CONTRADICTION BETWEEN EMPHASIZING CREATIVITY IN THEORY AND STIFLING IT IN PRACTICE**

The word ‘creativity’, like other frequently used and popular words, is at risk of becoming a vague platitude or a slogan devoid of its conceptual determination. The knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon of creativity are not proportional to how much it is affirmed and promoted nowadays. This is particularly noticeable in work organizations of all kinds. Besides the subjective factors such as the employers’ and managers’ superficial or inadequate knowledge of what creativity really is, there are objective factors which put pressure on and hinder the creative impulses and processes. Economic, financial and market imperatives such as: fierce competition, short-term goals and deadlines, acceleration of work processes, rationalization, productivism, overall quantification (only measurable parameters and results being taken into account), excessive regulations, tight control systems and the like, contribute to the design of organizations which crush creativity. Some quite widespread management practices and behaviors, especially the so-called intrusive or micromanagement, are often a reaction to these constraints. As for the employees, they internalize all these pressures into strong inner imperatives of (over)achievement. The imposed standard of a constantly high level of motivation, excellence and self-improvement is unsustainable in the long run. The guiding management principle of performing more and better for less (time, resources, energy, leads to the exhaustion of mental and other psychological resources needed for creative ideas to emerge and develop. Creativity involves complex, subtle and dynamic psychosocial mechanisms. Too often the managerial practices and organizational cultures are detrimental to the well known most powerful source of creativity: the intrinsic motivation. Briefly, this article deals with the paradox which lies in the fact that, in theory, so much emphasis is put on creativity and innovation as indispensable assets, while at the same time so much is done to stifle them in practice.
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1. Introduction

The word ‘creativity’, like other frequently used and popular words, is at risk of becoming a vague platitude or a slogan devoid of conceptual determination. The knowledge and understanding of creativity are not proportional to how much this phenomenon is affirmed and promoted nowadays. This is particularly noticeable in work organizations of all kinds. Besides the subjective factors which include the employers’ and managers’ superficial or inadequate knowledge of what creativity really is, then their personal profile, general interpersonal and specifically management style and behavior, there are objective factors which put pressure on and hinder the creative impulses and processes. Economic, financial and market imperatives such as: fierce competition, short-term goals and deadlines, acceleration of work processes, rationalization, productivism, quantification (only measurable parameters and results being taken into account), excessive regulations, tight control systems and the like, contribute to the design of organizations which crush creativity. Some quite widespread management practices and behaviors, especially the so-called intrusive or micromanagement, are often a reflection of these external factors as well as a reaction to them. As for the employees, they eventually internalize these pressures turning them, often unconsciously, into strong inner imperatives of (over)achievement. The imposed standard of a constantly high level of motivation, performance and self-improvement is unsustainable in a long run. The guiding management principle of achieving unrelentingly more and better for less (time, resources, energy) leads to the exhaustion of mental and other psychological resources needed for creative ideas to emerge and develop. Creativity involves complex, subtle and dynamic psychosocial mechanisms. Managerial practices and organizational cultures are too often detrimental to the well known most powerful source of creativity: the intrinsic motivation.

Eminent researchers of creativity concluded that contrary to popular opinion, being creative does not imply a certain type of personality according the way different psychological theories classify personality types. Rothenberg states emphatically: “Only one characteristic of personality and orientation towards life and work is being absolutely expressed in all creative people: motivation.”¹. As the topic of the article is creativity in the organizational context, and (according to Rothenberg and many other researchers) the most powerful driving force of creativity is the intrinsic (internal) motivation, the following section will be devoted to this issue.

2. Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination Theory

The theory of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relies on Deci and Ryan’s theory of cognitive evaluation. Their basic hypothesis is that intrinsic motivation arises from innate needs, which every man possesses to a greater or lesser extent, namely the need for competence; relatedness and self-determination (or autonomy). According to this theory, the motivational process depends on all personal and contextual factors that may affect these needs. First, the need for competence means the desire to control and master the environment and outcome. We want to know how things would turn out and the results/consequences of our actions. This ability develops by the accumulation of knowledge and experience during various interactions with the environment, but also from within the power of the human need for this interaction. Erich Fromm ranks this need, which he calls the need for effectiveness, among eight basic human needs and he equates it with the need to feel accomplished. The need for relatedness deals with the desire to interact with, be connected to, and experience caring for other people. Our actions and daily activities involve other people and through this we seek the feeling of belongingness. The need for autonomy concerns the urge to be causal agents and to act in harmony with their integrated self. However, Deci and Ryan stated that to be autonomous doesn’t mean to be independent. It means having a sense of free will when doing something or acting out of our own interests and values.

Regarding the topic of creativity and the internal and external factors which encourage or discourage it, we find that it is best explained by the Self-Determination Theory (hereinafter referred to as SDT).

2.1. Self-Determination Theory

“SDT develops an integrative approach to the delicate issue of the work motivation by linking the inherent needs of growth to the active nature of man, which (providing there are normal and favorable environmental conditions) tends to develop an autonomous regulation style of behavior as well as integrate life experiences and personal dispositions in a coherent self system. The theory considers the cases of excessive external pressures, which lead to the frustration of basic needs of growth and to the development of controlled motivation or state of a motivation. The assumptions of this theory have been tested in a number of domains such as learning, work, sport, intimate relationships, pro-social

---

3 Fromm, Erich (2003): The Sane Society, Abingdon: Routledge
behavior and many others. The proponents of this theory analyze the connection between the self and the feelings of self-determination and competence. The central hypothesis of SDT is that individual behavior is motivated by one’s need to feel competent and be the cause of his/her own actions and behaviors. It refers to a framework of analysis in which three theories intersect: the theories of cognitive evaluation, of causal orientation and of self-integration.

In order to satisfy his/her need for self-determination, the individual seeks to gain a sense of inner causality or internal locus of control, that is to feel that he/she is the cause of his/her actions. Creative individuals have a strong internal locus of control. When they can keep the internal locus of control, they perceive their work environment positively, as a context that supports and encourages their autonomy, which in turn strengthens their inner motivation. Therefore, although we refer to internal needs and motives, it is clear that situational factors play an important role in stimulating intrinsic motivation. But any inappropriate and ill-advised interference of external factors, such as excessive control, competition, deprivation of autonomy, unrealistic expectations, objectives and deadlines and other pressures (even reward predictions and expectations in terms of enticements) overturn motivation into demotivation. So the secret is in a thoughtful and careful use of appropriate external motivators, as means in the service of intrinsic motivation.

“SDT is the only theory which uses the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and describes the process of transforming one into the other. One type of motivation that occurs at the transition between the spheres of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on the continuum of self-determination is the autonomous extrinsic motivation (AEM). AEM refers to one’s willingness to perform the tasks he/she considers important for his/her own goals or values. It is very important to note that these are tasks that the person has not set herself, but that they have been assigned from outside. However, if the objective to be achieved by the task is being integrated into the personal goals and values of the performer, the supporting work behavior will become regulated by personal values and goals and it will become important as a source of intrinsic satisfaction for the person.”

2.1.1. Autonomy and Organizational Constraints

Since we have selected autonomy as one of the three essential components of intrinsic motivation, knowing that this is the key factor of creativity, we need to point out the tense, even conflicting relationship between the need for autonomy and belonging to a work organization.

7 Majstorović, Nebojša (2008), 13.
Autonomy in the organizational context is defined as the ability of an entity (individual or collective) to freely determine the rules of activities to which it is subjected, to fix the precise modalities of its activities within the area of its operation, without someone from the outside (here, a formal organization) imposing its own norms.\textsuperscript{8}. The employees’ autonomy doesn’t belong to the corpus of human rights: when someone consents to an employment he/she renounces, implicitly or explicitly, a portion of his/her freedom, at least for as long as he/she intends to respect the contract and receive a salary in return in accordance with his/her qualifications and investments.\textsuperscript{9}

However, what seems obvious \textit{de jure}, is not \textit{de facto} the case in social relations. Deep down employees are aware that accepting employment contract they have deliberately alienated a part of their freedom. However, they constantly forget this and tend to benefit on all plans, sometimes at the cost of a bad faith or a very subjective perception and reconstruction of what is legitimate. On the other side, the employers want to control all the professional procedures and activities, but deep down they know - even if they firmly believe in the scientific organization of work - that the production depends on workers’ initiatives and autonomous \textit{bricolages}. Thus there is the paradox that autonomy - which has been partly conquered \textit{against} the organization - is at the same time the condition of the good functioning of the organization.\textsuperscript{10} One of the definite findings of the researchers’ studies on the effective functioning of highly rationalized industrial organizations is the observed discrepancy between the standard (required by the organization) and the situated action of the operator (and the team); between the prescribed work (job preset by the design engineer) and actual work. This gap, in which the autonomy of actors fits, can be read either as an act of resistance (of ownership and assertiveness) against the order of the organization, or as an act of taking charge of the formal organization which, overwhelmed by the eruption of unpredictable elements, is unable to tell its members what they should do in each case, or as a mixture of both.\textsuperscript{11}

The inevitable and ever-present tension between the need for autonomy and organizational constraints doesn’t mean that there are no ways to manage it successfully in order to motivate employees to be creative. On the one hand, it presupposes that this tension is not denied and is not a taboo, and that the organization doesn’t harbor the illusion of a harmonious unity of the organization’s and employees’ needs and interests. On the other hand, it demands a more flexible


\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{11} Chatzis, Konstantinos (1999), 29.
control system and trust based on results rather than on imposing the ways how to achieve them.

Since the need for self-determination, autonomy and a strong internal locus of control are the foundation of intrinsic motivation for work in general, and especially for creative work, it is clear that every unjustified pressure, coercion and control destroys this motivation. The harmful consequence of inappropriate control over the processes by which different individuals realize their tasks is that the creative impulse, which involves taking initiative and risk, freedom of research (also meaning the freedom to make mistakes) withdraws and hides beneath the surface. This particularly affects creative individuals, the same ones who are sought by organizations because of their creativity and who, by their nature, have a pronounced tendency towards autonomy, individualism and non-conformism.

After almost sixty decades of McGregor’s criticism of the management style based on the „Theory X” (1960), it is still widespread under a new label: micromanagement.

3. Micromanagement: the New Face of the X Theory

Let us remind ourselves briefly of the essence of McGregor’s theory (1960). The “Theory X” is based on the postulate that most people have an innate aversion to work and strive to avoid it in every possible way. People work only because they have to. This implies that employees should be treated as “donkeys”, with “carrot and stick” to produce results. It is necessary to coerce and control them and resort to threats and sanctions, as the expectation of reward is not a sufficient incentive. Given that people are essentially immature, devoid of ambition, unable or unwilling to take responsibility for their work, they should be actively managed. The “Theory Y” gives a completely opposite view. Its basic premise is that human beings, by nature, have a psychological need to exercise their psycho-physical and social skills in work. Moreover, they like to have responsibility, as it allows them to express and realize their personality and potentials (the innate and universal need for competence or effectiveness mentioned before). The working man is an adult, able to take an interest in what he does and to participate actively in the objectives and activities of his organization, not only for economic, utilitarian reasons but also because such participation coincides with his own hedonistic goals. The management style which emerges from this understanding of the human’s nature is opposed to the type of management characteristic of the traditional X organization. However, it seems that this tradition is very resilient, as it continues to live and flourish under the guise of new forms, despite the litany of its shortcomings. “If Micromanagement is such a Discredited and Flawed Management Style, Why

do so Many Practice it?” is the title of an internet article, and the subtitle states that micromanagement is the least admired but most applied style of management. Before we come back to the answers suggested in this article, we will rely on the following insights of another author, Yves-Pierre Gomez.

In the interview titled: “All Under Pressure: How Companies Killed the Added Value of their Employees with Great Blows of Intrusive Management“, Gomez says that work is a modality of humanization. Work is more than a mere factor of production among others. It is both the means of ensuring the economy and a vector that produces more or less humanization. Therefore, we must consider it both from an economic and anthropological point of view. That is why work cannot be reduced to its mere results. The neoliberal economic theory has served its time, because by asserting that every individual is seeking his/her own interest, one has to build increasingly complex organizations to make egocentric individuals work, communicate and consume. As the neoliberal theory holds that the actors are opportunistic, i.e. that they serve only their own interests, the more companies give a supposed autonomy to the actors the more they implement control and monitor systems. It is an elementary principle, the more the actor is supposed to be autonomous and searching for his own interest, the more the social structure is governed by very strict rules.

The undeniable progress in reducing the objective penibility at work was also accompanied by a regression. By reducing work time, as well as its constraints through the use of machines, the work content has been greatly intensified. To deliver a result quickly, ensuring fast performance became the contemporary denominators of work. We work less in time hours, but these worked hours are much more intense than in the past. It is very demanding and stressful, because the body, mind, and nerves are continuously under a high tension. The intensification of work has been further increased tenfold by new technologies which have multiplied the possibilities of access to networks, multitasking, hypermobility and therefore continuous solicitations, at any time. The result is the paradoxical feeling of lacking time and still being overloaded and unable to deliver work on time. This dual pressure is the source of tensions that can lead to a burnout, that is to say the sudden collapse of the employee’s energy.

Since the 1990s and the financialization of the economy, the production systems have turned to the achievement of performances objectively evaluated by profit. This led to the reduction of work to its contribution to the realization of a
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profit. Reporting systems, control and management standards have increasingly abstracted the material reality of human activity in companies, detecting only one’s participation in the creation of value in terms of financial profits. The content of work has become less important than the financial results it produces. Thus, its anthropological dimension went by the wayside. The fact that any work is carried by a subject, a human being who by working produces himself - as a craftsman realizes and asserts himself by making his object – is ignored and discarded. The more work is made invisible, the more people are demotivated.\(^{16}\) Furthermore, the control system inhibits the capacities of action and creativity. The more the control is tight, the more people will exercise their talents elsewhere. And the more they exert their talents elsewhere, the more the company is under pressure, so the more it increases the control. It is a vicious circle. It ends up in doing the minimum possible and wealth is created elsewhere. Thus, value creation can escape now because people do elsewhere what they are prevented from doing in their job.\(^{17}\)

Of course, if a greater consideration of the individual at work is desirable, it would be naive to be indignant that a company thinks and acts according to financial and utilitarian goals. Managers are bound to reason from this perspective. They have to fill tables and reports, to achieve objectives and performance. Personally, many of them care as much as they can for their employees, but they are always in a rush and lack of time. The reality is that the manager has to control and operate the machine - the control system. This is not only negative, as a world without control would not liberate creativity either. In fact, creativity is prompted by external constraints, i.e. it unfolds in a context of necessities. When one disposes of unlimited possibilities and resources, he/she needs not to be creative.\(^{18}\) However, between the need to supervise and the current financial bureaucracy, there is a balance to be found. The most unhappy with this situation are often the managers themselves, who do not feel that they do their job while constantly chasing new organizations, new meetings, without having time to effectively manage, that is to say, encourage, assist and support the teams, etc.\(^{19}\)

MacDonald provides a psychological explanation of the micromanagement phenomenon. According to him micromanagement “is a popular management tool because it appeals to both the self-doubting and self-centered manager. The weak manager is filled with insecurities and paranoia. Their worst fear is that if the job is not done right, they will be blamed […] Concerned with their lack of ability, weak-willed managers also want to make sure they get the credit if the job goes well. This feeling and attitude causes the insecure manager to constantly hover over and interfere with those tasked with the actual work. On the other hand, the self-centered (should I say egoistical?) managers have this belief that they are the only ones with

\(^{16}\) Gomez, Yves-Pierre (2014).
\(^{17}\) Ibid.
\(^{19}\) Gomez, Yves-Pierre (2014).
the knowledge and ability to actually do the job right. They do not trust others to do the job so they believe they must constantly be knee-deep in the efforts of others or the job will not get done; at least not the way they would do it. It is possible to sympathize with these managers because the truth is that if the job is not completed properly and the results are unsatisfactory, they will be deemed responsible, placing their future and even their job on the line. You can understand the feeling that if they are going to be blamed for something, they want to be in total control. But it is not possible to condone the use of micromanagement as a way to diminish this risk. In fact, micromanaging the process increases the risk of failure [...]With scant argument to the contrary, there is agreement that micromanaging is inefficient, that it suppresses creativity, suffocates alternative options, discourages the development of talent, makes for frustrated and dissatisfied employees and is often counterproductive to what the manager seeks to achieve.²⁰ And yet, it continues to flourish.

4. Productivism against Creativity

Scientist Peter Higgs, who gave his name to the Higgs boson in 1964, believes that no university would hire him today because of high productivity criteria. It takes time to stimulate discoveries, he said. So, does productivity undermine creativity? Is their coexistence possible?

“Creativity takes time, requiring people to struggle down several blind alleys before finding the right solution. That’s why a lot of creative activity may look suspiciously like loafing around until a breakthrough happens. [...] Managers also need to provide some flexibility for employees to alter their schedules when an interesting idea begins to develop. And they need to reward employees for engaging in tasks that ultimately lead to creative solutions, like learning new things, developing new skills, having wide-ranging conversations with colleagues, and trying out ideas that don’t work.”²¹ If the schedule is overcharged it is difficult to make room for new ideas, and there is no time to further those already found. If the work schedule offers no opportunity to take breaks for reflection, creativity will be seriously compromised. The ability to generate new ideas is greater when a time off is granted to our brain to „unhook“. Breaks can lead to new ideas because they give space to direct the thoughts elsewhere. Creativity cannot arise if one is not the master of his/her own time. While it is true that appointments, meetings, conferences and other events can produce various stimulating experiences for creativity, giving them most of the agenda produces the opposite.²²

²⁰ MacDonald, Bob (2013).
Various studies have shown that the “creative stress” stands only for a part of the creative process, which starts with something almost invisible, but not less important: the slow rise of intuition which itself requires the opposite of stress, relaxation, calm, “letting go”.\textsuperscript{23} The visible creative product is preceded by a huge invisible, unpredictable, uncertain and apparently ineffective process. Some authors emphasize that creativity requires a way of being which is incompatible with stress.\textsuperscript{24} Judee Gee affirms that “to develop our creative intuition, we must first learn to do nothing! This doesn’t mean that we fall asleep, as creativity requires an intense, but relaxed presence. It means that we should give ourselves spaces of complete idleness [...] And as individuals are so different, everyone has to find the “tonus/letting“ dosage that matches him/her best.”\textsuperscript{25} Although the creative process triggers the hormones of pleasure, mainly endorphin and oxytocin, it is still stressful because much energy is mobilized which causes general fatigue of the organism.\textsuperscript{26} Therefore, the alternation of periods of intense work and those of rest are necessary. The creative individuals have an uncommon work energy, but they are often calm and at rest too. They are not hyperactive, always busy and productive. In fact, they often pause and sleep a lot.\textsuperscript{27} So, the usual organizational pressure to be perpetually and evenly creative (as well as motivated) is simply unreasonable and untenable.

Psychologists Wallach and Kogan\textsuperscript{28} advocated that the creativity tests, unlike the intelligence tests, should be assigned with no time restrictions. Their research showed that stereotypical, common answers are readily available while the original answers are not so quickly available due to a longer latency period. In the beginning of the testing both creative and less creative subjects provide common, usual answers. Furthermore, the rhythm of association of the less creative persons is faster than the one of the creative persons. The original responses occur later and in increasing numbers. If there is a time restriction, less creative subjects give a greater number of answers, because of the shorter response latency. When examining the correlations between intelligence and creativity, Boersma and O’Brien have also shown that creativity and intelligence diverge increasingly as two separate cognitive dimensions when the tests of creativity are assigned in an informal and relaxed atmosphere.\textsuperscript{29} Vernon also found that the

\textsuperscript{24} Cabana, Guy (2009): Soulevez des montagnes, Quèbecor, Montréal.
\textsuperscript{25} Gee, Judee (2010): Comment développer votre intuition, Trajectoire, Paris, 32.
\textsuperscript{27} Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi (2006), 81.
\textsuperscript{29} Boersma J. Frederic, O. Brian Kenneth (1968): “An investigation of the relationship between creativity and intelligence under two conditions of testing”, Journal of Personality,
results obtained in the creativity tests which were done in more relaxed, informal and relatively untimed, i.e. game-like conditions had a much richer psychological meaning than those obtained in usual test conditions.\(^{30}\)

As Csikszentmihalyi discovered, creative individuals work harder and persevere more than other people. Even when they do not seem to work, they actually work as they observe, gather information, muse, think and dream. They need periods of tranquility, loneliness and retreat. Their energy is under their control and not under the control of a clock, calendar or an externally imposed timetable. When it is necessary, they have the concentration of a laser, and the rest of time they gather new energy. All the creators interviewed by Csikszentmihalyi have confirmed that this alternation between work and relaxation is crucial for the success of their enterprise.\(^{31}\) But one of the things that the employees are often suspected of from their employers and managers is that they do not work enough in terms of hours. The X or micromanagers are more focused on the quantity then on the content and quality of the work.

In short, it seems that to work creatively very much and quickly is a contradictory expectation, and that a formal and rigorous management obsessed by control and productivity is antagonistic to creativity.

5. The Difference Between Creativity and Innovation

One of the indicators that the real nature of creativity is misunderstood lies in its identification with innovation. The two are closely related, but not identical, as creativity is the source of innovation. The importance of creativity in the innovation process has been significant in recent years. The literature on innovation management sheds light on the involvement of the creative process in an innovation process.\(^{32}\) Amabile points out that the creative process in the individual or organizational context should be treated as the first step of innovation. According to her, creativity of individuals and groups is used as raw sources for innovation.\(^{33}\) For Cook a successful innovation product or service depends on creativity. Creativity is a process based on individual and organizational skills


\(^{31}\) Csikszentmihalyi, Mihayli (2006).


which play an important role in innovation. Cummings believes that the mechanisms of development of new ideas are the main supports of innovation in the whole organization. Quality and creativity remain the milestones in the process of organizational innovation, as the quality and reliability of new ideas are the source of innovation value.

There is a bias harmful to understanding creativity as researchers and practitioners believe that it should be both constructive and profitable and problem-solving. Consequently, new ideas which do not solve problems are not called innovations and they are usually discarded because they are considered errors. The authors usually take a functionalist approach by seeking to answer the question “how to increase creativity?” Thus the studies do not tend to analyze the creative process as such, but to discover how companies can improve their ability to be creative and innovative, i.e. by valuating teleological definitions. However, when creativity is not considered in theory and when it is reduced to the innovation process in practice, the impetus and meaning of the innovation process as a whole is lost. Only after having allowed the emergence of creative ideas, the criteria of usefulness, value creation and economic feasibility are used to select the idea which will become an innovation. This does not mean that the creative process should not lead to a useful production, but that if the organizations want to get more usefulness, they must devote more attention and time to the process of emergence of ideas. The selection of ideas which are evaluated as the most useful and profitable is the second phase. Thus the real challenge is first to take a step back from the search of utility and economic profitability inherent in any innovation in order to enable the development of creativity. Creativity corresponds to a specific nature - different from innovation - which needs to be respected if the organizations want to improve their innovation processes.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of the above considerations we may conclude that “managing creativity” is almost an oxymoron. We have seen that while the environmental factors which foster and promote creativity can be managed, it is not the case with creativity *per se*. The roots of creativity are deeply personal, reaching into the realm of the unconscious and engaging some subtle, dynamic, elusive and immeasurable variables. Creativity is always associated with the specific qualities of each individual. The concept of group creativity does not refute this claim, since it relies on individual contributions, which are encouraged and enriched by mutual processes of stimulation, inspiration and motivation. In other words, the creative subject is not collective, but individual, and the group or team is one of the factors which contribute to the stimulation, improvement and selection of the best creative ideas. In her Componential Theory of Creativity, Teresa Amabile\(^{40}\) states that the creativity of individuals is the essential source of innovation, while the social environment influences creativity by influencing the individual components. As creativity is based on the individual’s intrinsic motivation, his/her domain expertise and psychology, all managerial actions advised to promote the creativity of the group or organization are incentives to give more opportunities for individual expression. If they are truly committed to creativity, organizations should provide conditions favorable to individual creativity, among which are more space, time and autonomy to the employees who are expected to work on creative tasks. Individual creativity can become an innovation only under specific conditions, that is, when creative expression is permitted and encouraged, and when the support to the development of creative ideas is accompanied by adequate resources and strong incentives to intrinsic motivation. This implies an organizational climate of openness and trust instead of rigid control. However, trust, flexibility and openness are fraught with risks that managers do not dare to take in today’s business environment.

\(^{40}\) Amabile, M. Teresa (1997).
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PROTIVREČNOST
IZMEĐU NAGLAŠAVANJA KREATIVNOSTI U TEORIJI
I NJENOG GUŠENJA U PRAKSI

Reč “kreativnost”, poput drugih često korišćenih reči, rizikuje da postane neodređena banalnost ili slogan ispražnjen od svog pojmovnog određenja. Znanje i razumevanje fenomena kreativnosti nije proporcionalno onome koliko se on danas afirmiše i promoviše. To je naročito uočljivo u radnim organizacijama svih vrsta. Pored subjektivnih faktora kao što je površno ili neodgovarajuće znanje poslodavaca i rukovodioca o tome šta kreativnost zaista jeste, postoje i objektivni faktori koji pritiskaju i ometaju kreativne impulse i procese. Ekonomski, finansijski i tržišni imperativi, kratkoročni ciljevi i tesni rokovi, ubrzavanje radnih procesa, racionalizacija, produktivizam, sveobuhvatni kvantitativizam (uzimanje u obzir samo merljivih parametara i rezultata), preterana regulativa, sistemi tesne kontrole i slično doprinose organizacionom dizajnu koji razara kreativnost. Određena prilično raširena menadžerska praksa i ponašanje, posebno tzv. intruzivni ili mikromenadžment, često je reakcija na ta ograničenja. Što se tiče zaposlenih, oni internalizuju te pritiske i pretvaraju ih u snažne unutrašnje imperative (sve većih) postignuća. Nametnuti standard konstantno visokog nivoa motivacije, izvrsnosti i samopoboljšanja neodrživ je na duži rok. Rukovodeći princip postizanja sve više i sve bolje za sve manje (vremena, sredstava, energije...) vodi iscrpljivanju mentalnih i drugih psihičkih resursa potrebnih za nastanak i razvoj kreativnih ideja. Kreativnost uključuje složene, tanane i dinamične psihosocijalne mehanizme. Menadžerska praksa i organizaciona kultura prečesto ugrožavaju dobro poznat najmoćniji izvor kreativnosti: intrinzičnu (unutrašnju) motivaciju. Ukratko, ovaj članak se bavi paradoksom prisutnim u činjenici da se, u teoriji, kreativnost i inovacija toliko ističu kao neophodni aduti, dok se u isto vreme, u praksi, toliko radi na tome da se one uguše.

Ključne reči: kreativnost, inovacija, intrinzična motivacija, mikromenadžment, organizacija.