ECONOMICS
& Sociology

Tomas Kačerauskas,
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University,
Vilnius, Lithuania,
E-mail:
Tomas.Kacerauskas@vgtu.lt

CREATIVITY MANAGEMENT: TOWARDS SOFT CONTROL

ABSTRACT. The paper deals with the management of creativity. Creative activity is peculiar since it covers specific (creative) worker, his (her) own working time, peculiar resources, implementation of a particular product. A creative worker resists to any forms of control and management including forced labour hours, work in an office, strong terms and contractual obligations. An office could be treated as a panopticon, i.e. as a prison, in which every labour operation of a worker-prisoner is observed. Transparent walls of an office are not a fashionable trend, but the requirement of control and management so that to see every motion of workers. Control over creative workers is an inevitable element of social order but it should be "soft" enough in order to avoid their frustration. There are two alternatives: control should be even harder in order to manage creative workers slipping from control as such, or it should be softer in order to catch at least the rest of the subjects to be controlled. Although creativity does not tolerate organizations with strong control and rigid hierarchy, if there is no (self-)control at all, most likely there would be no creative result either. A creative worker usually has no motives to create without any orders, both in a broader (social order) and in a narrow sense (economic order). Nevertheless, a "hard" structure of management with strong hierarchy is destructive for creativity. Creativity is usually mobilized by creative education and by stimulation of creative risks. There is a collision between the rules forced from outside and those created by a creative worker him/herself. Thus, collisions, contradictions and clashes are inseparable from creativity. The purpose of the paper is twofold: (1) to review different approaches to creativity management and (2) to show the specificity of creativity management.

Introduction: the peculiarities of creative work

Creativity from the managerial point of view has been described as a subjective judgement (Amabile, 1982), as the generation of original and useful ideas (Amabile, 1983; Amabile, 1996; Arndt *et al.*, 1999), as a complex activity including expertise, creative thinking and motivation (Amabile, 1998), as a complex interaction between the individual and

his (her) environment (Anderson *et al.*, 2014; Pruskus, 2015), as a critical process (Drazin *et al.*, 1999), as a social activity within particular context (Ford and Gioia, 2000), as a divergent thinking including fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration (Paulus, 2000) and so on. Beside this, there is the evolution of creativity understanding in the history of human thinking (Barevičiūtė, 2014; Černevičiūtė, 2014), as well the differences of understanding in different regions or even in the same but culturally diverse region (Klimczuk, 2014). Some scholars (Pečiulis, 2015; Reimeris, 2016) characterize the contemporary society as an essentially creative one.

Scholars emphasize that creativity management is paradoxical and contradictable (McLeod *et al.*, 1997; Amabile, 1998; Sutton, 2001; Bilton; Cummings, 2014; Lane and Lup, 2015; Johnsen, 2015; Chen *et al.*, 2015).

The work time of a creative worker usually is not standardized. On the one hand, it is impossible to lock him (her) up in one place during the defined time due to creative nature of work. On the other hand, his (her) work time often violates the work hours defined by employer or law: he (she) creates also while eating, having vacation or sleeping. The resources of creativity are also peculiar: although ceramicist needs clay, a painter needs canvas and brushes, a sculptor needs stone and a writer needs paper with a pen, the key resources are not material at all. In creativity, the most important elements are the ideas that emerge in the process of creative communication.

Tools for production vary from pencils and paper to more complicated and expensive ones – computer programs, antique kiln etc. Nevertheless, all these different tools are related to the fact that the main process of creation proceeds in the heads of creative workers, tools serve only to realize the ideas of a creative worker. On the contrary, a factory excludes "thinking" by a worker: contemporary tools think instead of workers. No creative worker starts from zero, rather from a combination of ideas and pictures from available menu whatever it is: sights, experiences or thoughts. However, creativity is rather the harmonization of ideas in order to reach the new harmony of pictures or sounds instead of their mix. Creative product is peculiar by being unique and exclusive. It may have both positive and negative features since a product could be attractive but also unsaleable.

R. Florida (2002) noted that all administrative rules devoted to work class, country class or even service class are not valid for *the creative class that needs different rules and different forms of control*. In general, the aim of ruling is to force a worker "by hook or by crook" to work more efficiently, i.e. to produce as much products as possible in time as short as possible by economizing the resources as much as possible and by saving the resources for production. Control seeks to check a worker, whether he (she) adheres to contract conditions of contract, i.e. whether he (she) gives all his (her) time and power in a work place to the employer in return to ontracted salary. Control presupposes employer's belief that a worker in a workplace does not have one's body, which is only part of mechanisms in a factory. The state controls every employer who uses social resources, i.e. workers. This state control presupposes that every taxpayer serves as a social mechanism that produces welfare and happiness, as well as accumulates social capital. That is why the control over working hours is the biggest trouble for both employers and politicians. The key precondition for this control is strict separation of working and leisure hours, as well as of working days and the holidays.

The method used in the paper could be called critical analysis.

1. The forms of control and management in a mediated society

Control had different forms in different historical periods. For instance, M. Foucault in his books (1991, 2001) raised the question of how the members of a society have been

controlled and how the uncontrolled members have been disciplined and punished. As he noticed, one of the control's aspects is as follows: the members of society should be visible. The models of such disciplining are prisons and madhouses. There is a bigger possibility to "illuminate" the society in a mediated society, not only with a help of such media as phone that is possibly under control. It is possible not only to "listen" to every member of society but also to indicate his (her) place in the case of mobile phone. In general, the mobile phone is such media that does not allow being aside, in a private creative space for any moment, neither at day nor at night, without a certain volition that pushes "out of connection zone" by cutting communication drastically. Herewith, it is not as much a technical invention as one of social engineering. Being "out of connection zone" has been treated as misanthropy, eccentricity and madness.

Speaking about other media, such as radio, TV and Internet, they transfuse every individual being by enforcing him (her) with a certain way of life and unified model of behaviour. Our worldview, intrinsic to everyone and everybody, does not require any additional control: it is already "illuminated", thus predictable. There is not any smaller need to "illuminate" an individual in a democratic society. On the contrary, publicity policy is inseparable from democratic management principles and presupposes visibility that is denunciatory depending on interest of publicizing media. Symbiosis of democratic and mediated society guarantees that the higher position a person has, the more "illuminated" he (she) is. The result of this roentgen for public individual is as follows: he (she) inevitably turns to a product of the media, demonstrative "face" without his (her) creative identity.

Removed into a social rim, a creative worker revolts against these forms of visual control. A creative worker resists to any forms of control and management including forced labour hours, work in an office, strong terms and contractual obligations. Creative activity is neither consistent with accounting for labour hours, nor with being in an office, nor with strong contractual obligations. This freedom, the other side of which is social unwarrantedness of the creative workers, changes inevitably the society that develops towards creative one.

Nevertheless, there is a revenge of the control in the offices even speaking about creative society. *An office could be treated as a panopticon* described by M. Foucault (1991), *i.e. as a prison, in which every labour operation of a worker-prisoner is observed.* The aim of labour in the office is not only to ease labour communication between the workers and to do work as productively as possible but also to control a worker, who "as a whole" belongs to the employer there. *The transparent walls of the office are not fashionable trend or fancy of the designers but the requirement of control and management to see every motion of a worker.* The office imprisons by making a worker visible with appropriate furniture, layout and glass-partitions. All of this has been called "contemporary" interior that answers to the relationships of mediated and computerized society. It is like life in a medieval monastery, all acts in which have been performed together with "brothers".

2. Peculiarities of creative workers' management

As result, there arises the question whether a creative worker is to be controlled or even disciplined in general. Rejection of control and management leads to disharmony of creative society (the creative class in a narrow sense), which would turn into the sum of eccentric individuals instead of a purposeful whole. What is more, we cannot ignore the fact that creative workers are inseparable from economic order. That is why R. Florida (2002) speaks about "soft" control with creative workers. In other words, *control of the creative workers is an inevitable element of social order but it should be "soft" enough in order to avoid frustration of creative workers, herewith the very creative society, which should not*

turn into totalitarian one. If we no more use tools of the factory and of the industrial society in general for management, control and disciplining of the member within a society, it is another symptom that the structure and formation of the society has been changed towards creative one.

Hierarchic system of control represents control of different layers, while the chains of production and management control each other. For instance, workers are controlled by a team-leader, who is controlled by the heads, directors with assistants, etc. If it is a corporate enterprise, meeting of the shareholders (including ordinary workers) controls the director of the company. It is a typical hierarchic control system, within which managers and subordinates control each other.

We have additional control of governance institutions in the society. For instance, every business enterprise has been controlled by dozens of governance institutions. As a result, every worker and employer could be sure that he (she) has been observed watchfully. Sometimes the control is so "hard" that a worker cannot make any motion, i.e. one works with a feeling that he (she) is controlled and observed from both sides, an employer and the state.

The question is whether this system suits and runs in the case of creative workers. R. Florida (2002) is categorical: no. We will have a contrary result by applying this cumbersome mechanism in the case of creativity. In other words, we will have a parody of a unique creative product, i.e. mass product in the sense that it satisfies the requirements of controlling mass, while these requirements are often contradictory. However, the most important thing is that this product would not have the features typical to creative products, i.e. it would not be new, exclusive, original, attractive and unexpected. A creative worker will not create anything or it will be an inferior piece of art if the artist feels like an observed prisoner in any creative activity. After presuming this outcome of the work under control, a creative worker escapes from the office that is in the steady crossfire of controllers. In general, the feature of post-industrial society is emptying of offices. This process has been stimulated not only by economical motives (high rent costs) and peculiarities of observation ("glass-partitions"), but also enlargement of Internet space: the office is now any virtual space with its outcomes.

Time has very different sense in the creative society after erasure of the border between labour time and leisure. A creative worker works at day by communicating with friends and at night by dreaming and relaxing from creative tension, as well as on holidays by the sea or in the forest. Holidays could be more productive comparing to all labour season "at home" from the point of view of creativity. In general, a creative worker is at home where his (her) work emerges. Herewith the transformations of labour time also change labour space that is no more connected with specific labour environment in an office. These changes of labour time and space influence strategy of control. *There are two alternatives: control should be even harder in order to manage the creative workers slipping from time and space to be controlled, or it should be softer in order to catch at least the rests of subject to be controlled.* As the tendency of the exemption of offices is universal, it suits to the whole society, not only to the creative class. Herewith labour time and space, which was liberated by the creative workers, force to change the management forms of the whole society. One of the reasons of the breakdown of such totalitarian state as the Soviet Union is inadequacy of social controlling forms and creative charge of liberated society.

After the offices are empty and herewith there is no more labour time and space to be accounted, the region of control considerably diminishes. On the other hand, being connected to the global web expands it impossibly by ignoring national and state borders. Both of them have crucial outcomes for all social relationships – not only for management. *The control of a company and a state makes a way for global intergovernmental control that is to be connected with both establishment of international companies and political international formations.* An individual, including a creative worker, becomes the conductor of global

strategies (even they do not have any strategists), a part of "optical cable". Herewith the whole global space and time diminishes while they compose "transparent" communicative environment.

The scholars appeal to the conflict between creativity and organization. This conflict covers the contradictions between dogmatic thinking and sparking of new initiatives (Johnsen, 2015), the commercial interests of organization and creative value (Bilton, 2007; Bilton, Cummings, 2014), the save development and creative failures (Sutton, 2011), majority in a team and minority of the pioneers (McLeod *et al.*, 1997). In general, management of creativity is inseparable of management of the conflicts (Gelfand *et al.*, 2008; Tekleab and Quigley, 2014; Nijstad *et al.*, 2014; Jung, Lee, 2015; Chen *et al.*, 2015). *The source of any conflict is the very creativity. Creativity does not tolerate any organization with strong control and organizational hierarchy*. In other words, we have an alternative: creativity or organization. On the other hand, certain creativity is collective, for instance, in cinema industries. Other industries, including scientific ones, also need work in a group with "brainstorm" during the sharing of ideas. Nevertheless, we can state that there are certain spheres with dominant collective creation. Without sitting around the table, without changing of ideas, without having the folds and brothers-in-arms, without discussing with colleagues, the creativity is impossible sometimes. One of these spheres is scientific and pedagogical activity, developed at university. The role of an office here has not so much a department, where colleagues meet each other so seldom that these meetings (even the most intensive and warring) hardly influence creative activity of a lecturer. The auditorium is much more important while here a lecturer is responsible for proper microclimate and stimulating relationships.

Nevertheless, *if there is no (self)control at all, most likely there is also no creative result*. In this case, a harmonic work could arise from the creative chaos only accidently. Speaking about the results of an individual creative worker, the arousal of them is presupposed and creative chaos is disciplined by both internal and external discipline of creativity. External discipline is to be connected with an order and with control of its realization, meanwhile the internal one − with self-control of a creative worker and self-discipline regarding life art[1]. *A creative worker usually has no motives to create without any orders, both in a broad (social order) and in a narrow sense (economic order)*. If we analyse the arousal of the so-called masterpieces, most of them have been created having economic order[2]. The objective to find new aesthetical ways and to educate society (social order) have played although important but secondary role. Every order presupposes at least a "soft" control. Nevertheless, some economic orders can turn to "hard" dictate while the customers interfere in creative process. For instance, every economic order covers an agreement concerning size, the deadline and reward. There can also be an agreement concerning certain stages. For instance, an architect obligates to present the project and to get the permission in certain terms and he obliges to perform certain stages.

In general, *"hard" or cumbersome structure of management with strong hierarchy is destructive for creativity*. For instance, ideas of an architect could be impoverished not only by limited budget and bad taste of customer but also by different institutions, the function of which is to save *status quo* of cultural environment. In other words, the function of any institution is to limit any creative outbreak that attempt to destroy the old order. Another example: an advertisement should please not only director of production but also a customer, who is limited not only by aesthetical taste or by absence of it but also by moral convictions. Finally, there is an example from university organization: new study programmes are

---

[1] Com. Amabile, 1998.

[2] V. van Gogh and M. K. Čiurlionis, who created without any economic order, are the exceptions here. L. da Vinci, S. Botticelli, Raphael, J. S. Bach, W. A. Mozart, L. van Beethoven − all of them had economical orders.

coordinated in different sections so long, both at the faculty and at university. As result, the accepted version is often a shadow of that creative flight that was showed by an initiator in the beginning of this way.

Nevertheless, certain institutional resistance is inevitable and even necessary for both the work and the creative worker. The "free" artists are least institutionally engaged and are least under pressure. However, this "freedom" has its cost: low social guarantees and financial uncertainty. Besides, even "free" artists are disturbed by certain institutions (publish house or art gallery) on their way to public acknowledgement, the rules of which should be appreciated in order to overcome this obstacle course. A good piece of art stays original or even shocking even under institutional press.

Speaking about a creative individual in a narrow sense, *creativity is mobilized both by creative education and by stimulation of his (her) creative risk*. As education system (even being under reformation) belongs to a traditional layer destroyed by an individual creation, they are the contrary principles. Despite this, namely this contradiction awakes the creative entelechy. In general, the principle of uncertainty or of "nobody knows" (Caves, 2002) prevails in motivating a creative worker and in mobilizing his (her) creative powers. By using one or another method, nobody knows whether an artist will be motivated or not. It could also play against his (her) creative entelechy that depends on unique combination of the factors including leisure regime, labour rhythm, mood, personal relationships and so on. All of these can work against creativity despite the best[3] organization methods. It weights the attempt to organize creative work as best as possible.

Herewith, a creative work should be directed towards a certain way that is also a creative impulse. Clear rules of a game are to be connected with this aspect. Even if those rules of games are dictated or forced for creative worker, he (she) seeks to recreate them. It is a part of his (her) creative entelechy. For instance, L. da Vinci needs at least a year to paint a canvas or fresco and that it is his rule, which results from the rule of thoroughness and particularity when this rule is connected with special technology of sfumato. All this contradicts to a wish of consumer to get a product as soon and as cheap as possible. Herewith, *there is a collision between the rules forced from outside and created by creative worker*, while the latter and the costumer (in a broad sense) understand differently not only the final product but also creative ways. However, *the collisions, contradictions and clashes are inseparable from creativity*[4]. Speaking about freedom of communication, a creative worker needs access to certain creative sources including material resources and human beings: he (she) must get and change the ideas freely. In this sense even most individual creativity is also collective being in communication with other creative workers. For instance, by writing a novel the writer communicates both with other writers and readers when, it seems, other people disturb. No writer will write any good novel without reading hundreds of other novels. A writer communicates with the whole world by writing, he (she) communicates with other writers freely by reading their books. True, this freedom of communication is necessary for emerging of the new ideas and is inseparable from self-discipline in keeping created rules when the writer switches from reading to writing. An aspect of communication is an exchange of roles: only being reader as well, a writer can get new ideas.

---

[3] As mentioned, the best organizational method is not the "softest" one; it is rather a proper combination of motives and discipline.

[4] Not by accident L. da Vinci always came into a conflict with customers. Having unpainted face of Jude in the fresco "The Lord's Supper", he considered the possibility to choose the face of the hated costumer – abbot of monastery – for this sake.

Conclusions

There are the different understandings of creativity from managerial point of view. Management deals not only with original ideas to be implemented. Since creativity follows from divergent thinking or even from the clash of different attitudes, there should be also managed the conflicts in an organization. Because of the different work forms, mediated environment and amalgamation of work and leisure, the contemporary society has been changed. A creative worker resists to any forms of control and management including forced labour hours, work in an office, strong terms and contractual obligations. On the one hand, a creative worker can feel more free by choosing the work at home. On the other hand, his (her) work-time is longer. Management of creativity balances between the necessity of control and the danger of too "hard" control. Under the conditions of globalization, the trends of control in an international organization come from the intergovernmental sphere. It means often more hard decisions by neglecting the local social environment including the peculiarities of creative workers. Farther research could include a quantitative analysis of creative workers in specific industry.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1982), Social psychology of creativity: a consensual assessment technique, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 43, pp. 997-1013.

Amabile, T. M. (1983), Social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45, pp. 357-376.

Amabile, T. M. (1996), *Creativity in context*, Boulder, CO: Westview.

Amabile, T. M. (1998), How to kill creativity, *Harvard Business Review* 76 (5), pp. 76-86.

Anderson, N., Potocnik, 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), pp. 1297-1333.

Arndt, J., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S. et al. (1999), Creativity and terror management: Evidence that creative activity increases guilt and social projection following mortality salience, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77 (1), pp. 19-32.

Barevičiūtė, J. (2014), Pagrindiniai kūrybiškumo ir kūrybingumo aspektai šiuolaikiniuose humanitariniuose bei socialiniuose moksluose (The aspects of creativity and creativeness in contemporary humanities and social sciences), *Filosofija. Sociologija* 25(1), pp. 19-28.

Bilton, C. (2007), *Management and creativity: from creative industries to creative management*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Bilton, C., Cummings, S. (2014), A framework for creative management and managing creativity, In: C. Bilton, S. Cummings (eds.), *Handbook of management and creativity*, Regency: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Caves, R. (2002), *Creative Industries: Contracts between Arts and Commerce*, Cambridge: Harward University Press.

Černevičiūtė, J. (2014), Creativity Understandings, Evolution: from Genius to Creative Systems, *Santalka: Filosofija, Komunikacija* 22 (2), pp. 113-125.

Chen, M.-H., Chang, Y.-Y., Lo, Y.-H. (2015), Creativity cognitive style, conflict, and career success for creative entrepreneurs, *Journal of Business Research* 68 (4), pp. 906-910.

Drazin, R., Glynn, M. A., Kazanjian, R. K. (1999), Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemaking perspective, *Academy of Management Review* 24, pp. 286-307.

Florida, R. (2012), *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books.

Foucault, M. (1991), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Trans. By A. Shendan, New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2001), *Madness and Civilization – A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, Trans. By R. Howard. Routledge: Routledge Classics.

Ford, C. M., Gioia, D. A. (2000), Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making, *Journal of Management* 26 (4), pp. 705-732.

Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., Keller, K. M. (2008), On the etiology of conflict cultures, *Research in Organizational Behaviour* 28, pp. 137-166.

Johnsen, C. G. (2015), Deconstructing the future of management: Pharmakon, Gary Hamel and the impossibility of invention, *Futures*, 68 (SI), pp. 57-66.

Jung, E. J., Lee, S. (2015), The combined effects of relationship conflict and the relational self on creativity, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 130, pp. 44-57.

Klimczuk, A. (2014), Barriers to the development of creative industries in culturally diverse region, *Santalka: Filosofija, Komunikacija* 22(2), pp. 145-152.

Lane, C., Lup, D. (2015), Cooking under fire: Managing multilevel tensions between creativity and innovation in haute cuisine, *Industry and Innovation*, 22 (8), pp. 654-676.

McLeod, P. L., Baron, R. S., Marti, M. W., Yoon, K. (1997), The eyes have it: Minority influence in face-to-face and computer-mediated group discussions, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82, pp. 706-718.

Nijstad, B. A., Berger-Selman, F., De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014), Innovation in top management teams: Minority dissent, transformational leadership, and radical innovations, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 23 (2), pp. 310-322.

Paulus, P. B. (2000), Groups, teams, and creativity: The creative potential of idea-generating groups, *Applied Psychology* 49, pp. 237-262.

Pečiulis, Ž. (2015), Vienetiškumas ir tiražas – kūrybos visuomenės paradoksas (Paradoxes of the creative society), *Filosofija. Sociologija* 26(1), pp. 81-85.

Pruskus, V. (2015), Kūrybingumo panaudojimo gerinant aplinkos kokybę etiniai ir socialiniai kultūriniai aspektai (Ethical and sociocultural aspects of creativity use in improving the quality of the environment), *Filosofija. Sociologija* 26(3), pp. 201-209.

Reimeris, R. (2016), Theoretical features of the creative society, *Creativity studies* 9(1), pp. 15-24.

Sutton, R. I. (2001), The weird rules of creativity, *Harvard Business Review* 79 (8), pp. 94-103.

Tekleab, A. G., Quigley, N. R. (2014), Team deep-level diversity, relationship conflict, and team members' affective reactions: A cross-level investigation, *Journal of Business Research* 67(3), pp. 394-402.