Ольга Ломак,
аспірантка кафедри психології,
ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький
державний педагогічний
університет імені
Григорія Сковороди»

Olha Lomak,
PhD Student of the Department
of Psychology of SHEI
«Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi
Hryhorii Skovoroda State
Pedagogical University»

E-mail: olga.lomakk@gmail.com

ORCID 0000-0002-1465-3139

ОСНОВНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ КРЕАТИВНОСТІ ТА ІННОВАЦІЙНОСТІ В ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНОМУ КОНТЕКСТІ

У статті проаналізовано проблему дослідження креативності та інноваційності в рамках організаційного контексту. Висвітлено основні підходи до визначення понять креативності та інноваційності. Обґрунтовано взаємопов'язаність цих понять через новизну як спільну характерну рису інноваційності та креативності. Визначено ключову відмінність між креативністю та інноваційністю, яка полягає в тому, що остання вимагає впровадження, прийняття та поширення; ідея також має бути актуальною, корисною та ефективною, щоб вважатися інноваційною в організаційному контексті. Охарактеризовано підходи до дослідження креативності та інноваційності на 3 рівнях: мікро (індивідуальному), мезо (командному) та макро (організаційному). Визначено типові фокуси індивідуального рівня аналізу креативності та інноваційності: мотивацію, риси особистості, цілеспрямованість, Я-концепцію, когнітивний стиль, креативну поведінку. Дослідження на командному рівні сфокусовано на аналізі структури та складу команд, командного клімату, процесів в команді та стилі лідерства. На організаційному рівні проаналізовано такі атрибути, як знання та зв'язки, організаційна структура та стратегія, розмір організації, культура, організаційний клімат, зовнішнє середовище, поширення інновацій, корпоративне підприємництво. Організаційну креативність визначено як створення цінного, корисного нового продукту, послуги, ідеї або процесу індивідами, які працюють разом у складній соціальній системі. Висвітлено взаємозв'язок прояву креативності та інноваційності на різних рівнях. Враховуючи складність цих концептів, обґрунтовано необхідність подальших емпіричних досліджень креативності та інновацій у взаємозв'язку з комплексом зовнішніх чинників.

Ключові слова: креативність, інновації, інноваційність, інноваційний потенціал, організаційна культура, когнітивний стиль, креативна поведінка.

The article analyzes the problem of studying the creativity and innovation of employees. The main approaches to defining the concepts of creativity and innovation are highlighted. The interconnectedness of these concepts through novelty as a common feature of innovation and creativity is substantiated. The key difference between creativity and innovation is identified, which is that the latter requires implementation, adoption, and dissemination. The idea also have to be relevant, useful, and effective to be considered innovative in the organizational context. Approaches to the study of creativity and innovation at 3 levels: micro (individual), meso (team), and macro (organizational) are described. The typical focus of individual level of analysis of creativity and innovation are determined: motivation, personality traits, purposefulness, self-concept, cognitive style, creative behavior. Research at the team level focuses on the analysis of team structure and composition, team climate, team processes, and leadership style. At the organizational level, attributes such as knowledge and networks, organizational structure and strategy, organization size, culture, organizational climate, environment, dissemination of innovation, and corporate entrepreneurship are analyzed. Organizational creativity is defined as the creation of a valuable, useful, new product, service, idea, or process by individuals working together in a complex social system. The relationship between manifestation of creativity and innovation at different levels is highlighted. Taking into account the complexity of these concepts, the need for further empirical research on creativity and innovation in relation to a set of external factors is justified.

Keywords: *creativity, innovations, innovativeness, innovative potential, organizational culture, cognitive style, creative behavior.*

Stating of the problem. In the nowadays dynamic and changing economy, organizations face external challenges and changes more often than ever before. Innovations in organizations are extremely important conditions for successful adaptation to these changes. Moreover, creativity and innovativeness are considered as skills that can promote human potential, self-realization, well-being, job satisfaction and engagement. Many resources are allocated to support innovations, as they are necessary for any company's sustainability, dynamism, and success. Thus, there is a great need for people who are able to work effectively in an innovative environment. Psychologists play an essential role in helping organizations increase creativity and innovations and use them more effectively, eventually leading to increased corporate success. The development of psychodiagnostic approaches that make it possible to identify and measure innovative potential is of particular relevance. However, when analyzing the problems connected to innovations, the focus is usually on economic and organizational factors, the psychological aspects are insufficiently covered. Although financial resources, the organizational environment, the management system alone do not make sense without the essential component – people who have to develop and implement innovations. Moreover, the most practically actual are researches aimed at studying not just the tendency to create and use innovations in life in general but in the organizational context. However, in most studies, personality qualities that determine the propensity to innovations are examined regardless of their applicability in the workplace.

Analyzes of the recent researches and publications. In psychology, creativity and innovations has been studied from different approaches: as a personality trait (N. Popkins, R. W. Woodman, L. F. Schoenfeldt); as a set of personality traits (F. Barron, R. B. Cattell, H. J. Eysenck, D. M. Harrington); as a property of intelligence (J. P. Guilford, E. P. Torrance); as a cognitive style responsible for the propensity to innovate (T. M. Amabile, M. Basadur, J. L. Farr, M. J. Kirton, N. West). Innovations at the workplace are considered as a process that includes idea generation (creativity) and the implementation of ideas within the workgroup or organization (N. Anderson). Farr suggests that different individual, group, and organizational factors can affect the innovation process, including the generation of ideas and their implementation, in different ways.

The article aims to define the concepts of innovation and creativity, analyze the approaches to researching the creativity and innovations of employees at different levels (individual, team, organizational) and to substantiate the importance of interlevel researches.

Description of the fundamental information. Nowadays, there is a discussion of how innovation and creativity are related. In order to develop the methods of researching creativity and innovation, it is important to consider the different definitions of creativity and innovations that can be found in the scientific literature.

Psychology

By doing this, we obtain a clearer understanding of creativity and innovations as independent constructs and relationships and differences between these concepts. Several perspectives on this issue may be found in scientific literature. Some researchers state that creativity generates innovation; others argue that innovation generates creative ideas [Man, 2001: p. 230].

Moreover, the terms innovation and creativity are often used interchangeably. In both creativity and innovation, novelty is seen as a key distinctive factor. However, the nature of innovations is adaptive, and they are usually carried out in response to unfamiliar, unexpected, or non-routine problems. Creativity, basically, does not have to have a goal. T. M. Amabile argues that creativity is the production of new relevant ideas in any field of human activity [Amabile, 1988: p. 128-133]. However, other researchers have defined it as the ability to create work that is both new (original, unexpected) and relevant (useful, adaptive), and it is this utility characteristic that provides the strongest link of innovation [Sternberg, 1999: p. 169-171].

M. Sundgren and A. Styhre define innovation as the realization of ideas in practice within a project, team, or field of science, that has been developed to achieve the project objectives [Sundgren, Styhre, 2003: p. 150].

Similarly, R. McAdam define effective business innovation as using people's creativity and processes in an organization in response to customer and market demands. These definitions mean that innovation requires the implementation of creative ideas in a way that is valuable to the organization's business requirements and the organization's technological or inventive requirements [McAdam, McClelland, 2002: p. 86-97].

The key difference between creativity and innovation is that innovation requires implementation, acceptance, and dissemination. In addition, T. M. Amabile notes that in business, to be creative, an idea must also be relevant, useful, and effective. She also believes that creativity is the first step towards innovation, which can be considered successful in implementing those novel, relevant ideas [Amabile, 1988: p. 128-133].

M. Williamson hypothesizes that innovation is a combination of individual creativity and creative organizational culture. It is hypothesized that creativity will lead to innovation under a number of favorable conditions, namely when there is the opportunity for creative self-expression and the absence of limitations, sufficient resources, and support for the development of ideas and solid internal incentives [O'Shea, Buckley, 2007: p. 101-128].

Thus, it is clear that creativity and innovation are closely connected and related concepts. They have many common features, and some researchers use the term as a synonym. Many scientists see creativity as the first step towards innovation, but they see no further role for creativity once the implementation phase begins.

For further researching of creativity and innovation, it is necessary to have a common structure for the study. Creativity and innovation can be analyzed at three different levels of micro (individual), meso (team) and macro (organizational).

Typical focuses of individual level of analysis of creativity are: motivation, personality traits, goal orientation, self-concept, cognitive style, creative behavior.

Intrinsic motivation has been identified as one major component of many creativity theories: componential model of creativity (T. M. Amabile), interactionist model of creative behavior (R. W. Woodman and L. F. Schoenfeld), interactive approach (M. Csikszentmihalyi) [Tang, 2017: p. 17].

Intrinsic motivation is characterized by a deep interest and involvement in the work, curiosity, enjoyment, or personal sense of challenge. Individuals who are extrinsically motivated are characterized by a desire to achieve goals apart from work itself, for example, receiving rewards or recognition from others. High levels of intrinsic motivation are most conducive to creativity since such motivation increases the tendency to be curious, cognitively flexible, risk-taking, and persistent in the face of barriers. Extrinsic motivation results in poor performance as they draw attention away from task performance [Tang, 2017: p. 19].

Researchers acknowledge personality traits as moderators or mediators of innovations. Locus of control, psychological femininity/masculinity, curiosity, persistence, autonomy, self-esteem, and narcissism, Big Five personality traits are considered as those which improve the level of innovativeness or personality [Woodman, Schoenfeldt, 1990: p. 280-285].

G. J. Feist researched that creative employees showed high levels of: autonomy, independence, and introversion; energy, achievements, drive, and self-confidence; openness, flexibility, imagination, and tolerance [Feist, 1999: 275-278].

Goal orientation is individuals' beliefs that serve as a motivational mechanism that influences how employee interprets and acts in achievement situations. Scientists differentiate intrinsic (learning, mastery goal orientation) from extrinsic (performance) goal orientations. Studies found that learning orientation (emphasizes personal development of competence) has a positive effect on creativity, whereas performance orientations (focuses on showing competence to external observers) has not [Tang, 2017: p. 13].

Self-concept is one's belief, perception, and evaluation of themselves. Creative self-concept is typically composed of creative self-efficacy, creative role identity, and creative self-esteem. Creative self-efficacy in the workplace is defined as employees' self-belief about the degree to which they think they are capable of being creative [Tierney, Farmer, 2011: p. 280-282].

On the individual level, creativity is also considered as a cognitive style. Cognitive style is defined as the way in which people prefer to perform mental actions. M. J. Kirton was the first to argue that people differ in continuity in their preferences for creative styles, decision-making, and problem-solving. The author argues that some people tend to adapt, and some typically innovate. Adapters usually produce a sufficient number of ideas, extending existing problem solutions. On the other hand, innovators are more likely to reconstruct a problem in an effort to change and come up with much less expected solutions [Kirton, 2001: p. 628].

E. Rogers carried out a typology of the subjects of innovation activity depending on the degree of their involvement in the process of introducing and implementing new ideas, solutions, and technologies. He highlighted that innovators who are inclined to take risks for the sake of innovation, early adopters, generally

Psychology

accepting innovations without much delay; late mass consumers, represented mainly by skeptics; slow and late, who are often conservatives [Kirton, 2001: p. 625].

A further measure of creative style has been developed by E. Selby, D. J. Treffinger, S. G. Isaksen and K. J. Lauer. They consider three dimensions of creative style relating to creative problem solving and change management. These dimensions are: orientation to change (Explorer and the Developer), the preferred manner of processing (External and Internal), preferred way of deciding (People-focused and Task-focused) [Feist, 1999: p. 283].

Creativity on the individual level is also reviewed as creative behavior. In this case, innovativeness on the individual level is considered as a part of organizational creativity. The researches show that encouraging creativity at the individual level should lead to improved creativity at the group or organization level. As a result, this improvement in a group or organizational creativity increases individual innovations. Creative behavior is determined by the complex interaction between personality and environmental attributes. Thus, it is almost impossible to study creative behavior without taking into account external influences [Tang, 2017: p. 11].

Mezo (team) level studies can be categorized into team structure and composition, team climate and processes, and leadership style. Team structure and composition focuses on team diversity. A positive association of diversity with higher performance and innovation was proved [Anderson, King, 1991: p. 17-19].

The correlation between positive team climate and innovativeness is stated. Team vision, support for innovation, task orientation, team cohesion, and participative safety – these attributes have positively correlated with team innovativeness. The authors concluded that these findings provided further support to the importance of social processes and relationships to team-level innovation [Anderson, King, 1991: p. 20-21].

The relation between the type of leadership and team-level innovations has been investigated. For example, B. M. Bass differentiated transformational leadership from transactional leadership. Transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals and motivates followers to reach high performance. In contrast, transactional leadership establishes an exchange-based relationship by clarifying goals, rewarding goal achievement, and by intervening only when necessary [Bass, 1999: p. 15-18].

The analysis involving over 800 teams found that transformational leadership was correlated substantially more strongly for the opening-up phase of innovation, whereas transactional leadership was more effective for idea implementation. G. R. Oldham and A. Cummings observed a positive correlation between non-controlling leadership and rated individual creativity. Somech found that participative leadership (shared decision-making by supervisor and employee) and directed leadership (providing a framework for decisions and actions) positively correlated with team innovation [Oldham, Cummings, 1996: p. 615-618].

M. A. West proposes a model of team innovation, which is affected by groups of factors that will determine the level of group innovation: Task characteristics (the specific of the task that a group performs) fundamentally influence on the work of

group, defining its structural, process, and functional requirements: group knowledge, diversity, and skills) and External demands (the external context of the group's work, for example, organizational climate, support systems, market environment, environmental uncertainty – all are likely to have a highly significant influence on team creativity and innovation implementation) [West, Altink, 1996: p. 5-8].

On the organizational level, creativity and innovation often tend to flourish when there are opportunities for exploration and autonomy and when originality is supported and valued [Amabile, 1988: p. 128-133].

R. W. Woodman, R. K. Sawyer, and R. Griffin define organizational creativity as the creation of a valuable, useful new product, service, idea, procedure, or process by individuals working together in a complex social system [Tang, 2017: p. 19].

Attempts to increase innovation in organizations have been largely based on the belief that by increasing individual creativity, and identifying and removing barriers to individual creativity, organizations can increase their ability to respond to changes in the external environment. However, the area of organizational creativity is opening new possibilities in relation to how creativity is conceived in organizations as well as in relation to the relationship of creativity and innovation [Csikszentmihalyi, 1997: p. 143].

Studies addressing resources in terms of time and money have repeatedly proven that resources available to projects are directly related to the projects' creativity levels. It was found that organizations that provide trainings and employee involvement practices, use performance-based pay systems, enable flexible working hours, emphasize job variety and autonomy, and demonstrate more human resource flexibility have higher levels of innovation [Tang, 2017: p. 20].

N. Anderson have also summarized studies and findings of other attributes such as knowledge and networks, organizational structure and strategy, organizational size, culture and climate, external environment, innovation diffusion, corporate entrepreneurship in the review of the creativity and innovation studies in organization [Anderson, Potocnik, Zhou, 2014: p. 1301].

E. C. Martins and F. Terblanche stated that organizational culture influence the creativity and innovations of employees. Culture can affect behavior through socialization. During this process, employees learn which behaviors and responses are acceptable and which are not. Norms, values, and assumptions that guide people on how to behave and how to think are developed. In this phase, individuals learn whether creative behaviors are valued [Rasulzada, 2007: p. 17].

As mentioned above, the complex of personality and environmental determinants influence creativity and innovations. Thus, it is of importance to study these concepts taking into account these external factors.

Conclusions. Managing people to promote creativity and innovation is essential if we strive to realize the full creative potential of individuals and organizations. Due to the complexity of concepts creativity and innovation, we should take into account different factors from different perspectives and levels of analysis.

Creativity and innovations should be further researched in its multi-disciplinary perspectives to advance knowledge which can help organizations in developing both individual, team, and organizational creativity and innovation, which will, in turn, increase a company's competitive advantage and advance the usefulness of research undertaken by psychologists

REFERENCES

- Amabile, 1988* – Amabile T. M. A Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 1988. 10. P. 123-167.
- Anderson, King, 1991* – Anderson N., King N. Managing innovation in organizations. *Leadership and Development Journal*. 1991. 12. P. 17–21.
- Anderson, Potocnik, Zhou, 2014* – Anderson N., Potocnik K., Zhou J. Innovation and creativity in organizations a state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*. 2014. 40 (5). P. 1297–1333.
- Bass, 1999* – Bass B. M. Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 1999. 8 (1). P. 9–32.
- Csikszentmihalyi, 1997* – Csikszentmihalyi M. Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention. New York : Harper Perennial, 1997.
- Feist, 1999* – Feist G. J. The influence of personality on artistic and scientific creativity. *Handbook of Creativity*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 273–296.
- Kirton, 1976* – Kirton M. Adaptors and innovators: A description and measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1976. 61 (5). P. 622–629.
- Man, 2001* – Man J. Creating Innovation. *Work Study*. 2001. 50 (6). P. 229–233.
- McAdam, McClelland, 2002* – McAdam R., McClelland J. Individual and team-based idea generation within innovation management: organisational and research agendas. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. 2002. 5 (2). P. 86-97.
- Oldham, Cummings, 1996* – Oldham G. R., Cummings A. Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996. 39 (3). P. 607–634.
- O'Shea, Buckley, 2007* – O'Shea D., Buckley F. Towards an integrative model of creativity and innovation in organisations: A psychological perspective. *Irish Journal of Psychology*. 2007. 28 (3/4). P. 101–128.
- Rasulzada, 2007* – Rasulzada F. Organizational creativity and psychological well-being. Retrieved from http://www.farida.se/Farida_Rasulzada_book.pdf
- Sternberg, Lubart, 1999* – Sternberg R. J., Lubart T. I. The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. *Handbook of creativity*. 1999. P. 3-15.
- Sundgren, Styhre, 2003* – Sundgren M., Styhre A. Creativity – A Volatile Key of Success? *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 2003. 12 (3). P. 145- 161.
- Tierney, Farmer 2011* – Tierney P., Farmer S. M. Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2011. 96 (2), P. 277–293.
- Tang, 2017* – Tang M. Creativity and Innovation: Basic Concepts and Approaches. *Handbook Of The Management Of Creativity And Innovation: Theory And Practice* / edited by M. Tang and C. H. Werner. 2017. P. 3-32.
- West, Altink, 1996* – West M. A., Altink W. M. M. Innovation at work: Individual, group, organisational and socio-historical perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 1996. 5 (1). P. 3–11.
- Woodman, Schoenfeldt, 1990* – Woodman R. W., Schoenfeldt L. F. An interactionist model of creative behaviour. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*. 1990. 24 (4). P. 279–290.