Creativity Conceptions and Media Management

A framework for analysis
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‘Tools for Creativity and Innovation in Magazine Publishing’

Two initial ‘things’, concepts, to grapple with:

Creativity and its definitional problem in literature

Its relation to media industry and its management
Creativity’s definitional problem

It’s everywhere. Called the ‘rhetorics’ of creativity in one lit review (Banaji et al)

“[Creativity] is not like height or acidity, but more like, say, humor or beauty, a quality that people—even though they may concur in many of their actual judgments—are prone to disagree about.” (Klausen 2010 p348).
Creativity’s definitional problem

Adapting Klausen’s philosophical paper on the subject, he groups creativity

People, Products and Processes (Klausen 2010)

Each P places emphasis on a different location, depending on context. I added another P, for Place – or the idea that environment itself is important in literature too.
Creativity Lit review

The Four P’s of Creativity

Products: creativity as making things: ideas, innovations

People: creativity as genius, innate talent, skills

Process: creativity as stages, steps, something that

Place: creativity as dependent on wider societal ‘system’
1. Creativity as...Products

Big C and Small C creativity in different discourses

Example: the difference between
(i) finding a new way to travel to work or (ii) inventing a new product like an iPad or an artwork nominated for Turner Prize

Kantian art tradition of the ‘sublime’, creativity as innovations

vs

Creativity as ubiquitous, democratic, DIY culture and social capital
1. Creativity as...Products

Novelty, appropriateness and ‘rating’

“A product or response will be judged as creative to the extent that (a) it is both a novel and appropriate, useful, correct or valuable response to the task at hand, and (b) the task is heuristic rather than algorithmic. (Amabile 1996)

Whether Big or Small C, novelty vs appropriateness raises a philosophical problem, like classical notion of freedom (prescription or inaction) the ‘pull and push’ of creativity

This relies on ‘rating’ by someone, whether teachers, markets, or experts
1. Creativity as...Products

Some examples of Small C Big C, and its assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big-C</th>
<th>Little-c</th>
<th>Mini-c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Breakthrough creativity that changes a field</td>
<td>Everyday creativity that may make a solid contribution</td>
<td>Intrapersonal creativity that is part of the learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of a product</td>
<td>A painting by Van Gogh</td>
<td>A painting you create to give to a dear friend</td>
<td>A Student’s sketch pad with various combinations of light and shadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of a person</td>
<td>Bill Gates</td>
<td>A colleague</td>
<td>A high school art student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Usually historiometric; examining impact or citations</td>
<td>Psychometric tests; Consensual Assessment Technique</td>
<td>Microgenetic methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>More than ten years needed</td>
<td>Some level of schooling or general experience</td>
<td>Virtually none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Beghetto & Kaufman (2007 p8)
2. Creativity as...People

Research into creativity by psychologists interested in creativity via quantitative (1) historiometrics and (2) psychometrics

Historiometric methods tend to examine the great achievers in fields of endeavour (Csikszentmihalyi 1996, Simonton, 1987 and Sternberg, 2000).

Psych School Research from 1950s onwards often focused on traits, talents, and psychometric assessment (JP Guilford)
2. Creativity as...People

Weisberg’s Myth of Genius

But the ‘qualitative’ nature of case studies is important too

The incremental steps have led to all major achievements: case studies of methodology of Picasso and Crick and Watson have shown this.

‘Edison was a genius, just not in the way you thought’
Maats & O’Brien (2012) from the Straight A Conspiracy
3. Creativity as...Process

Poincare’s canonic 1908 study of problem-solving cognition: its stages being (a) preparation, (b) incubation, (c) illumination, and (d) verification.

But we know, from creativity researchers such as Amabile, that creativity in this process may depend on

An Individual’s psychology and talent  **(cognitive)**

And

On what others do and how they might ‘rate’ it **(sociological)**
3. Creativity as...Process

On the more cognitive side...

A number of people, notably, Harvard Business School’s Teressa Amabile, who considered motivation, and intrinsic reward mechanisms
3. Creativity as...Process

Amabile, along with others, recognised creativity as a ‘confluence of factors’ (Human Relations Management)

**Internal Components**

Creativity skills – traits, personality, flexible thinking
Intrinsic task motivation – the interest and drive in the work
Domain skills– expertise or competencies in area

**External Components**

The wider environment
3. Creativity as...Process

On the more sociological side

Organisational creativity and innovation

Amabile 1996
4. Creativity as...Place

Thinking about where creativity happens was the starting point of Csikszentmihalyi’s well known ‘systems model’.

Why was Renaissance Italy, Florence, in particular, the home to so much creativity in art? Couldn’t all be traits or something in the water?
4. Creativity as...Place

The often cited ‘systems’ model.
Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1997)

The Individual
The Domain
The Field
Tools for Creativity

“This is the age of creativity because it’s the age of knowledge. And in an era that prizes knowledge, creativity adds value to knowledge and it makes it progressively more useful.” John Kao (from Jammin’)
But in media industries, they favour analysis on consumption of their output over analysis of its production. Not thinking about creativity as a tool but a gift...... The X Factor!

Warhurst (2010) and others calls this ‘the missing middle’ in creative industry work – the blinding by the fantastic outputs.
Managing creative ‘push and pull’

Few discourses in business studies accepts creativity as a management theory. According to Styhre & Sundgren (2005) it becomes subsumed into ideas of either myth or the contingency theories of ex post-facto research:

We cannot ‘do’ anything about creativity...
“The inability to take an ex ante perspective on creativity has added further to the ‘mystification’ of creative processes because creativity has been treated as something that one cannot fully control... creativity actually managed rather than being an effect of various conditions of which one can only control a subset.”

Styhre & Sundgren (2005)
Managing Creativity in Organizations

In the case of new drug development, several drivers for organizational creativity can be defined as destabilizers, such as informal networks, information sharing, new skills (e.g. rational persuasion, political entrepreneurship), and intuition (Sundgren, 2004). From an organizational creativity perspective, proper destabilizers are important to promote creative action. It is important to note that the model in Figure 7.1 does not argue about the need for stabilizers. The basic argument is that organizational creativity in many for example in new drug development is too embedded in stabilizers (projectification, planning, and so forth) and needs to move towards practices that make better use of destabilizers. In this sense, new management practice and strategy are necessary to understand and create a balance between the two systems – to promote organizational creativity. The double arrow in Figure 7.1 suggests that management should not only bridge the two systems and secure a strategy in which productivity is not enhanced at the expense of organizational creativity, but also aim to create a kind of creative equilibrium between two systems.

Traditionally, there is a strong urge for leaders to acknowledge stabilizers. In fact, leadership and management skills are often defined in terms of stabilizers. The primary reason for this is that it is a safe arena. Leadership and management practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stabilizers (Static, predictable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous step improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Projectification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Instrumental rational processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Management control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reduced slack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ “Silo” thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Extrinsic motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destabilizers (Dynamic, unpredictable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radical change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Informal networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Thinking out of the box &amp; Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ New skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Translator agents &amp; alternative arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Intrinsic motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 The creative equilibrium model of new thinking in management practice to support organizational creativity in new drug development

Styhre & Sundgren 2005
Managing creativity in media

Media industry is increasingly hourglass shaped (Deuze 2011). Concentration and fragmentation at same time

Corporations high control → freelancers low control

Magazine Publishers are asking magazines to run them from home

TV Channels similarly increasingly use freelance firms
What about tools for innovation

Implications then, for ‘Tools’...?

Psychological: intrinsic motivation focus, leadership styles

Technological: open source tech, shared knowledge, social networks

Organisational: freedom vs control, training and support, environment and affective states, working culture and h

Methodologies for ‘testing’? Trying tools, examine case studies.
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