there’ (Boje et al., 2004, p. 756), but without these bets their ‘Being-in-the-world’ could not become.

Any creative process, but creative team processes, in particular, are naturally complex and chaotic (Boje et al., 2004). Artisans, for example, often start with a vague and blurred vision of what they want to create, an antenarrative of minimal fore-sight, and only during the process of production, when they start playing with the “materials, tools, techniques, design, form, and function” (Guthrie, 2007, p. 2), the vision that essentially inspired them becomes more and more clear, is the antenarrative bet on the future understood. In this context, the creative process is playful and engaging (Mainemelis and Ronson, 2006), an experimental (formative) search for new ideas during the process of producing ideas in-between the senses and the mind through acts of encounter, in action (Gherardi and Perrotta, 2014, p. 143). Here, ideas do not seem to originate from “sudden and brilliant inspiration”, but rather to emerge from “the mixing of colours, letting oneself be led by taste in a ludic dimension where emotions, sensible knowledge, and aesthetic judgement lead the process” (Gherardi and Perrotta, 2014, p. 143).

In other situations, however, the appearance of ideas can look and feel like a sudden inspiration (e.g. chef Raymond Blanc in Stierand, 2015, p. 12), which is a “manifest sign of long, unconscious prior work” (Poincaré in Hadamard, 1996, p. 14), or what we are calling antenarrative fore-structuring. It is believed that play by fore-structuring can trigger such situations if it is used in a divisionary manner that is when play is used as a diversion from the actual work-related tasks and therefore is able to affect creativity indirectly (see Perry-Smith and Shalley, 2003, Elsbach and Hargadon, 2002). Thus, playing can relieve from the coercive rules and norms of behaving and thinking in organizations (March, 1976) and can foster cognitive and behavioural flexibility (Weick, 1979, Amabile,
1996). This further shows that creativity has to do with a willingness to stay in the in-between, to work out something, as yet, unknown. In other words, in-betweenness constellates the testing and re-testing of new ideas in organizational spaces of play, the boundaries of which are real but irrelevant during the process of re-creating what will emerge.

Leaving the playground, what is in-between gets internally evaluated whether it make sense, is feasible to implement, and may have real world implications. This description of the in-between shows resemblance to Weick's process of disciplined imagination in theorizing, which, he argues, is far less rigid and linear than propagated and actually far more 'intuitive, blind, wasteful, serendipitous, [and] creative' (Weick, 1989, p. 519). It is an evolutionary process of designing, conducting, and interpreting imaginary experiments (Weick, 1989).

Organizing the Literature on Chefs’ Practices

Based on the above discussing of play, practices and creativity, we conceptualise play as the carrier of knowing-in-action during the creative process. Amin and Roberts (2008) have identified three modes of knowing-in-action relevant to our discussion (see Stierand, 2015). The first, typical for more closed and hierarchically managed organizations, uses predominantly task/craft practices aimed at creating customised products with incremental innovation. The second, typical for organizations in which knowing-in-action is predominantly carried by networks of collaborators that extend their doings into other communities, makes use of professional practices aimed at producing both incremental and radical innovation, but mostly within the confines of the accepted institutional and professional norms and rules. The third, typical for organizations that utilize deliberately created groups of experts from different disciplines, employs epistemic/creative practices aimed at creating radical and path-breaking innovations.

In addition to these three modes of knowing-in-action, we have employed Mainemelis et al. (2015) three categories of practices of creative leadership since, as mentioned earlier, the creative progress in haute cuisine is typically in the hands of a leader, the ‘grand chef’ (Bouty and Gomez, 2010, Bouty and Gomez, 2013). The first category is directing practices that help the leader to materialize his or her own vision as a creative institutional entrepreneur. The second is facilitating practices that foster the creativity of others in the organizational context. And the third is integrating practices that foster the
collaboration with other experts synthesizing the “own creative work with the heterogeneous creative contributions of other professionals” (Mainemelis et al., 2015, p. 7).

Mainemelis et al. (2015) describe the typical haute cuisine chef as a directive creative leader, a description that we can support based on the practices in haute cuisine we have identified in the literature and which we present in Table I organized in a matrix combining Amin and Roberts (2008) three modes of knowing-in-action with Mainemelis et al. (2015) three categories of creative leadership practices.

[insert Table I about here]

Table I shows that creativity in haute cuisine is embedded amongst many different practices of which some can be described as creative and others as supportive. Due to the highly institutionalized nature of haute cuisine, chefs usually learn first the standards and rules of the domain before they disconnect from them and playfully change them (Stierand, 2015, Horng and Hu, 2008). Their work is characterized by a permanent search for new ideas, which they create by experimenting with ingredients and techniques or by playing in their imagination with their creative repertoires (Stierand et al., 2014, Svejenova et al., 2007, Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2007). The codification of new ideas is promoted by both critics and the media and by the chefs themselves who make their ideas public, for example in cookery books, thereby achieving a ‘norms-based patenting’ of their ideas (Fauchart and von Hippel, 2006).

More and more chefs engage in systematic record-keeping, categorizing, and cataloguing of their creative endeavours and findings (e.g. Abend, 2013). These archiving efforts seem to become ever more important the more chefs increase the ‘revolutionary intensity’ of their creativity and root their creative voice in the professional and epistemic/creative sphere of practices (see Stierand, 2015). Intuitively, this makes sense, because the unpredictability of creativity requires that the tools are readily available and do not occupy the chefs’ attention during the creative process. In other words, creative ideas in haute cuisine have “nothing to do with serendipity” (Bouty & Gomez, 2013: 81). Rather, they are the result of long prior work that lays the foundation for the embodiment of the domain’s practices so that they become ‘sensors of creativity’ (Polányi, 1962, Polányi, 1969, Polányi and Prosch, 1975, Tsoukas, 2005). Hence, creative ideas emerge, in part, from antenarrative fore-structuring processes. In our
discussion we will highlight some of the other antenarrative connections to creativity.

**Discussion and Meta-Vignette**

In this final section we develop our main contributions. Based on the practices organised in Table I, we identify ‘prototypical’ characters that creative chefs adopt when organizing and leading for creativity in-between people. Then, we further elucidate these characters through storytelling and explain the power of their systemic constellation—our meta-vignette—for evoking stories of organizational creativity. It is important to note that the characters are dynamic due to changing levels of creativity in the chefs’ present and historic creative production. This means, the innovator of today may be the traditionalist of tomorrow and the epistemic/creative practices of today may be the craft/task practices of tomorrow.

Furthermore, the characters do not represent the creative choices and performance of chefs, but rather characterize the process of interconnected practices through which a new creation emerges (see Chia and Holt, 2006). Hence, the characters should be treated as ‘prototypical’ rather than exact and precise casts. When we collected the practices from the literature presented in Table I and then immersed ourselves in the storytelling that led to the meta-vignette presented in Table II, we gradually realised that the nine characters are actually metaphors symbolizing different constellations of organizational constraints on entrepreneurship, play and creativity. Moreover, the nine characters present three distinct, yet overlapping, fluid, and iterative paradigms depicting types of organizations in which antenarratives are either focused on material aspects, conceptual aspects or bets on the future. The three horizontal level types of practices, in turn, describe the change in methodology (directing practices), epistemology (facilitating practices), and ontology (integrating practices) chefs go through during their creative evolution.

For example, chefs are artisans. As chef Alain Passard puts it: “You need to listen to the food products, you need to master the flame that it never damages, but rather caresses” (cited in Gomez and Bouty, 2011, p. 930). These character roles depend on the ‘revolutionary intensity’ of creativity chefs currently pursue. If change does not happen, it is difficult to sustain reputation as expressed by Chef René Redzepi: “Even though we got a Michelin star in the first year, I felt I was cheating people. We weren’t touching anything new. It was Scandinavian
French – I was cooking things I knew, I just replaced products. I was borrowing someone else’s brain” (interviewed by Durrant, in The Guardian, 2010 in A(p) cited in Messeni Petruzzelli and Savino, 2014, p. 231).

The directing of craft/task practices is described with the metaphor of the artisan, who is running a workshop with the aim to make the guest happy by doing what has always been done. Customization results simply from a variation of known practices. Thus, for the artisan it is all about “...technique, rigor, discipline, professionalism, memory, culture...Only if one knows one’s traditions and is able to make the classics impeccably, then it is possible to modify them, to invent new dishes” (anonymous chef cited in Balazs, 2001, pp. 136-137). Hence, without artisanal roots “creativity is just make up” (chef WP cited in Horng and Lee, 2006, p. 16). Even chef Ferran Adrià, the ‘Salvador Dali of modern cuisine’ (Stierand, 2015, Woodward and Stierand, 2014), “is a master of the classics foremost, and then he sat down in the creative role. He knows how to use salt first before anything else” (anonymous chef cited in Opazo, 2012, p. 88).

The role of the designer, our ‘director’ of professional practices, is more collaborative and inclusive than that of the artisan. The designer is familiar with what is possible and acceptable in the domain, does not go beyond that, but utilizes the available possibilities to full extent. One such possibility is, for example, to repackage classical dishes. Chef Davide Scabin, when creating his dish called “‘Piola Kit”...wanted to recreate the atmosphere of old inns within a box where the customer could find the classic bottle of Barbera, an original Del Negro pack and six different small pots containing a complete old inn menu” (Slavich et al., 2011, p. 27). “There’s always been art in haute cuisine”, says Ferran Adrià, but “[w]hat is happening now is that there is a demand for the art to be surprising, that it have a greater design factor” (cited in Svejenova et al., 2007, p. 554). This design factor can be achieved, for instance, by “putting together all the ingredients which [have] the same colors” (chef Moreno Cedroni cited in Slavich et al., 2011, p. 21) or by “[changing] the material...like an artist who works in watercolours and turns his hand to oils or a sculptor in wood who changes to bronze” (chef Alain Passard interviewed by Daily Telegraph, 13 January 2001, cited in Gomez and Bouty, 2011, p. 932).

The final character at the level of directing practices is the philosopher, whose role is to engage in or even invent epistemic/creative practices with the aim to
challenge the domain’s boundaries and what is accepted within them. The philosopher is interested in new knowledge and perhaps in creating a better new world, someone who wants “to mark the history of haute cuisine” (chef B cited in Gomez and Bouty, 2009, p. 13). Today, extraordinary chefs “need to ‘explain’ [their] distinctive culinary style ‘by setting [their] philosophy down in writing” (Svejenova et al., 2010, p. 419, referring to Ferran Adrià and his team at elBulli). Like philosophers, chefs write down in order to trace and codify “the evolution of [their] cuisine” (chef Ferran Adrià cited in Svejenova et al., 2010, p. 420), but also to create strong emotions in themselves and in others in order to get the necessary support to be able to push the boundaries of the domain: “I was writing to a girl and my tears dropped onto the letter. So, I made a teardrop-shaped choux pastry as a present for her. The ingredients included cheese, coco powder, sugar powder. I put all my affection into the product; I made the story of my love for her real. Like Dewey said, emotions increase the depth of design. That helps my work come to life” (chef CF1-124 cited in Horng and Hu, 2008, p. 229).

The instructor, the facilitator of craft/task practices, is closely tied to the idea that team members must apply recipes and thus the instructor’s role is to ensure that recipes are strictly followed. It is important to stress that we do not suggest that chefs in the craft/task paradigm are not creative. We argue, however, that they are in a phase in which they ‘protect’ or ‘capitalise on’ a previous phase of creative leadership (or they are simply ‘tired and empty’). This is why they “cannot stand mediocrity…[they] love to teach [their] apprentices, to see them develop. But if someone is sloppy or careless, [they] get very angry” (anonymous chef cited in Balazs, 2001, p. 140). In fact, such chefs can be commercially very successful: “…Ducasse created a formula that each time is fitted in different ways. Indeed, each chef of Ducasse restaurants adds a personal and original touch. However, Ducasse insists his restaurants remain “his”, because the chefs have worked under him for years and this is the key of his success” (chef Davide Scabin cited in Slavich et al., 2011, p. 24).

The mentor, our metaphor for facilitating professional practices describes a senior colleague, who has already been where the protégé is. The mentor wants to be known “for being somebody who has given, who has trained, who has taught…It is the privilege of age to train people” (anonymous chef cited in Balazs, 2001, p. 146). Our mentor knows what is around the corner, can open doors that are important for but beyond the reach of the protégé: “I have had many apprentices, many people have learned in my kitchen. They were screamed at when they did not do their best. But they love me. Still today, my
old apprentices call me from all over the world and tell me how much they learned from me" (anonymous chef cited in Balazs, 2001, p. 146). In fact, chef Moreno Cedroni stresses that, “[i]n order to make [his] business grow, …[he has] to become a mentor…However, it is extremely important to choose talented people, and this is another important responsibility that a chef has: being able to find talent in people and to enrich it” (cited in Slavich et al., 2011, p. 22).

Our facilitator of epistemic/creative practices is the coach. The primary means of facilitating in this role is by opening up ‘melting pots of play’ to include knowledge not only from the cutting edge of the domain but also from beyond the domain’s boundaries. This knowledge is then contextualized within a particular problem area to enable the creation of new knowledge. Their main strength lies in “the ability to reunite talents of different calibers”, as one chef explained: “Once I hired an MBA from MIT. When I asked him to work for me, he said: But what am I going to do in a restaurant? My answer was: You are going to have fun. You are going to do something new and different. This was many years ago, and he is still with me” (anonymous chef cited in Balazs, 2001, p. 143). The role of the coach is to enable experts from different disciplines to work together. Chef René Redzepi, for instance, brought a biologist into his team “whose role is to ensure the suitability of the old ingredients Redzepi discovers in his travels. Redzepi said, “If I see something I haven’t seen before, I just snap it and send it to her” (interviewed by Rose, in The Financial Times, 2010, in A(t), cited in Messeni Petruzzelli and Savino, 2014, p. 232).

Moving on to the ontological level of integrating practices, we have chosen the label of the curator to describe the integrator of craft/task practices. The curator is a content specialist, who integrates practices of others, oversees and keeps record of the domain’s cultural heritage, and aims for more or less risk-free interpretations of heritage creations. Curating includes a lot of teaching, because “people, even though they have access [to elBulli’s material], they don’t know where to look…[Students] may have seen these techniques but not necessarily seen somebody do them first-hand” (anonymous chef cited in Opazo, 2012, p. 87, [in original]). The worldview of the curator is that of protecting the holy grail of the domain.

The diplomat, in contrast, integrates professional practices not simply by softly interpreting heritage creations, but by building synergies between the interpretations of collaborators in order to give rise to emergent features that can inform new creations. This requires that the practices of the collaborators
are negotiated diplomatically. Ferran Adrià tells the following story: “For four hours, we explained our philosophy, how we understand that the senses work in cuisine, our way of seeing the sixth sense, the symbiosis between the sweet and savory worlds, and our overall understanding of cuisine. At the end, they stood up and applauded for twenty minutes. It was one of the happiest moments of our gastronomic lives. We were 20000 km from home, but here were many leaders of opinion from different countries who now understood that there was a modern Spanish cuisine (chef Ferran Adrià, 2001, 14 August in A1(f), cited in Svejenova et al., 2007, p. 552).

Finally, the visionary, our integrator of epistemic/creative practices is a character driven by the ability to see the ‘big picture’ and constantly searches for new ‘big pictures’, a process by which all the explicit and implicit knowledge components come together and form an entirely new yet consistent and valid vision of the future of the domain. “[I]n the end, everything exists already…So it is a matter of seeing it and conceptualizing it. [One could say that] until 1998 hot jellies did not exist [an innovation incorporated by elBulli in haute cuisine] – this is not true! You could find it [hot jellies] in Chinese cuisine! The fact that in the year 98 the first hot jelly appeared in [culinary] history is because we conceptualized it” (chef Ferran Adrià, public talk given at the “Food and Wine Festival”, NewYork, October2011, cited in Opazo, 2012, p. 86, [in original]). Hence, visionaries know that they are the engine that advances the history of the domain and that they will potentially “contribute to a deep change in culinary creation” (chef Alain Passard interviewed in Libération, 29 December 2000, cited in Gomez and Bouty, 2011, p. 934). “[A]ll this has to do with ego too. Ferran Adrià to create his brand, he wants elBulli and Ferran Adrià to exist for 20 years more, after he dies, and for this he needs to leave proof. So they have shared all the information of what they have done, but at the same time they’re saying: ‘this was made by elBulli, this was made by Ferran Adrià’” (Apprentice at elBullirestaurant, 2011, cited in Opazo, 2012, p. 88).

Based upon these practices organized in the above section, we turn now to making several summary ‘antenarrative’ theory connections. Rather than fully-formed, creativity practices, according to the chefs examples and by extending Heidegger’s thoughts further, involve use of play combined with antenarrative processes that afford fore-having (bringing about the possibilities of creativity), fore-structuring (bringing the material elements and actors together in a place and time where creativity could unfold), fore-concept (ideas and language in play that identifies particular kinds of play as more or less creative), fore-sight (the ability to foresee that such spaces, times, and material elements are
important to creative emergence), and fore-caring (the answerability for getting the creative process in its entirety to unfold, i.e. bringing all these antenarrative elements together).

All these antenarrative processes happen before the narrative coheres, in retrospect, ‘ah that is the way in which the dish might be prepared, could be prepared, is on the way, to being something entirely new.’ The craft/task paradigm is concerned with material aspects of creativity, the materials in-between people, bringing about something original. The professional paradigm focuses on the conceptual (fore-concept). The epistemic/creative paradigm is more about the bet on the future (fore-sight). The directing, facilitating, and integrating practices are less about fore-telling and instead set the necessary conditions, bringing together actors, actants (materials, contexts), and a sense of play, for a team to enact creativity, to go about the process of letting events unfold, new dishes arrive, and are rescued from the play, as something worth repeating, tinkering with.

Thus, the antenarrative practices are an additional layer ‘in the middle’ and ‘in-between’ (Boje, 2001, p. 293) the ontological, epistemological, and more empiric practices of organizational creativity. Antenarrative practices are the ‘glue in-between’ intra- and inter-personal spaces of play. We further suggest that chefs adopt these characters in their Unternehmergeist, or entrepreneurial spirit, to actualize organizational creativity by providing a behavioural orientation for their team and collaborators during the process of creating ideas between their ‘hands and heads’ (Gherardi and Perrotta, 2014). Hence, we see the nine characters as dwelling modes for chefs, enabling them to organize and lead for creativity in-between people (see Chia and Holt, 2006). The characters should, therefore, not be viewed from the perspective of the individual creative leader’s goals and motivations, but rather from a perspective of relations and practices in-between people (see Chia and Holt, 2006).

**Concluding Remarks**

Based on our meta-vignette we argue that all creative teams need entrepreneurs in the sense of creators of spaces of play in organizations that are often, as Hjorth (2010, p. 16) puts it, kept “in place by strategists”. We further follow Hjorth’s (2005) understanding of entrepreneurs as those with the “spirit of playful seriousness” amongst those other organizational systematisers
who are too serious in their solemn zeal to be really serious (Ardley, 1967, p. 227).

We believe that in order to better understand creativity and particularly creativity in-between people, we academics have to critically question our egalitarian but elite view of the world. Simonton (1999) clearly reminds us that the creative process, both at the intra- and inter-personal levels, is inherently Darwinian. Consequently, if we aim to build theories of organizational creativity that are interesting (Bartunek et al., 2007), relevant (Vermeulen, 2007, Fendt et al., 2008) and have the potential to impact organizational life and the practice of management (Pfeffer, 2007), we cannot just evaluate the team’s creative output. Instead we have to study creativity in-between people from within their natural contexts (see Luthans and Davis, 1982, Evered and Louis, 1981).

Organizational creativity research can be extended by inquiring in the in-between of intra- and inter-personal spaces of play, the embodied practices. These self-renewing playgrounds of creative practicing are evident in chef-work. Chefs and their teams are working out the fore-structuring of the conditions of creative play, casting for the emergence of new mixes of colours, tastes, aesthetics, and so on. The nine characters in this playful creative chef-work are places for researchers to look for evoking stories. We view this as a contribution that goes beyond researchers attempting to find a single narrative structure of creative conditions, and look instead at more dynamic interplay of embodied practices, to work out antenarrative processes that can bring about new cuisine discoveries.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>directing practices</th>
<th>professional practices</th>
<th>epistemic/creative practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>everyday cooking practices, developing recipes, dishes, and menus (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Fine, 1996, Slavich et al., 2011, Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2009, Svejenova et al., 2013; Zopilas, 2010 and articulating the own culinary style (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Durand et al., 2007; Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011; Hagarty &amp; Bahany, 2001, Rao et al., 2005; Stefano et al., 2010)</td>
<td>recombining ingredients and applying cooking techniques in new contexts (Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Lane &amp; Lup, 2014; Messi Petruzzelli &amp; Savino, 2014, Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009; Rao et al., 2005; Svejenova et al., 2010), e.g. using transposition (e.g. using old cooking techniques with new ingredients or new cooking techniques with old ingredients), acclimatization (e.g. importing other cuisine traditions, seasonings, and spices) (Byrkjeflot et al., 2013; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Messi Petruzzelli &amp; Savino, 2014; Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2010; Svejenova et al., 2013; Rao et al., 2003), or deconstruction (altering the temperature and texture of all or some ingredients of an existing dish) (Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2007)</td>
<td>intellectualisation of own creative philosophy (Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Rao et al., 2013; Stierand, 2015; Svejenova et al., 2007), and theorising practices through codifying and categorising knowledge and identifying relationships between the different knowledge categories (Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010; Svejenova et al., 2013) based on systems, record-keeping, documenting, and cataloguing (Opazo, 2013, Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focusing on aesthetic presentation of creations (Fine, 1996; Horng &amp; Lee, 2009; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
<td>focusing on the experience of gastronomy by including elements of surprise (Senf et al., 2013; Svejenova et al., 2013)</td>
<td>creating a new culinary language (Svejenova et al., 2010) and stipulating a culinary manifesto (Byrkjeflot et al., 2013),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rediscovering forgotten ingredients and recipes (Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011; Messi Petruzzelli &amp; Savino, 2014) and modernizing old/classical recipes (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013; Fine, 1996; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Lane, 2013, Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
<td>re-inventing and re-interpreting old/classical recipes(Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Messi Petruzzelli &amp; Savino, 2014) based on extensive secondary research (Balazs, 2001; Byrkjeflot et al., 2013; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; 2009; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010; Svejenova et al., 2013)</td>
<td>introducing new connections with elements, which have been transferred into cuisine from other domains, locations, or time periods through transposition and translation (Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2013) and thereby changing the field’s standards and practices (Rao et al., 2003, Stierand, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicitly defining existing routines and standards of haute cuisine and its culinary styles (Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2013), and implementing quality control evaluations (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013; Slavich et al., 2011; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008a, 2009a)</td>
<td>picking up new standards, performing a new style and introducing change (Senf et al., 2013; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
<td>strategically observing the environment and spotting opportunities others do not see (Balazs, 2001; Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Horng &amp; Lee, 2008) and publicizing own developments (Opazo, 2013, Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009a; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitating practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talent spotting (Johnson et al., 2008; Slavich et al., 2011; Stierand, 2015) and developing knowledge and creativity in team (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Fine, 1996; Stierand, 2015) (Johnson et al., 2005, (Slavich et al., 2011 Svejenova et al., 2010), through initiating, repeating, and rebuilding prototypes (Balazs, 2002, Gomez &amp; Bouty, Harrington, 2004, Horng &amp; Lee, 2009; Lane &amp; Lup, 2014; Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009; Rao et al., 2005; Slavich et al., 2011; Stierand, 2015; Svejenova et al., 2013; Zopilas, 2010)</td>
<td>identifying core team members (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013; Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011; Harrington, 2004; Slavich et al., 2011) and developing their habitat (Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011) and creative voice, the provision of open-ended contexts, often within master-apprentice relationships (Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Stierand, 2015)</td>
<td>writing precise descriptions of recipes (Slavich et al., 2011), but also make use of notes, short literary texts, images, and music to develop ideas in-between people (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen organization, team management, daily work organization, supply management, administration, time-management, budgeting, and strategic planning (Balazs, 2001; Birdt &amp; Pearson, 2000; Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013; Fargueson, 1998; Lane &amp; Lup, 2014, Rao et al., 2003; Senf et al., 2013; Svejenova, 2007; Svejenova et al., 2013; Zopilas, 2010; Johnson et al., 2005)</td>
<td>brainstorming, discussing, and testing the idea within the team (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013; Harrington, 2004; Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009)</td>
<td>engaging in teaching (Slavich et al., 2011) and business activities (e.g. consulting) (Svejenova et al., 2010) and building research centers and foundations to engage a wider circle of collaborators (Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrating practices</td>
<td>networking and consulting with other chefs Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010, 2013; Jacques, 2014; Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009, for example at events, conferences, forums (Opazo, 2013; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010; Svejenova et al., 2013), publishing books (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011; Opazo, Svejenova, 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010; Svejenova et al., 2015), and travelling and working in different restaurants (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2010; Stierand, 2015)</td>
<td>organizing events (Byrkjeflot et al., 2013) and working together with collaborators from different disciplines and fields (Ottenbacher &amp; Harrington, 2009; Svejenova et al., 2007; Svejenova et al., 2010), such as chemists, fragrance designers, gardeners, or industrial designers (Bouty &amp; Gomez, 2013, Gomez &amp; Bouty, 2011; Slavich et al., 2011; Stierand, 2015) and thereby connecting cuisine to the arts and science (Horng &amp; Hu, 2008; Jacques, 2014; Slavich et al., 2011; Svejenova et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Organization of Literature on Chefs’ Practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological level</th>
<th>Directing practices</th>
<th>Artisan</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Philosopher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemological level</td>
<td>Facilitating practices</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontological level</td>
<td>Integrating practices</td>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>Diplomat</td>
<td>Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenarrative connections</td>
<td>Antenarrative practices</td>
<td>Material aspects (fore-having and fore-structure)</td>
<td>Conceptual aspects (fore-conception)</td>
<td>Bets on the future (fore-telling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Constellations of Organizational Constraints on Entrepreneurship, Play and Creativity