



FEDERAL UNIVERSITY
OF CEARÁ

CONTEXTUS

REVISTA CONTEMPORÂNEA DE ECONOMIA E GESTÃO

Contextus – Contemporary Journal of Economics and Management

ISSN 1678-2089
ISSNe 2178-9258

www.periodicos.ufc.br/contextus

Plural creativity: Overview, challenges, and perspective for academic production in Management

Criatividade plural: Panorama, desafios e perspectiva para a produção acadêmica em Administração

Creatividad plural: Panorama, desafíos y perspectivas para la producción académica en Administración

<https://doi.org/10.19094/contextus.2022.78301>

Rafaela Gonçalves Freitas

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9106-3055>

PhD student in Administration at the School of Business - Federal University of Bahia (UFBA)
Master in Administration from Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)
rafaelagfreitas21@gmail.com

Eduardo Davel

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0610>

Professor at the School of Business - Federal University of Bahia (UFBA)
Ph.D. in Business from École des Hautes Études Commerciales de Montreal (Canada).
davel.eduardo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Plural creativity is a growing interest in the management field of research. Academic production, however, remain dispersed, without consolidation and understanding of this perspective. This article aims to review, integrate, and consolidate academic production on plural creativity in management. The research is based on a systematic review of national and international academic production in the field of management. The analysis of academic production generated four categories: group creativity, team creativity, collective creativity, and collaborative creativity. The analysis of the categories revealed two central approaches: creativity as a result and creativity as a process. Our results contribute to the consolidation of an integrated understanding of plural creativity.

Keywords: collective creativity; team creativity; group creativity; collaborative creativity; creativity management.

RESUMO

A criatividade plural é foco de um interesse crescente nas pesquisas em administração. Entretanto, as produções acadêmicas permanecem dispersas, sem uma consolidação e compreensão dessa perspectiva. O objetivo deste artigo é revisar, integrar e consolidar a produção acadêmica sobre criatividade plural em administração. A pesquisa se sustenta em uma revisão sistemática da produção acadêmica nacional e internacional no campo da administração. A análise da produção acadêmica gerou quatro categorias: a criatividade em grupo, criatividade em equipe, criatividade coletiva e criatividade colaborativa. A análise das categorias revelou duas abordagens centrais: criatividade como resultado e criatividade como processo. Os resultados contribuem para a consolidação de um entendimento integrado da criatividade plural.

Palavras-chave: criatividade coletiva; criatividade em equipe; criatividade em grupo; criatividade colaborativa; gestão da criatividade.

RESUMEN

La creatividad plural es un interés creciente en el campo de investigación de la Gestión. Las producciones académicas, sin embargo, permanecen dispersas, sin consolidación y comprensión de esta perspectiva. Este artículo tiene como objetivo revisar, integrar y consolidar las producciones académicas sobre la creatividad plural en la Gestión. La investigación se basa en una revisión sistemática de la producción académica nacional e internacional en Gestión. Este análisis de investigación organizó la producción académica en cuatro categorías: creatividad grupal, creatividad en equipo, creatividad colectiva y creatividad colaborativa. El análisis de las categorías reveló dos enfoques centrales de la creatividad: resultado y proceso. Nuestros resultados contribuyen a la consolidación de una comprensión integrada de la creatividad plural.

Palabras clave: creatividad colectiva; creatividad en equipo; creatividad en grupo; creatividad colaborativa; gestión de la creatividad.

Article Information

Uploaded on 04/02/2022
Final version on 16/05/2022
Accepted on 18/05/2022
Published online on 06/09/2022

Interinstitutional Scientific Committee
Editor-in-chief: Diego de Queiroz Machado
Associated Editor: Henrique Muzzio
Evaluation by the double blind review system (SEER / OJS - version 3)



How to cite this article:

Freitas, R. G., & Davel, E. (2022). Plural creativity: Overview, challenges, and perspective for academic production in Management. *Contextus – Contemporary Journal of Economics and Management*, 20(18), 253-265.
<https://doi.org/10.19094/contextus.2022.78301>

1 INTRODUCTION

Over the decades, creativity has instigated constant research within the management field, focusing its efforts on understanding individual creativity and its social context (Anderson et al., 2014; Bruno-Faria et al., 2008; George, 2007; Shalley et al., 2004; Slavich & Svejenova, 2016). Despite their significant contributions, new approaches to creativity within organizations appear in the opposite direction from the individual level. This new approach considers creativity as the involvement of two or more individuals in a creative production. Plural creativity is the term used to refer to these forms of approaches that transcend individual focus.

In plural creativity, creative expression is a collective phenomenon, generated because of the interaction of creative acts shared between individuals within teams or groups, engaged and committed to the production of new innovative products or services. In this conception, the creative performance of organizations depends on the collaboration of teams or groups that integrate the work environment (Karakaya & Demirkan, 2015; Pillay et al., 2020; Reiter-Palmom et al., 2012; Wróbel et al., 2021).

In the current context, organizations deal with several challenges: constant technological advances, new ways of working, and market demands for innovation. Plural creativity makes it possible to face these challenges (Reiter-Palmon et al., 2012), proving to be essential for the organization's performance and for the innovation of products and services. It is from the gathering of different individuals and their experiences that ideas and solutions are shared, and new interpretations are produced, leading to the implementation of innovations in products, services and processes (Im et al., 2013; Nisula & Kianto, 2016; Oddane, 2015; Parjanen & Hyypiä, 2019; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2013).

Moreover, shared knowledge and experiences contribute to organizational learning (Bodla et al., 2018; Chi & Lam, 2021; Tang & Naumann, 2016; Zhang & Gheibi, 2015; Zhang et al. 2020). Thus, new learnings are acquired with creative and innovative achievements. Consequently, learning is reformulated, and new information is assimilated for subsequent creative productions (Boon et al., 2016).

Organizations that value plural creativity to achieve innovation and/or learning cultivate a collaborative environment and an inclusive atmosphere. Therefore, a plurality of creative acts is important for building a collaborative culture in organizations (Barczak et al., 2010; Kyle'n & Shani, 2002; Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2017; Tripathi & Ghosh, 2020). Furthermore, plural creativity involves the engagement, collaboration, and shared interest of individuals. From this, positive bonds are built and encouraged by managers, which nurture a culture of collaboration (Bodla et al., 2018; Tripathi & Ghosh, 2020).

Considering the important contributions of plural creativity to organizations, studies have emphasized the relevance of performance (Cirella, 2016) for ensuring competitive advantage in organizations (Bissola & Imperatori, 2011; Cirella et al., 2014). Within a constantly changing environment, an individual's ability to find new solutions is essential for overcoming contingencies. According to research performance evaluations, plural creativity has a positive impact on the work performed individually (Bissola & Imperatori, 2011; Cirella, 2016), considering that in chaotic situations solutions are produced collectively. Therefore, goals, deadlines, and results are achieved through collective work, which helps to maintain the organization with significant performance (Jiang & Zhang, 2014).

For these reasons, a growing direction of research is observed to understand, foster, and develop strategies that encourage plural creativity in organizations. At the same time, the growing academic production encompasses different forms of investigation, with different theoretical-methodological contributions and with different focuses. In the Administration field, reviews of academic production cover only the description of the levels of analysis of creativity, in addition to individual and environmental factors (Anderson et al., 2014; Bruno-Faria & Veiga, 2015; George, 2007; Shalley et al., 2004; Slavich & Svejenova, 2016). Thus, there is a lack of a consolidated and integrated perspective of plural creativity, which considers both management knowledge and other academic fields. Developing an integrated understanding is essential for researchers to be able to increase research and build a more integrated academic field, identifying research paths, needs and challenges.

This article aims to review, integrate, and consolidate academic production on plural creativity within Administration. The methodology is based on a qualitative systematic review. The review comprises four stages, the first focuses on collecting articles in the following databases: Academy of Management, Amazon, Emerald, JSTOR, Library of Congress, CAPES Periodicals, Routledge, Web of Science, Sage Publication Journals, SCIELO, and SPELL. In this search, the term 'creativity' was used in the title of the works and as a result, 502 articles were identified. In the second stage, the articles published in Management and Business were selected and the bibliographic references cited by these productions were analyzed. As a result, 123 academic productions were gathered, including books, book chapters, and scientific articles.

The third step of the review involved a thorough analysis of the academic production. In the last stage, four main categories of plural creativity were identified: group creativity, team creativity, collective creativity, and collaborative creativity. From these categories, the considerable bases that sustained and mobilized academic

production were identified, specifically, the relevance of the perspective of plural creativity, the two main approaches to plural creativity, and the challenges of managing plural creativity in organizations.

Based on the results, our study contributes to the advancement of knowledge and research on creativity in management. In the theoretical field, the results provide a consolidated and integrated perspective so that researchers can better understand plural creativity. The article provides an understanding of the different approaches to plural creativity, gaps and problematic issues that can guide further research. In the practical field, the knowledge generated can guide the development of qualification activities and managers professional training in organizations, and this can lead to plural creativity in organizations, as well as guide the reflective exercise of managers on plural creativity.

Table 1
Relevance of Plural Creativity

Relevance	Contribution	Main Authors
Innovation	The ability to innovate indicates how work teams are dedicated to collaboration to create collectively. Plural creativity allows exploring and integrating new knowledge and ideas for implementing innovation in products and services.	Parjanen e Hyypiä (2019); Oddane (2015); Nisula & Kianto (2016).
Learning	Plural creativity involves sharing knowledge and experiences, contributing to collective learning, and, in turn, leading to new creative ideas and problem-solving.	Chi e Lam (2021); Bodla, et al. (2018); Boon et al. (2016).
Collaborative Culture	Fostering creativity contributes to building a collaborative culture in the organization. Fueled by a collaborative environment, collective work is more likely to deliver significant creative results	Tripathi & Ghosh (2020); Bodla et al., (2018).
Performance	Collective creativity has a direct and positive impact in the economic results, in the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. Collective creativity is more representative of organizational performance than the creativity of a person working alone.	Jiang e Zhang (2014); Bam et al. (2019); Cirella, (2016).
Advantage competitive	Collective creativity is a constant negotiation process with multiple partners of the organization that together collaborate to meet the growing market demands and guarantee the competitive advantage of the organization.	Bissola e Imperatori (2011); Cirella (2021)

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

The first relevance refers to innovation in organizations, since new, useful, and creative ideas produced by individuals are at the core of organizational innovation (Amabile, 1996). Therefore, innovation is necessary for creativity. Successful organizations are those that have a collective capable of producing useful and creative ideas and can materialize them in the products or services innovation processes, in response to the demand and expectations of their audience (Im et al., 2013; Nisula & Kianto, 2016). This ability to innovate reflects how dedicated work teams are to creative collaboration. New and useful ideas arise from the sharing and interaction of collective work, in which individuals are dedicated to work together promoting innovative solutions to complex problems that appear within the organization (Nisula & Kianto, 2016; Oddane, 2015; Parjanen & Hyypiä, 2019). Therefore, plural

2 PLURAL CREATIVITY: OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC PRODUCTION IN MANAGEMENT

To understand the concepts involved in the studies on plural creativity, the relevance, main approaches, convergences, and particularities addressed in management studies are presented below.

2.1 Relevance of Plural Creativity

Contemporary organizations are faced with constant transformations, new technologies, new ways of working, and market demands that require plural creativity to meet and respond to the different contexts. In academic production, five main relevance of plural creativity were identified, which contribute to the field of management, as highlighted in Table 1.

creativity is important for innovation. New findings emerge from the exchange of experiences and interpretations about problems and/or challenges often proposed by managers. Strategic actions by managers and leaders act as mediators, as they promote the integration of different partners that collaborate to implement innovations in the organization (Parjanen et al., 2012). In this way, plural creativity contributes to new ways of thinking and more creative achievements (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2013). As a result, individuals motivated by plural creativity are driven to implement creative achievements in product and service innovations in the organization (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2013).

The second relevance refers to organizational learning. When collective work is brought together for creative production, it shares its knowledge, information,

and experiences, contributes to the organization's constant learning. The importance of plural creativity lies in this shared practice of collective knowledge that is looking for something new or useful for a product or service. It is through dialogue and different forms of interaction that the collective learns from one another. This is a process that involves discussions, debates, and conflicts until the conclusion of ideas and creative solutions. At the same time, during this process, new knowledge is built and becomes a reference point for future creative experiences (Boon et al., 2016).

Organizations that have members from different locations tend to gather diverse information and are constantly learning; thus, learning is a mediating agent of the different perceptions produced by the differences within the collective (Bodla et al., 2018). Therefore, organizational learning has a reciprocal relationship of relevance with plural creativity, considering that the creation and validation of creative results in the organization require the sharing of knowledge by gathering of the different perceptions of the collective (Bodla et al., 2018). When managers stimulate and guide their teams towards the purpose of learning, they contribute to the creation of bonds around the different values that each member has, which adds to favorable creative results (Chi & Lam, 2021; Tang & Naumann, 2016; Zhang & Gheibi, 2015; Zhang et al., 2020).

The third relevance corresponds to a collaborative culture. Plural creativity occurs in the space of collaboration, dedication, and engagement of individuals willing to share knowledge for creative production. This context contributes to the construction of an inclusive space and collaborative environment. For that reason, plural creativity is important for the benefit of a collaborative culture. Based on engagement and cohesion at work, creative and innovative activities produced by the collective stimulate more positive interactions and contribute to maintaining a positive environment (Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2017). With a positive environment in the organization, interactions, dialogues, and interpersonal relationships flow harmoniously, with fewer conflicts and disaffections that undermine the individual's willingness to collaborate (Kyle'n & Shani, 2002). Positive bonds are built throughout the creative work and promote trust, better communication, autonomy, and engagement, besides enable a collaborative culture for the organization (Barczak et al., 2010). When managers and team leaders stimulate plural creativity, they nurture collaborative values, and promote an inclusive environment causing the diversity of team members to be perceived favorably and contribute more creative behaviors and results (Bodla et al., 2018; Tripathi & Ghosh, 2020). In organizations that have little stimulus for collaboration, people work in a culture that is insensitive to diversity,

learning, and communication, which makes collective creative production and relationships in the organization difficult (Tripathi & Ghosh, 2020).

The fourth relevance refers to performance. Organizations seek to achieve goals to maintain their business. This means using your financial, material, and human resources to achieve positive results. However, organizations are inserted into a dynamic environment, with constant changes and contingencies, and depend on the ability of its members to create solutions to overcome obstacles. Accordingly, plural creativity is important to build new paths in chaotic situations. Good results are achieved when the collective mobilizes creativity to solve problems, and to create products in the organization (Kyle'n & Shani, 2002). Plural creativity has a direct and positive impact on economic results, not only in terms of customer satisfaction, when providing products or services that meet their expectations, but also when is efficiently and effectively used to make the most out of the resources (Cirella, 2016).

Performance evaluations in organizations show the positive impact of plural creativity on the work performed individually (Bissola & Imperatori, 2011; Cirella, 2016); goals, deadlines and results are easily achieved through teamwork, helping to keep the organization's good performance (Jiang & Zhang, 2014). In this way, plural creativity is a potential source for reaching complex creative ideas, for problem-solving, and contributes to the achievement of high levels of innovation and performance in teams (Bam et al., 2019), organizational survival and quality in the results expected by the organization.

By achieving good results through plural creativity, the fifth relevance refers to competitive advantage. Organizations with high creative productivity have a work collective dedicated to production and inserted in a collaborative culture environment. Therefore, plural creativity sustains innovation, learning, collaborative culture, performance, and the competitive advantage of organizations, in short cycles, following changes in global economies (Cirella, 2016, 2021; Yoon et al., 2010).

2.2 Approaches to plural creativity: creativity as a result and process

Within management studies on plural creativity, two approaches that support the theoretical and methodological development of investigations were identified. The first one corresponds to the approach of plural creativity as a result and the second one, as a process. Each approach has different theoretical and methodological perspectives to understand plural creativity in organizations. From the approaches that support academic production, the main characteristics and differences identified are highlighted (Table 2).

Table 2

Approaches to Creativity in the Plural

Plural Creativity	As a result	As a process
Concept of Creativity	Creativity is the production of new and appropriate ideas in any domain of human activity.	Creativity is the process of engaging in creative acts, regardless of whether the results are new, useful, or creative.
Referenced authors	Amabile et al. (1996); Woodman et al. (1993).	Hargadon e Beck (2006); Drazin et al. (1999).
Predominant categories	Team Creativity Group Creativity	Collective Creativity Collaborative creativity
Key characteristics	Background, environment, and performance	Interaction, engagement, and collaboration
Ontology	Realistic	Relational
Predominant empirical approach	Universities and High-tech industries	Creative industries
Main Methodology	Quantitative Methodology	Qualitative methodology
Main contributions	Identification of factors that influence the performance of plural creativity	Identification of patterns of interactions that drive the creative process
Limitations	Approach focused on results	Approach focused on the collective
Suggestions for future studies	Develop research that integrates organizational variables and collective creativity	Develop collective creativity management practices

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

To focus on the description of the central approaches to plural creativity, it is necessary to distinguish the divergences and similarities between the concepts of team creativity, group creativity, collective creativity, and collaborative creativity. The terms “team” and “group” are used in studies with a focus on the creative result. Normally, these terms are situated on the theoretical basis of social psychology, however, the choice to use one of the terms does not have a clear justification, being alternately used many times in the same study. Additionally, it is noticed the adoption of the term “group creativity” in studies that focuses on groups of short- or long-term creative work (Baruah & Paulus, 2009; Harvey & Kou, 2013; Shin, 2014). Meanwhile, there are studies that use the term “teams” designating team project, in which they are brought together by bonds and shared objectives, mainly in service of an innovation project (C. Chen & Liu, 2020; M.-H. Chen, 2020; M.-H. Chen, 2006; Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2017).

Regarding the terms “collective” and “collaborative” creativity, the first is used by research that seeks the relationship between the individual and the collective dimension (Adler & Chen, 2011; Bissola & Imperatori, 2011; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006; Oddane, 2015; Saad et al. al., 2015). The term 'collective creativity' is also used to refer to teams in organizations. Most of these studies are included in the context of creativity and innovation (for example, in innovative projects) and seeks to understand how the collective contributes to innovation. As for the term 'collaborative creativity', research/studies use it to refer to the process of interaction in creative production, specifically, the social and cultural factors that lead individuals to collaborate at work.

In short, team or group creativity are definitions that fit the empirical or conceptual perspective on the outcome approach, whereas collective creativity and collaborative

creativity are guided by a process approach. The approaches are the main sources of distinction of the different terms used to refer to creativity. However, the terms are convergent with the conception of creativity as a plural phenomenon, in other words, that contemplates creativity beyond a single individual. In this way, the phenomenon is referred to as plural creativity, rather than limiting ourselves to overlapping terms.

Within the creative outcome approach, plural creativity is understood as the production of new and appropriate ideas in any domain of activity, by individuals working together (Amabile, 1996). In this approach, studies/research focuses on identifying antecedent factors, environmental and interpersonal factors that influence outcome performance. The theoretical contribution is situated in the cognitive perspective and social psychology. The predominant empirical focus is on universities and high-tech industries. The dominant methodology is of a quantitative tradition, which privileges tests of factors that precede creativity and scales for measuring creative performance.

The focus on previous factors is related to cognitive diversity (Aggarwal & Woolley, 2019; Bodla et al., 2018; Kim & Song, 2021; Men et al., 2019), mood and shared knowledge (Chen & Liu, 2020); Chow, 2018; Guo et al., 2020). The positive link of these factors is tested and validated against positive creativity performance (Bodla et al., 2018; Chow, 2018; Guo et al., 2020; Kim & Song, 2021; Men et al., 2019). In the organizational context, the factors that impact plural creativity are related to the organization's environment, leadership performance and task structure. A favorable environment involves orientation towards shared goals, appreciation and encouragement of shared work (Gilson & Shalley, 2004), which strengthens bonds of trust to reach high levels of creativity (Jiang & Zhang, 2014).

Additionally, within an organization, task structures, limits, functions, and technology support are identified as significant factors in the performance of plural creativity (Cirella, 2016, 2021; Cirella et al., 2014; Nisula & Kianto, 2016). In turn, management and leadership styles are factors that directly impact creativity performance (Jia et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020).

Notably, these studies seek to identify and analyze the influence of previous factors on the result of plural creativity. The focus on the result does not cover the relationships and situations in which creativity occurs; many studies, however, propose guidelines or theoretical models for the practice and verification of the multiple factors and situated levels, and their impact on plural creativity.

In the approach of plural creativity as a process, the phenomenon of creativity is conceived as a process of engaging in creative acts, regardless of whether the results are new, useful, or creative (Drazin et al., 1999; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006). By focusing on the process of plural creativity forms of interaction, engagement, collaboration, and negotiation between individuals in problematic and complex situations are highlighted. The main objective focuses on understanding what happens during creative episodes of the interaction, engagement, and collaboration process. The theoretical contribution is situated in the behavioral, cognitive, and emotional perspectives. The dominant empirical focus is on creative industries. The application of qualitative methods prevails, using case studies and conceptual propositions.

Research about the process of collective interaction indicates that creativity occurs in fleeting and distinct moments, in which the collective seeks to solve a problem together, by meeting and sharing their individual experiences and knowledge (Hargadon & Bechky, 2006). These forms of collective interaction occur in the search for help, in moments of support among colleagues, in discussions and reflections on new solutions, and in moments of decision about difficult situations (Hargadon & Bechky, 2006). Some interactions are seen as harmful to the collective creative process, such as the absence of dialogue, critical feedback, restricted freedom between collectives, and rigid norms of behavior in organizations (Kyle'n & Shani, 2002). On the other hand, creation of strategies to foster social interactions of knowledge by sharing, open dialogue, and autonomy are identified as facilitators of the collective creative process (Kyle'n & Shani, 2002).

In this collective process, engagement is an action related to the predisposition of individuals to get involved with the group to solve a problem, to seek and implement new ideas at different times in the organizational environment (Drazin et al., 1999). When considering the action of engagement in the work collective, the behavior, feelings, and motivations of social actors in relation to the work, the team, and the organization during the collection process are estimated (Glynn et al., 2010). Similarly,

collaboration is highlighted in academic production focusing on the collective creative act, through which creativity emerges from complex interactions between different agents (Elsbach & Flynn, 2013; Kenny, 2014).

The promotion of collaboration contributes to a constant flow of suggestions and exchange of ideas among individuals and to the construction of identities in the collective (Elsbach & Flynn, 2013). Moreover, in specific organizational contexts, such as creative industries, collaboration is a factor rooted in activities. Collective practices are privileged for understanding the essence of collaboration, with emphasis on improvisation sustenance, sharing knowledge, leadership, and balance between challenges during collective processes (Kenny, 2014). To emphasize collaborative practices in the collective process, gestures and symbols are formed through which the collective transmits and shares creativity effectively, promoting the understanding of these forms of management practices, training, and team preparation (Satama et al., 2021).

Based on empirical investigation, moments, actions, and interactions in collective creative episodes provide insights into constant changes in collective creative processes. Likewise, academic production seeks to understand collective processes in conventional environments and using new technologies (Joyce et al., 2010; Karakaya & Demirkan, 2015; Lee & Van Dolen, 2015; Parjanen & Hyypiä, 2019). In this context, the flows of interactions are identified, indicating guidelines for management practice in conduction, preventing any interruption to the unpredictable flow that occurs during the process (Van Oortmerssen et al., 2015).

Some factors conceived as significant for the creative process are considered in academic production. In the conception of creativity as a process, however, the factors are addressed in the dynamics of the process, that is, the privilege of real actions during investigative contexts, and not in variables testing through questionnaires. In this way, factors such as restrictions imposed by real situations are identified in the collective process as factors that lead to creative action, with practices of protesting, proposing, betraying, and untying (Lombardo & Kvålshaugen, 2014). In another context, restrictions can either boost the creative collective act or inhibit collective creative action. The positive or negative influence of restrictions is related to the team dynamics and the management performance (Rosso, 2014).

3 PLURAL CREATIVITY MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

The analysis of academic production on plural creativity in the management field allowed the identification of three challenges for management practices: (a) individual integration into collective sphere; (b) collaborative culture nourishment and (c) cultural differences articulation.

3.1 The challenge of integrating the individual in the collective sphere

Creativity is an essentially collaborative process, even if others participation of is not visible or explicit (Glăveanu, 2015). Participation requires the individual willingness to collaborate with the collective. This creative process involves tensions between individuals that can cause blockages and conflicts, since everyone has different needs, values, and perceptions (Farrell, 2003). Personal characteristics may or may not coincide with the identity, purposes, and values of the collective. Therefore, the lack of cohesion, trust, and affective ties can lead to the absence of engagement, which is essential for the creative process (Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2017).

In the relationship between the individual and the collective, interactions dynamics remain obscure. Some evidence indicates that diversity in team composition can affect collective creative work in different ways (Bodla et al., 2018; Chow, 2018; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2013; Tang & Naumann, 2016). Furthermore, some forms of diversity (eg, cognitive or value diversity) are not readily visible among individuals. Thus, selecting individuals with different skills, personalities and cultures does not necessarily lead too good results in collective creativity (Tang & Naumann, 2016). Conflicts are inevitable regardless of having heterogeneous or homogeneous groups. The ways of dealing with these situations are attributed to the creativity management (Yong et al., 2014).

Proposals for creativity management practice do not consider the role of individual factors that make up the collective and influence the development of collective creative processes. Components of individual creativity are usually cited in research, as well as strategies to support the individual's motivation (Bissola & Imperatori, 2011; Cirella, 2016). However, research does not clarify how the individual and his creative abilities are related and dedicated to the collective. In this context, understanding individual perspectives and using it to encourage collaboration and motivation in creative work requires empirical investigation in different organizational contexts to provide guidelines consistent with the practice of collective creativity management.

3.2 The challenge of nurturing a collaborative culture

Standards, norms, values, and regulations are instruments that direct organizational processes, ways of organizing tasks and members conduct. These instruments are organizational culture representations that allow a collective perspective creation of collaboration in favor of organizations' objectives (Cirella et al., 2016). Associated with the organization's creative performance, these instruments indicate several evidence about contextual and cultural factors of plural creativity (Nisula & Kianto, 2016; Tripathi & Ghosh, 2020).

By seeking to promote favorable conditions for plural creativity, a collaborative culture is conceived as significant

for creative work, because represents a culture oriented towards valuing teamwork, communication, respect, and autonomy (Pérez López et al., 2004). On the other hand, an organization with a culture marked by rigidity faces difficulties in obtaining collaboration in creative work processes. The initiatives recommended by the organization's strict standards of conduct may conflict with the members cultural values. Thus, creating an unfavorable environment for collective work limits the achievement of creative results (Gedik & Ozbek, 2020).

In this context, culture must be oriented towards promoting and valuing collective relationships and groups goals and results above individual (Sawyer, 2012). This type of culture can generate issues that strain and stress collective dynamics, such as deadlines issues and excessively bureaucratic controls (Sawyer, 2012). In order to avoid these tensions, managers must consider organization and individual cultural dimensions, as creativity is essential for its members work (Gedik & Ozbek, 2020).

To sum up, management-oriented towards the promotion of a collaborative culture for plural creativity is necessary, in order to contemplate interpersonal and structural factors in creative work. Organizational configurations, time contingencies and process dynamics must be carefully considered as they can positively or negatively impact on creativity.

3.3 The challenge of articulating cultural differences

In addition to the cultural normative standards that internally guide organizations and their members conduct, external culture allow the development of new products and services by organizations. This dialogue with external culture corresponds to the relationship between workgroups, customers, consumer public, and organizations' partners as well as other stakeholders (Baruah & Paulus, 2009).

In this context, the originality of new and useful ideas for new products/services requires a process of collaboration and evaluation, in which multiple agents from different cultures contribute with their perspectives to the legitimation of new ideas. The presentation of new useful ideas is a necessary phase for organizations innovation process. Therefore, ideas are useful as they are approved and implemented by the set of partner agents from the internal and external organization collective (Zhang et al., 2020).

This process demands an articulation of the agents' cultural differences that can have direct and indirect relationship with the organization. This action crosses organizational levels, but it is based in the individual, who is willing to share ideas with the work collective. Thus, the individual, the work and the organizational environment must be synchronized, and then integrated with external partners. This requirement to articulate differences becomes evident with the growing increase in virtual spaces and techniques to foster creative collaboration. Indeed, new

challenges arise to maintain interaction and dialogue in collective creative work that takes place in virtual environments (Karakaya & Demirkan, 2015; Kenny, 2014; Morreale et al., 2014). Thus, how collaboration will be guided and promoted in virtual spaces to meet external demands is a challenge for managers of plural creativity in organizations. It is up to management field to understand the different domains of activities and cultural aspects so that it can promote actions according to the objective of exploring new ways of thinking and facilitate the sharing and integration of ideas.

4 SOCIOCULTURAL CREATIVITY: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE TO RENEW FUTURE RESEARCH

From this perspective, creativity is conceived as a distributed creative expression and as an individual, social and cultural act (Glăveanu, 2011). An individual act because it depends on the individual's set of skills and knowledge, which is expressed in the construction of the creative result. Simultaneously, it is a social and cultural act because the individual's skills and knowledge are developed through social interaction. Thus, creative results are also cultural acts because they are produced according to the set of values, norms, artifacts and products established in a given creative field of activity (Glăveanu, 2011, 2017; Glăveanu, 2015).

Under the lens of sociocultural creativity, different creative contributions of each member (individual participation), as well as the collective creative result were analyzed (Sawyer, 2012). In addition, this perspective allows to assess how material artifacts are closely linked to individual and collective dimensions during plural creative production (Literat & Glăveanu, 2018; Parolin & Pellegrinelli, 2020). Therefore, all these components can be observed throughout collaborative creative processes (Glăveanu, 2011; Sawyer, 2012).

In this sense, the sociocultural perspective does not limit creativity to the mental capacities of a single individual or to individual participation in the process. It also does not restrict creativity to specific contexts, since it is seen as a process that integrates individual, society and culture. Thus, the focus is on the dynamic process, driven by the permanent interaction of these components (Glăveanu, 2011, 2017; Glăveanu, 2015; Sawyer, 2012).

An example of this dynamic process can be seen in theatrical shows where the performance is produced over successive formal encounters, such as rehearsals or in improvised moments (Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009). Throughout this process, interaction between different components take place during meetings in which an individual contributes with ideas and other members participate with new suggestions. In each new performance, changes and transformations take place through dialogue between collective and audience. Thus, a theatrical performance involves a creative, distributed and continuous

process, formed by the individual, the collective (theatrical group and audience) and the cultural dimension (Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009).

An example of this dynamic process can be seen in theatre performances where the play is produced over successive formal encounters, such as rehearsals or in improvised moments (Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009). Throughout this process, the interaction between different components take place during meetings in which an individual contributes with ideas and other members participate with new suggestions. In each new performance, changes and transformations take place through dialogue between collective and audience. Thus, a theatre performance involves a creative, distributed, and continuous process, formed by the individual, the collective (theatrical group and audience) and the cultural dimension (Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009).

Another example is musical production (rock concert, musical album, symphony orchestra, jazz), which shows a dynamic and relational process, in which musical part, organizational structure and cultural values are intertwined. The dynamics of this process is explained by the established relationships between multiple agents: composer, performer, conductor, listener, and their respective organization members (Clarke et al., 2013).

In these examples, the individual participation of each collective component is perceived, as well as the public contribution (audience) and the context (sociomaterial elements or practices). Behind the curtains that open for a theatre performance or for a musical concert there is a long process, permeated by rehearsals and improvisations, material elaborated in scripts, drafts, spaces, and tested scenes characteristic artifacts, repeated and recreated several times during the creation process (Parolin & Pellegrinelli, 2020).

The sociocultural perspective of creativity allows to understand how material and immaterial elements of culture relate to creativity. In the context of internet and virtual environment, this relationship reveals the uniqueness of how creative participation – mediated by technology – occurs both individually and collectively. In this environment, meetings, and gatherings enable real-time dialogue with individuals located in different environments. The involvement of these individuals occurs through different ideas, problems, and creative experiences stimulation. Thus, ideas are evaluated and integrated, giving rise to new creative productions (Miettinen, 2006).

Likewise, in social networks, plural creativity happens in real time and in different periods. For example, the electoral period, in which social networks become an arena of creative competition, is a fertile field for creative process observation. In this period, different individuals express different perceptions (discourses for/against candidates and political projects), which reveal social and cultural values in which they are situated in addition to creative expression. The product of this creation is shared on networks and

constantly recreated by other users (Kligler-Vilenchik & Literat, 2018).

In the continuous process of plural creativity, creative expression is associated with the exploration of creative possibilities not previously tracked by the individual and the collective (Glăveanu, 2012). Thus, creativity refers to acts of perception, invention and use by individuals (Glăveanu, 2012), as a dynamic process present even in small social practices. For example, in artisan work in communities, discoveries and innovations occur spontaneously, in everyday work. This breaks with the traditional norms of the culture, continually renewing creative work (Glăveanu, 2012).

The sociocultural perspective of plural creativity enables a future research agenda in the management field, by providing a theoretical and analytical framework that guides researchers in their theoretical-empirical practice. Based on this perspective, discoveries and understanding of the agents that are part of plural creativity both direct researchers to new discoveries and support them in overcoming challenges imposed by plural creativity.

To conduct research on plural creativity, the researcher must consider at least four fundamental principles. The first principle establishes that there is an infinity of points of view that can be adopted in relation to different realities. The second principle indicates that these points of view show accordance with the location and role of each person in any given time-space. The third principle guides that, in order to formulate and assume new points of view, it is necessary to become a participant in the reality experienced. The fourth principle recommends adopting a reflective and analytical stance on changes to highlight differences and identify the usefulness of each individual's contributions (Glăveanu, 2017; Glăveanu, 2015).

Following these principles of the sociocultural perspective of plural creativity, we can better deal with plural creativity management challenges in future academic production. In other words, this conception allows a better understanding of how integration between individual and collective participation occurs, how culture is interconnected to the individual, to the social and to the material and immaterial elements of creative production and how plural creativity depends more on the dialogue between cultures of groups and domains of activities, than on individual and isolated factors. Consequently, the sociocultural perspective of plural creativity in management provides greater reflection on the course of creative action and the creative results of this process.

5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this article was to review academic production on plural creativity in management. From an extensive systematic review of national and international academic production in management, we identified four categories that contribute to the consolidation and understanding of plural creativity: group creativity, team

creativity, collective creativity, and collaborative creativity. Integrating categories were also generated, such as: relevance, approaches, challenges, and sociocultural perspective. Each approach (result and process) reveals different theoretical and methodological perspectives to investigate plural creativity in organizations, reflecting on challenges for the creativity management practice. Such challenges are identified from questions that are not clarified or are little explored in academic production. Even so, three main challenges are highlighted: (a) individual integration into collective sphere, (b) collaborative culture nurturing and (c) cultural differences articulation. As proposals to meet these challenges, it was discussed how the sociocultural perspective of creativity can make future research promising and overcome the challenges of managing plural creativity.

For the adoption of the sociocultural perspective, two limitations are identified: the first one theoretical-conceptual and the second one methodological. The theoretical-conceptual limitation concerns the variety of definitions (team creativity, group creativity, collective creativity, and collaborative creativity) and theoretical approaches (process and result) on plural creativity, which limits and makes precarious a theoretical-epistemological integration for the advancement of the research field. Future research needs to minimally align terminologies and theories from a better understanding of plural creativity as a relational process distributed among individual, social context and material and immaterial elements in culture if it seeks to overcome challenges, disintegrations, and inconsistencies (Glăveanu, 2020; Glăveanu, 2015).

The methodological limitation refers to the type of research organization and methodological modality used. Much research, however, were carried out in universities, in business training courses, or applied to professionals acting as managers, through the application of questionnaires that do not capture relational dynamics and real actions of creativity processes. In future research from a sociocultural perspective, the researcher will need to be aware of two issues. First, it is necessary to expand the types of organizations surveyed. Second, the researcher needs to develop reflective skills to understand and describe in detail how the relationships between manager-collective, collective-social and collective-material are constituted in plural creativity. Qualitative methodologies such as ethnography can help in this process. Other techniques can be incorporated, such as videos and photos, contributing to improve the wealth of information sources and research analysis.

In addition to the theoretical and methodological limitations, the results provided by this article can help workers and managers in the development and improvement of qualification and training practices coherent and appropriate for the plural creativity management in organizations. They can also stimulate the reflective capacity for dialogue and interconnection of different creative perspectives. In short, this research results bring

important contributions to by strengthen and allow a better direction of future empirical research on plural creativity in organizations.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Chen, C. X. (2011). Combining creativity and control: Understanding individual motivation in large-scale collaborative creativity. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 36(2), 63-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2011.02.002>
- Aggarwal, I., & Woolley, A. W. (2019). Team creativity, cognition, and cognitive style diversity. *Management Science*, 65(4), 1586-1599. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.3001>
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity and innovation in organizations* (Vol. 5). Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297-1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>
- Bam, L., De Stobbeleir, K., & Vlok, P. J. (2019). Outcomes of team creativity: A person-environment fit perspective. *Management Research Review*, 42(6), 760-774. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2018-0098>
- Barczak, G., Lassk, F., & Mulki, J. (2010). Antecedents of team creativity: An examination of team emotional intelligence, team trust and collaborative culture. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(4), 332-345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00574.x>
- Baruah, J., & Paulus, P. B. (2009). Enhancing group creativity: The search for synerg. In E. A. Mannix, M. A. Neale & J. A. Goncalo (Eds), *Creativity in Groups* (pp. 29-56). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Bissola, R., & Imperatori, B. (2011). Organizing individual and collective creativity: Flying in the face of creativity clichés. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20(2), 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2011.00597.x>
- Bodla, A. A., Tang, N., Jiang, W., & Tian, L. (2018). Diversity and creativity in cross-national teams: The role of team knowledge sharing and inclusive climate. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(5), 711-729. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.34>
- Boon, A., Vangrieken, K., & Dochy, F. (2016). Team creativity versus team learning: Transcending conceptual boundaries to inspire future framework building. *Human Resource Development International*, 19(1), 67-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1096635>
- Bruno-Faria, M. D. F., & Veiga, H. M. D. S. (2015). Indicadores de condições para criar no ambiente de trabalho: Evidências de validação empírica de uma medida. *Revista de Administração (São Paulo)*, 50, 492-506. <https://doi.org/10.5700/rausp1215>
- Bruno-Faria, M. D. F., Veiga, H. M. D. S., & Macêdo, L. F. (2008). Criatividade nas organizações: Análise da produção científica nacional em periódicos e livros de Administração e Psicologia. *RPOT*, 8(1), 142-163. <http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/rpot/article/viewFile/9074/8422>
- Chen, C., & Liu, X. (2020). Linking team-member exchange differentiation to team creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(2), 208-219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2019-0288>
- Chen, M. H. (2006). Understanding the benefits and detriments of conflict on team creativity process. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(1), 105-116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00373.x>
- Chi, N. W., & Lam, L. W. (2022). Is negative group affective tone always bad for team creativity? Team trait learning goal orientation as the boundary condition. *Group & Organization Management*, 47(1), 72-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011211011336>
- Chow, I. H. S. (2018). Cognitive diversity and creativity in teams: The mediating roles of team learning and inclusion. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(2), 369-383. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-09-2017-0262>
- Cirella, S. (2016). Organizational variables for developing collective creativity in business: A case from an Italian fashion design company. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 25(3), 331-343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12189>
- Cirella, S. (2021). Managing collective creativity: Organizational variables to support creative teamwork. *European Management Review*, 18(4), 404-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12475>
- Cirella, S., Radaelli, G., & Shani, A. B. R. (2014). Team creativity: A complex adaptive perspective. *Management Research Review*, 37(7), 590-614. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-12-2012-0261>
- Clarke, E., Doffman, M., & Lim, L. (2013). Distributed creativity and ecological dynamics: A case study of Liza Lim's 'Tongue of the Invisible'. *Music and Letters*, 94(4), 628-663. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/gct118>
- Drazin, R., Glynn, M. A., & Kazanjian, R. K. (1999). Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemaking perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 286-307. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.1893937>
- Elsbach, K. D., & Flynn, F. J. (2013). Creative collaboration and the self-concept: A study of toy designers. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(4), 515-544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12024>
- Farrell, M. P. (2003). *Collaborative circles: Friendship dynamics and creative work*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gedik, Y., & Ozbek, M. F. (2020). How cultural tightness relates to creativity in work teams: Exploring the moderating and mediating mechanisms. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 29(4), 634-647. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12409>
- George, J. M. (2007). Creativity in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 439-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/078559814>
- 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(4), 453-470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2003.07.001>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2011). Creativity as cultural participation. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 41(1), 48-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2010.00445.x>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2012). What can be done with an egg? Creativity, material objects, and the theory of affordances. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 46(3), 192-208. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.13>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2015). Creativity as a sociocultural act. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 49(3), 165-180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.94>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2017). The creative self in dialogue. In M. Karwowski & J. C. Kaufma (Eds.), *The creative self: Effect of beliefs, self-efficacy, mindset, and identity* (pp. 117-135). Academic Press.
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2020). A sociocultural theory of creativity: Bridging the social, the material, and the psychological. *Review of General Psychology*, 24(4), 335-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268020961763>
- Glynn, M. A., Kazanjian, R., & Drazin, R. (2010). Fostering innovation in complex product development settings: The

- role of team member identity and interteam interdependence. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 27(7), 1082-1095. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2010.00772.x>
- Guo, W., Gan, C., & Wang, D. (2020). The mobility of team members and team creativity: exploring the mediating role of team cognition. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(6), 1111-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-03-2020-0073>
- Hargadon, A. B., & Bechky, B. A. (2006). When collections of creatives become creative collectives: A field study of problem solving at work. *Organization Science*, 17(4), 484-500. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1060.0200>
- Harvey, S., & Kou, C. Y. (2013). Collective engagement in creative tasks: The role of evaluation in the creative process in groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(3), 346-386. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213498591>
- Im, S., Montoya, M. M., & Workman Jr, J. P. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of creativity in product innovation teams. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(1), 170-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2012.00887.x>
- Jia, J., Jiao, Y., & Han, H. (2021). Inclusive leadership and team creativity: A moderated mediation model of Chinese talent management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1966073>
- Jiang, H., & Zhang, Q. P. (2014). Development and validation of team creativity measures: A complex systems perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(3), 264-275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12078>
- Joyce, C. K., Jennings, K. E., Hey, J., Grossman, J. C., & Kalil, T. (2010). Getting down to business: Using speedstorming to initiate creative cross-disciplinary collaboration. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 57-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00538.x>
- Karakaya, A. F., & Demirkan, H. (2015). Collaborative digital environments to enhance the creativity of designers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 42, 176-186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.03.029>
- Kenny, A. (2014). 'Collaborative creativity' within a jazz ensemble as a musical and social practice. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 13, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2014.02.002>
- Kim, J., & Song, C. (2020). The relationship between R&D team diversity and team creativity. *Management Decision*, 59(2), 175-189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-12-2019-1727>
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N., & Literat, I. (2018). Distributed creativity as political expression: Youth responses to the 2016 US presidential election in online affinity networks. *Journal of Communication*, 68(1), 75-97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqx005>
- Kyle'n, S. F., & Shani, A. B. (2002). Triggering creativity in teams: An exploratory investigation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8691.00233>
- Lee, H. H. M., & van Dolen, W. (2015). Creative participation: Collective sentiment in online co-creation communities. *Information & Management*, 52(8), 951-964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2015.07.002>
- Literat, I., & Glaveanu, V. P. (2018). Distributed creativity on the internet: A theoretical foundation for online creative participation. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 16. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/7621>
- Lombardo, S., & Kvålshaugen, R. (2014). Constraint-shattering practices and creative action in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 35(4), 587-611. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613517597>
- Men, C., Fong, P. S., Luo, J., Zhong, J., & Huo, W. (2019). When and how knowledge sharing benefits team creativity: The importance of cognitive team diversity. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(6), 807-824. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.47>
- Miettinen, R. (2006). The sources of novelty: A cultural and systemic view of distributed creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(2), 173-181. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00381.x>
- Morreale, F., De Angeli, A., Masu, R., Rota, P., & Conci, N. (2014). Collaborative creativity: The music room. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 18(5), 1187-1199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-013-0728-1>
- Nisula, A. M., & Kianto, A. (2016). Group climate and creativity in temporary innovation camp settings. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 25(1), 157-171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12168>
- Oddane, T. A. W. (2015). The collective creativity of academics and practitioners in innovation projects. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 8(1), 33-57. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-10-2013-0060>
- Parjanen, S., & Hyypiä, M. (2019). Innotin game supporting collective creativity in innovation activities. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 26-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.10.056>
- Parjanen, S., Hennala, L., & Konsti-Laakso, S. (2012). Brokerage functions in a virtual idea generation platform: Possibilities for collective creativity? *Innovation*, 14(3), 363-374. <https://doi.org/10.5172/impp.2012.14.3.363>
- Parolin, L. L., & Pellegrinelli, C. (2020). Unpacking distributed creativity: Analysing sociomaterial practices in theatre artwork. *Culture & Psychology*, 26(3), 434-453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X19894936>
- Pérez-López, S., Peón, J. M. M., & Ordás, C. J. V. (2004). Managing knowledge the link between culture and organizational learning. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(6), 93-104. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270410567657>
- Pillay, N., Park, G., Kim, Y. K., & Lee, S. (2020). Thanks for your ideas: Gratitude and team creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 156, 69-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.11.005>
- Reiter-Palmon, R., Wigert, B., & de Vreede, T. (2012). Team creativity and innovation: The effect of group composition, social processes, and cognition. In M. Mumford (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (pp. 295-326). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374714-3.00013-6>
- Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., Devloo, T., Rico, R., Salanova, M., & Anseel, F. (2017). What makes creative teams tick? Cohesion, engagement, and performance across creativity tasks: A three-wave study. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(4), 521-547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116636476>
- Saad, G., Cleveland, M., & Ho, L. (2015). Individualism-collectivism and the quantity versus quality dimensions of individual and group creative performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), 578-586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.09.004>
- Satama, S., Blomberg, A., & Warren, S. (2021). Exploring the embodied subtleties of collaborative creativity: What organisations can learn from dance. *Management Learning*, 53(2), 167-189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620985226>
- Sawyer, K. (2012). Extending sociocultural theory to group creativity. *Vocations and Learning*, 5(1), 59-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-011-9066-5>

- Sawyer, R. K. (2011). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Sawyer, R. K., & DeZutter, S. (2009). Distributed creativity: How collective creations emerge from collaboration. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 3(2), 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013282>
- Schmidt, S., Schreiber, D., Pinheiro, C. M. P., & Bohnenberger, M. C. (2020). The moderating role of creativity in the relation between collaboration and performance. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(06), 2050051. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919620500516>.
- 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), 933-958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.007>
- Shin, Y. (2014). Positive group affect and team creativity: Mediation of team reflexivity and promotion focus. *Small Group Research*, 45(3), 337-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496414533618>
- Slavich, B., & Svejenova, S. (2016). Managing creativity: A critical examination, synthesis, and new frontiers. *European Management Review*, 13(4), 237-250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12078>
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2013). Translating team creativity to innovation implementation: The role of team composition and climate for innovation. *Journal of management*, 39(3), 684-708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310394187>
- Tang, C., & Naumann, S. E. (2016). Team diversity, mood, and team creativity: The role of team knowledge sharing in Chinese R & D teams. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 22(3), 420-434. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2015.43>
- Tripathi, N., & Ghosh, V. (2020). Deep-level diversity and workgroup creativity: The role of creativity climate. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 12(4), 605-624. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIBR-01-2019-0007>
- Van Oortmerssen, L. A., Van Woerkum, C. M., & Aarts, N. (2015). When interaction flows: An exploration of collective creative processes on a collaborative governance board. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(4), 500-528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114560586>
- Wang, X., Li, H., & Yin, H. (2020). Antecedents and consequences of creativity in teams: When and how leader humility promotes performance via team creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 54(4), 843-856. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.410>
- Wróbel, A. E., Johansen, M. K., Jørgensen, M. S., & Cash, P. (2021). Facilitating creativity: Shaping team processes. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 30(4), 742-762. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12465>
- Yong, K., Sauer, S. J., & Mannix, E. A. (2014). Conflict and creativity in interdisciplinary teams. *Small Group Research*, 45(3), 266-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496414530789>
- Yoon, S. W., Song, J. H., Lim, D. H., & Joo, B. K. (2010). Structural determinants of team performance: The mutual influences of learning culture, creativity, and knowledge. *Human Resource Development International*, 13(3), 249-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2010.483815>
- Zhang, P., & Gheibi, S. (2015). From intrinsic motivation to employee creativity: The role of knowledge integration and team psychological safety. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(11). <http://oai-ojs.pkp.sfu.ca:article/5527>
- Zhang, Y., Li, G., & Wang, M. (2020). Designing creative teams from creative members: the role of reward interdependence and knowledge sharing. *Nankai Business Review International*, 11(4), 617-634. <https://doi.org/10.1108/NBRI-05-2020-0028>

CONTEXTUS

CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND
MANAGEMENT.

ISSN 1678-2089

ISSNe 2178-9258

1. Economics, Administration and Accounting - Journal
2. Federal University of Ceará. Faculty of Economics,
Administration, Actuaries and Accounting

**FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, ADMINISTRATION, ACTUARIES
AND ACCOUNTING**

University Av. – 2486, Benfica
60020-180, Fortaleza-CE

BOARD: Paulo Rogério Faustino Matos
Danielle Augusto Peres

Website: www.periodicos.ufc.br/contextus

E-mail: revistacontextus@ufc.br



Contextus is classified in the Qualis - Capes system as a B1 journal, in the area of Public and Business Administration, Accounting and Tourism (2013-2016).



Contextus agrees and signs the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA).



Contextus is associated with the Brazilian Association of Scientific Editors.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International license.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Diego de Queiroz Machado (UFC)

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Alane Siqueira Rocha (UFC)

Márcia Zabdiele Moreira (UFC)

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Adriana Rodrigues Silva (IPSantarém, Portugal)

Alessandra de Sá Mello da Costa (PUC-Rio)

Allysson Alex Araújo (UFC)

Andrew Beheregarai Finger (UFAL)

Armando dos Santos de Sousa Teodósio (PUC-MG)

Brunno Fernandes da Silva Gaião (UEPB)

Carlos Enrique Carrasco Gutierrez (UCB)

Cláudio Bezerra Leopoldino (UFC)

Dalton Chaves Vilela Júnior (UFAM)

Elionor Farah Jreige Weffort (FECAP)

Ellen Campos Sousa (Gardner-Webb, USA)

Gabriel Moreira Campos (UFES)

Guilherme Jonas Costa da Silva (UFU)

Henrique César Muzzio de Paiva Barroso (UFPE)

Jorge de Souza Bispo (UFBA)

Keysa Manuela Cunha de Mascena (UNIFOR)

Manuel Anibal Silva Portugal Vasconcelos Ferreira (UNINOVE)

Marcos Cohen (PUC-Rio)

Marcos Ferreira Santos (La Sabana, Colombia)

Mariluce Paes-de-Souza (UNIR)

Minelle Enéas da Silva (La Rochelle, France)

Pedro Jácome de Moura Jr. (UFPB)

Rafael Fernandes de Mesquita (IFPI)

Rosimeire Pimentel (UFES)

Sonia Maria da Silva Gomes (UFBA)

Susana Jorge (UC, Portugal)

Thiago Henrique Moreira Goes (UFPR)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ana Sílvia Rocha Ipiranga (UECE)

Conceição de Maria Pinheiro Barros (UFC)

Danielle Augusto Peres (UFC)

Diego de Queiroz Machado (UFC)

Editinete André da Rocha Garcia (UFC)

Emerson Luís Lemos Marinho (UFC)

Eveline Barbosa Silva Carvalho (UFC)

Fátima Regina Ney Matos (ISMT, Portugal)

Mario Henrique Ogasavara (ESPM)

Paulo Rogério Faustino Matos (UFC)

Rodrigo Bandeira-de-Mello (FGV-EAESP)

Vasco Almeida (ISMT, Portugal)

SCIENTIFIC EDITORIAL BOARD

Alexandre Reis Graeml (UTFPR)

Augusto Cezar de Aquino Cabral (UFC)

Denise Del Pra Netto Machado (FURB)

Ednilson Bernardes (Georgia Southern University, USA)

Ely Laureano Paiva (FGV-EAESP)

Eugenio Ávila Pedrozo (UFRGS)

Francisco José da Costa (UFPB)

Isak Kruglianskas (FEA-USP)

José Antônio Puppim de Oliveira (UCL)

José Carlos Barbieri (FGV-EAESP)

José Carlos Lázaro da Silva Filho (UFC)

José Célio de Andrade (UFBA)

Luciana Marques Vieira (UNISINOS)

Luciano Barin-Cruz (HEC Montréal, Canada)

Luis Carlos Di Serio (FGV-EAESP)

Marcelle Colares Oliveira (UFC)

Maria Ceci Araujo Misoczky (UFRGS)

Mônica Cavalcanti Sá Abreu (UFC)

Mozar José de Brito (UFL)

Renata Giovinzano Spers (FEA-USP)

Sandra Maria dos Santos (UFC)

Walter Bataglia (MACKENZIE)