
The creativity researchers who wrote this chapter were educational psychologists at the University of Georgia at the time of this book's publishing, in the late 1980's. Their research interest was quite practical for such a theoretical book and relevant to my topic: How can creative persons better manage their time to accomplish more of their creative goals? They don't state that question explicitly, but the chapter content implies it. Drawing on computer science literature available at that time, the researchers propose a solution to help creative persons work more efficiently. They suggest that creative persons adopt a multi-component "mental-time management system" to stay on track to achieve important goals. The chapter mostly discusses the details of this mental-time management system, identifying and explaining the function of its components, and emphasizing special properties of time management that are especially useful for creatives. The article is light on references due to lack of prior scientific research, and the conclusion mostly calls for further research rather than stating limitations of their model based on existing creativity research.

I found it interesting that the authors intentionally use the term "intellectual productivity" in place of the word "creative." They say the word itself is "debased" and this term is what they have in mind. I surmise that from their understanding of creativity, and in accordance with their definitions of terms set in the introduction, they would agree that a "creative" [as a noun] is: 1) an intellectually productive person, and 2) one who works to produce useful new ideas. Regarding their basis for their proposed time-management mind machine, they seem to think the mind is like a machine: it's a limited resource, as they describe it, that produces high-quality mental products; and creatives must manage it effectively, they believe, to complete the creative goals they want to achieve (p. 429). The benchmark of success, they say, is when the mind produces the largest number of high quality intellectual products in the shortest time; and the risk of
failure is that forces beyond one's control—both internal and external—will continue to determine the work that gets done (p. 430).

The basic conceptual scheme for their model of mental time-management appears in the following diagram (p. 430). It shows that goal manager, task planner, and schedulers are the three main components of the system. The article elaborates on each.

Figure 1. Top-level components of a mental time management system.

Dr. Bronowski opens his remarks at the conference by posing the question: "What prompts men to make something which seems beautiful, to them or to others?" (3). He says that although his background is that of mathematician, his approach to aesthetics and scientific thought is the same: it is active. He says the question is rational and deserves a rational answer; and his conviction is that art and science are normal activities of human life. He proceeds to distinguish man from animal, tracing back to early cave paintings, noting that two-steps of evolution have liberated mankind: 1) humans' ability to remember what is out of sight, and our ability to speak--to become familiar with what is absent. Thus, "Beauty," he says, "is the by-product of interest and pleasure in the choice of action" and his central aesthetic is the liberty evolution has allowed mankind" (5).

Bronowski then turns to science. He says that it too--like early human creations--is "an attempt to control our surroundings by entering into them and understanding them from the inside . . . and like [early human creations] science has . . . made a critical step in human development which cannot be reversed" (5). Three words describe such changes: discovery, invention, and creation; and he distinguishes between them. A discovery is a groundbreaking achievement, but it is not personal enough to call a creation. Someone else would have made the discovery if the famous person had not. A creation such as Shakespeare's *Othello*, however, "remains profoundly personal," he says; no one other than Shakespeare would have written exactly that, even though Elizabethan drama would have gone on. This leads him back to science, wondering, can a scientific theory be considered a creation? The idea is absurd to non-scientists, he says, but he proceeds to argue for the rest of the chapter that scientists and artists, and their respective domains, are similar because the act of creation for each is the same" (14), as well as their roles in society, their common focus on relationships, arrangements, structure, shape, and search for unity [over facts and numbers]. He even shows how progress in the domains coincided in ancient Greece and during the Renaissance.
"A man becomes creative, whether he is an artist or a scientist, when finds a new unity in the variety of nature," (12).

While reading his comparison of artists and scientists, I wondered: What is difference between sciences and the arts in regard to creativity? I quote his answer: The difference "lies not in the process of creation, but in the nature of the match between the created work and your own act of recreation in appreciating it." In art, you don't recreate exactly a form--like you would a theory or experiment--instead you "explore your own experience; you learn; you live; you expand inside" (14).
Chong, Mark. "How Do Advertising Creative Directors Perceive Research?"

This qualitative research study explores tension between advertising creatives and researchers. It’s clear that these groups are different. Their career paths differ; they don’t communicate much; and while creatives want to immediately apply the results of newfound research, academics are accustomed to slowly acquire cumulative knowledge in order to advance theories. With these differences, it is no surprise that they do not agree about the value of research, the author seems to think. The only creative practitioners who seem to apply a theoretical framework to their work are copywriters. Their two-step process involves breaking through clutter to attract the consumer’s interest, and then delivering the sales message (365).

Since copywriters have been studied before on this topic, Chong decided to seek input about the value of research from creative directors. In thirty minute interviews with seventeen creative directors from international agencies located in Singapore, Chong searched for answers to two questions: (1) How do advertising agency creative directors perceive advertising research? (2) How can research be made more relevant to advertising agency creative directors?

Chong coded and transcribed the interviews, then analyzed the samples. He found that creative directors “focused more on the problems associated with advertising research and not on its benefits, advantages, or opportunities” (368). They especially disliked focus groups as a way to understand consumers, felt research is too slow or late to be useful, “lamented that advertising research is often conducted in non-contextual fashion” [i.e., in laboratories away from the real world], and some even suggested research is a means for managers to cover up bad decisions. Creative directors seemed to only like target market research and post-campaign research evaluating the effectiveness of a campaign (373, 370).

Because Chong believes research has a place in advertising, he suggests that researchers focus on “providing fresh consumer insights and product ‘truths’ rather than on testing advertising ideas” in order to be more relevant outside their academic bubble.
Researchers should also do more “contextual” research, intern at agencies to gain real experience, and learn to write without academic jargon” (375-376).

Chapter 14, "Enhancing Personal Creativity" (pp. 343-372) and the Chapter Notes for the book (pp. 399-428) nail two of the areas covered by my research topic: how to increase production and quality of creative work and how to limit stagnation. Chapter 14 explains that a healthy amount of "psychic energy" is crucial for a person to have within them in order to lead a creative life. It's like mental fuel for creative work. The good news is that everyone is able to acquire this energy, but the problem is that certain obstacles prevent many people from storing and using the necessary amount of psychic energy to get their flow on.

The four common obstacles, the author says, are mental exhaustion, lack of focus, laziness, and uncertainty about how to use psychic energy stored up (344). Csikszentmihalyi says the solution to all these obstacles is for us to resist our human biological urge to pursue predictable goals; and instead, we should engross ourselves in the world around us, exploring it as though we were adventurers in unknown lands.

In the rest of the chapter, the author identifies and discusses four major steps a person can take to encourage more extensive creative freedom and psychic release:
1. Cultivate curiosity and interests in things that naturally draw our attention as an end in themselves--i.e., even when there's no 'purpose' to be so focused on whatever it is. Surprise and follow-through are key subtopics:
   a) Try to find something surprising every day,
   b) Try to surprise at least one person every day,
   c) Write down what was so surprising each evening, and
   d) Follow each and every spark of interest that strikes
2. Cultivate flow in everyday life
3. Once creative energy is found, carefully guard it
4. Internalize into our personalities the structures that promote good psychic energy and release.

The author, a young journalist with a degree from UNC Asheville, documents the daily working habits of 164 creative heavyweights who lived during the last 400 years. The book is laid out as a list, with each artist's name serving as a headline, followed by a written entry. The entries are straightforward and informative, providing the daily schedule and work routine of each artist, specifying when on a typical day the person was most productive at his or her craft, and detailing any individual habits or rituals the artist used during the creative process.

The term 'artist', as used in this book, is not limited to 'fine artist' or 'visual artist'. It's more inclusive and means, in practice, something similar to 'creative professional': the creative persons covered in this book include writers, composers, painters, choreographers, playwrights, poets, philosophers, sculptors, filmmakers, and scientists.

Overall, I think the book demonstrates the strength of the word "professional" in the term "professional creatives." Many on this list are known historically for their great creative successes and brilliant achievements, yet the irony and--in a sense--lesson from the book is that their work ethic was like that of many other jobs requiring dedication: much humdrum day-in, day-out work, much of which was typically mediocre (as several of the artists admitted). Yet its that very description of all their humdrum work ethic that also fuels inspiration: It takes a lot of hard work and mediocre results to every now and then break through creatively, as all creative persons in this book proved.

This book is a great resource for my paper because it provides many creative profiles who can help characterize and illustrate the discussion of managing creative persons (including oneself); and also, due to the extensive historical and biographical research that factually supports each entry, this book maintains academic integrity and does not fall into the lackluster "celebration-of-great-creatives" genre. The 29 pages of source notes, all cited for other researchers, is a good reference as well if I want to read more about the creative process of a particular person.

The book presents the reader with a made-up word: "Po." Then, through eight chapters, the author defines the word, attributes characteristics to the term, discusses ways that the word is favorable and unfavorable to the public at large and certain groups; he also describes the sorts of groups who will ignore or oppose what it stands for, and groups that will embrace it. While at first the book seems bizarre, after reading into it some more, it becomes clear that the content is theoretically grounded in psychological and creativity research theories, but disguising the science under the veil of what seems like an unusual, albeit engaging philosophy.

As it turns out, the author is very prestigious. The term mentioned in this book, "lateral thinking," was his original term. According to his website <http://edwdebono.com/biograph.htm> De Bono is a Rhodes scholar with honors degrees in psychology and physiology, a D.Phil in Medicine, a Ph.D. from Cambridge and a MD from University of Malta, where he is from. His work, based on his website's description, is future-oriented, focused on "creative and constructive" thinking fit for a changed world where traditional thought (analysis driven) is not always applicable anymore.

De Bono's work is not completely praised, however. I came across his name elsewhere in my research, on pages 24 and 25 in the first chapter of Sharon Bailin's "Achieving Extraordinary Ends: An Essay on Creativity." Her chapter is called "Originality," and she mentions De Bono in the part on "Problem-Solving and Originality in Everyday Life." She basically says the types of problems he poses for others to solve (there are some in the last chapter of Po) do not require the participant to use originality. "There is a right answer to each of these sorts of problems," she says, "a previously established and accepted solution . . . thus the modes of solution are not new, and there cannot be originality in a situation where the problem-solving activity exhibits no novelty. [...] The act of solving one of De Bono's trick closed problems does not, itself, exhibit originality" (25). Bailin also says real-life problems are open-ended; his are the opposite of that (25).

I read this article to gain insight from an educational psychologist about creative persons’ understanding or misunderstanding of themselves, and to investigate the extent to which one’s self-awareness affects creative work.

Dowd says, “True creativity is invention, or the process of making something new” (233). It cannot be mental activity alone; something must get produced. Yet creativity cannot be mere production either. Whatever get produced must be “new” in the sense that the products are “truly original and break new ground, even though they build to some extent on previous activity” (233). If the products only vary what exists, they are not creative. They are mere innovations.

Another key term discussed is “self.” Dowd identifies three aspects of the self: unity, consistency, and self-reflection. He acknowledges the debate about whether or not creative persons are more neurotic than others, but he doesn’t take a position. He notes that prior literature showed a lack of relationship between self-esteem and creativity (235-36). Self-actualization and its relation to creativity is not given much consideration, but Dowd seems receptive to research findings that show creative persons have an internal [rather than external] locus of control. Creative persons believe they are largely in control of how events turn out, in other words. Traits such as self-contained, self-oriented, flexible, and original are associated with an internal locus of control; and those traits also appear in literature describing creative qualities (236).

Evidence also indicates that creative persons are intrinsically motivated, more open to inner experience [for males, open to “theoretical and aesthetic experiences” and for females, open to “inner experiences and sensation seeking”], potentially more complex thinkers than the norm, and—true to stereotype--autonomous and independent (238). Divergent thinking is characteristic of creative persons too, which requires three mental allowances: 1) tolerance of ambiguity, 2) holding contradictory ideas, and 3) accepting new ideas and willingness to modify prior constructs [236-37].
The conclusion offers tips to foster creativity in oneself and others: Reduce authoritarian direction, especially with children; avoid premature evaluation (brainstorming can help here); train in paradoxical thinking to heighten tolerance for ambiguity and divergence; ask “What if?” Allow occasional rule breaking; increase failure rate; use humor; meditate to reduce if-then thinking and to heighten circular thinking; engage in “appropriate” leisure activities [i.e., exploratory, divergent, creative activities rather than problem-solving, goal-directed, convergent activities] (240-41).

This article reviews trends in creative research by exploring three questions: (1) what do we know about advertising creativity? (2) How can we measure it? (3) How can we enhance and encourage it? The first and third questions interest me in regard to my research topic.

We know that most researchers agree that originality is not enough to deem something creative. There must be a combination of novelty and appropriateness, or usefulness. We also know that advertising and marketing creatives and managers have different opinions about the role and importance of creativity. Managers value effectiveness, marked by changed attitudes and market sales, whereas creative teams and individuals tend to see advertising as a means to showcase their own skills and aesthetics to promote their careers, according to Hirschman's research, cited in their literature review.

They differentiate between creative work in advertising and creative work in the arts, but they find the process involved in both to relate. Unlike the arts, the objectives in advertising are set by others, and the work can still be successful even if it fails aesthetically to please the audience. But the work must get noticed and have an effect to be successful. In terms of process, advertising creativity and creativity in other fields share these attribute: goal attainment, problem solving, and effort to combine previously unrelated things.

The literature review identifies three primary theories of creativity: (1) Primary Process Cognition, which enables creatives to switch adeptly between mental modes; (2) Defocused Attention, which enables creatives to make unusual combinations due to retaining many thoughts in mind; and (3) Associative Hierarchies, based on Mednick, which says creativity is an associative process—the "ability or tendency . . . to bring otherwise mutually remote ideas into contiguity [to] facilitate a creative solution." They point out that all these theories emphasize associative ability as a major component of creative ability. Even a somewhat
outsider fourth theory, Sternberg and Lubart’s "Investment Theory of Creativity," makes use of associative ability.

The authors merge ideas from their literature review to form three suggestions for managers on how to foster creativity at work: (1) encourage employees to take creative risks by providing their staff with a conducive work environment and "that nurtures their creative potential" (Cummings and Oldham, 1997, p. 35)--for example, a social environment that encourages positive interactions (Brower, 2000). (2) "Be supportive and non-controlling (Cummings and Oldham, 1997) and show creative staff 'sympathetic understanding' while at the same time giving specific, agreed guidelines and clear boundaries that staff understand and appreciate (Fletcher, 1990)." (3) Promote teamwork for healthy diversity.
In response to the Harvard Business Review article "Seven Rules for Managing Creative Types," which Rae Ann Fera disliked, the columnist interviewed two creative managers from the advertising agency Crispin Porter + Bogusky to hear their ideas on how to manage creative talent. The managers were Evan Fry, executive director of creative development, and Dave Swartz, creative director. Here I list the ten ideas and paraphrase the discussion which followed each one:

1) “Set the bar.” First figure out exactly what talent is present in regard to skills and temperament. Ask two questions: "What kind of team do we need here [?] What works well for the individual agency process that we have?”

2) “Identify and leverage traits of individuals.” Put down on paper skills and traits of everyone, objectively noting their abilities at present. This is important in order to "optimize strengths by assembling the right skills and talents for projects.”

3) “Cater to strengths.” Know how each creative produces his or her best work, and how they respond in certain environments. Some creatives need more room to explore; others need competition. A mix-up can cause setbacks for anyone.

4) “Keep your hands dirty.” Lead by example. In addition to mentoring, managing talent, carrying out the duties as a department head, creative managers must demonstrate to the creative team they are capable of performing duties like pitching to clients and setting the tone. It creates respect.

5) “Suggest—but don’t necessarily impose—a process.” Try to keep away all sorts of worries for the creative so they can work with a clear mind. Something as simple as putting up a calendar to keep them on track can help. Don’t force a certain method.

6) “Create healthy confusion.” Keep enough projects going at once so the creatives’ minds can take a break from one task and move on to another task, before coming back. It aids the incubation process of ideation.

7) “Encourage switching off to switch on.” This idea is somewhat specific to how Crispin+Porter operates the ship: they believe in working hard, long hours during the
week, but giving time when possible for employees on the weekend. They don’t want pressure to be so great that employees burn out.

8) “Keep [creatives] producing.” The reason behind this idea is especially relevant for my topic, which considers the lifestyle of a creative person and their overall well-being. As way to explain the creative managers’ idea for fostering talent, the columnist writes: “Creative talent lives to make stuff. When they’re not making things, they get unhappy, prone to relocate, or worse, creatively uninspired.” The simple statement sheds light on a relationship between creative output and the welfare of a creative person. That is noteworthy.

9) “Make retention a conscious choice.” Maintaining a healthy culture, they believe, is what keeps talent around. [Side note: I learned some industry lingo here; a “boomerang” employee is one who leaves and then comes back.]

10) “Know when to—and be able to—speak the tough truth.” Good mentorship can mean saying what’s hard for the creative to hear sometimes, but it’s with good intention.

This book is the companion to the four-part PBS television series in 1992 by the same name as title, "The Creative Spirit." The authors are all well credentialed. According to endnotes, Goleman is a psychologist who writes about behavioral science for the New York Times, taught psychology at Harvard, and had won a Lifetime Achievement Award from the American Psychological Association. Kaufman was the creator, writer, and senior producer of the TV series, explored the subject of creativity as Visiting Research Associate at Harvard University's Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts and a Senior Research Associate at Stanford University. And Michael Ray, at the time of this writing, held the McCoy-Banc chair of Creativity and Innovation at Stanford's Graduate School of Business.

The idea of the book is that the creative spirit--the "breath of life" from which creative work is born--is within each person, and it's up to the individual to bring that out: "If you're looking to find the creative spirit somewhere outside of yourself," Kaufman writes, "you're looking in the wrong place" (9). So the four chapters deal with aspects of this theme. The chapters are: Inside Creativity, Creativity in Children, Creativity at Work, and Creating Community; but for my purposes, I focus on the first and third. The insights and advice are more relevant to the target audience of my research: adult, professional creatives.

The book helps breakdown some concepts. For example: It says there are five stages of creative process: preparation, frustration, incubation, illumination, translation (18-23); Three basic ingredients of creativity: 1) expertise in specific area: domain skills; 2) creative thinking skills: imagining diverse range of possibilities, persistence with problem, high standards, traits associated with independent person: taking risks, courage to try something new; 3) passion, “intrinsic motivation” (pages 29-30); and four great tools to develop one’s own creativity: 1) Faith in one’s own creativity, 2) absence of judgment, 3) precise observation, 4) penetrating questions [65].

Other helpful tips in the book include the recommendation to talk later with someone about the moment that one had a creative experience or breakthrough. Talking
about it taps into that inner voice and makes one more aware of his or her creative process. Also, stay playful (page 38). Why? According to research, “groups that laugh most readily and most often (within limits—you can’t goof off entirely—are more creative and productive than their more dour and decorous counterparts” (38).
According to the information about the author alongside the article, Keil was very familiar with advertising creativity. At the time of this writing he was Senior Vice President, Member of the Board of Directors, Chairman of the Creative Directors’ Committee and Creative Director at Dancer-Fitzgerald-Sample, Inc., New York. I trust his opinion on the topic under discussion. Keil wrote this article for young persons entering the world of work. Keil was concerned that many future workers in the business sector had not received much, if any, education about how to judge creativity. He thinks that is bad for the creative industry as well as students. If they are ever asked for an opinion about a creative advertisement, he says, they will basically dodge the question or make up some nonsense or jargon in effort to avoid providing an answer, all because they have not developed the ability to evaluate creative work.

The good news is that Keil believes the ability to judge creativity can be acquired; it’s not only for the few blessed with natural instinct at such a task. So the answer to the article’s title question is “Yes.” Keil then lists ten rules to use when judging:

1. Make sure that the advertising adheres to and follows the creative strategy.
2. Make sure the advertising is directed to the right audience.
3. Make sure that the advertising is single-minded. “If you are shown advertising with a laundry list of product points—be wary” he says, “The public seldom remembers laundry lists.”
4. Know what the creative people have in mind. [This rule applies more to marketing people; he means that they should know that the layout is only a mock-up, and it’s the marketer’s duty to know what the final work should look like.]
5. Make sure the advertising technique doesn’t overpower the message.
6. Separate your personal prejudices from your judgment decisions (including personal tastes).
7. Make sure the advertising does not attempt to change the product image.
8. Have Faith. “Nowhere in this piece have I indicated that a technique used or executonal style should be part of your creative judgment. It shouldn’t. That’s their job.”
I think that this article is a good practical guide for creative persons hoping to develop their own criterion for judging work.
I read this creativity research study to learn more about improvisation techniques, and to get a better sense from the data and findings if improvisation is a practical way for persons to increase their creativity. Enhancing creativity and developing new skills are part of my research topic. The first section of the study gives a brief summary of the four conceptual components of creativity through which researchers engage the subject: creative product, creative environment (or "press"), the creative person, and creative process. This information resembles what is written in several other studies, with the exception of a "fifth element" to creativity research, which the researcher adds to the list. The added creative concept is "purpose." The author says that purpose, as used in this context, "involves the interests and passions that motivate individuals to pursue endeavors" (p. 27).

The author asks three questions, and then proceeds to the qualitative research and discussion in search of their answers: (1) "What are the elements of improvisation that enhance innovative, creative thinking across domains, interests, and ages?" (2) "Are there some heuristics that can facilitate creative thinking regardless of the field of interest?" (3) How can creative tendencies be encouraged in all people?" [p. 27].

I think the data sampling was weak for a study claiming to be empirically based. The data consists of transcribed interviews with only seven individuals. While they all had experience at improvisation in different fields—a good thing for the research—they all "were known to the researcher" (p. 28). That’s not as good for research because bias could more easily have infiltrated the interviews. The sample size was also very small.

Despite minor qualms about data collection, I like the findings. The author identifies seven components of improvisation across a range of fields and then compares them to the four theoretical concepts of creativity research noted above, along with the new “purpose” concept. The results is an interesting parallel between improvisation and creativity, which helps support the idea that practicing improvisation can help one develop creative traits. The following list denotes the seven aspects of improvisation
identified by the research, and in parentheses following each one I note the creativity concept to which the author thinks it relates: communication (environment), teamwork (environment), risk (process), safety (person), honest emotion (product), self actualization (purpose), joy (purpose). The article discusses each of the relationships, and the discussion makes clear how each of these terms do seem to relate.

At the end of Thomas E. Dowd’s "The Self and Creativity: Several Constructs in Search of a Theory” [see bibliography], he mentioned meditation as one way to foster creativity. Since my topic concerns ways to manage creative lifestyles, I decided to pursue the meditation idea further. I wondered if there were any creative persons who meditate and discuss it in the context of aiding their creative work. Film director David Lynch turns out to be one such creative person, and he wrote this book which links meditation and the creative process.

The book itself is like a self-help book that consists of anecdotes, and somewhat resembles a shooting outline for a film. There are many sections of just around two pages each. The main message of the book, I think, is that transcendental meditation expands yours consciousness, making you happier in general and more creative in particular by helping you to find, grasp, and develop ideas more easily. Lynch encourages the reader to look at his own condition, his state of being, in order to discover ways to improve.

The fishing metaphor, referenced in the title, is the key link between the meditation and creativity. I understood it to mean that just as a fisherman on a boat casts his line with bait into the water to catch a big fish, the person doing transcendental meditation submerges himself with desire into his consciousness to catch ideas. He refers to that place in one’s soul as “the ocean of pure consciousness, the Unified Field—the Self” (48). He also says it’s familiar to people of all religious practices, whether they call it that or not.

I liked his other thoughts on creativity, and thought they related well to what some of the other texts said about creative persons and process. He talks generally of how creativity is less about relating things than discovering how things relate, and that creatives must be open to new ideas and willing to dismiss bad ideas—no matter how inconvenient. That sounds like divergent thinking. And what seemed somewhat surprising to me, given his creativity, is how disciplined he is. Lynch acknowledges this trait, saying that restrictions foster creativity (113).

This research paper gives insight into real-world knowledge that high-level creative professionals use in the performance of their advertising agency jobs. I think the research and discussion is useful for my paper's topic on managing a creative lifestyle because the information sheds light on the mentality of successful creative persons in an occupational environment.

The authors state that a knowledge gap exists between advertising 'academicians' (i.e., professors of advertising) and advertising practitioners (agency employees). They say that the issue has been discussed in many academic research papers on advertising, but the reason usually given for the knowledge gap is wrong. Academicians' inability to clearly explain their scientific research and share their information is not the cause. Instead, practitioners of advertising are to blame. The researchers hypothesize that practitioners are similar to academicians to the exist that they exist within a special sphere of "knowledge autonomy," from which information rarely leaves except by occasional role exchanges (such as an advertising practitioner becoming an educator, and vice-versa) or indirectly through intermediaries like journalists, workshops, and forums.

Nyilasy and Reid seek to understand this "knowledge autonomy" of advertising practitioners from the perspective of advertising practitioners themselves. The authors believe that the knowledge gained could enlighten academics and help bridge the gap between the opposing sides of the industry—academia and agency practice.

Their empirical research was qualitative. They interviewed many high-level agency professionals, analyzed the recorded interviews for key concepts, and researched theories to help explain advertising agency practitioners’ understanding of the advertising industry. The evidence from the data supported their hypothesis, and from their literature review they established that 3 related areas of "knowledge autonomy" exist in advertising, which guide practitioners on the job: 1) quasi-theoretical theories, 2) meta-theories, 3) pseudo-professionalization tactics. They focus on the first area in this paper and seek an answer to the question: "What is agency practitioners' quasi-theoretical knowledge of how advertising works?"
Managing a creative lifestyle could lead to managing a group of creative lifestyles as a creative leader in a work setting. To get a better sense of creative leadership, I read this article by Robert Pater, M.A., whom the article identifies as managing director of SSA/MoveSmart and author of *Leading From Within*.

Pater argues that “leadership is both a science and an art” (p. 37), and for an organizational leader to perform successfully, he or she must use and balance both forces.

What he calls 'art' in leadership is basically the ability to appropriate impulse. The positive side to this leadership ability shows up in actions: when a leader can discern "ever morphing subtleties of any scenario," choose the appropriate "science/method" amidst changing circumstances, and create and apply new direction where and when necessary, not after-the-fact. The downside of relying too heavily on artistic abilities can results in a leader being inconsistent, making "fuzzy or arbitrary" decisions, and coming across as unreliable. The scientific side of leadership, on the other hand, is more familiar to executives. Its focus is execution. That's obviously what an "executive" should do, but he says without the artistic, creative aspects of leadership to balance it, companies risk becoming "mechanistic", stiff, and dangerously unresponsive to changing conditions.

Pater offers six practical principles to develop effective, creative leadership: (1) Be courageously dissatisfied [Ask oneself: to what degree is your success because of what you do? And what degree is despite of what you do?]; (2) Lead in the present [always assess current situation before applying a tried-true method]; (3) Bring "different in" [meaning skills acquired in extra-professional pursuits]; (4) Maintain a piloting mode ["don't throw out what's really working, but carve out organizational spots to try contrary or unusual approaches" (38)]; (5) Re-channel mistakes [It's not true that creativity only comes from desperation; leaders must "embrace the stress of questioning and change, rather than only rehearsing past successes or adopting a 'good enough' mentality" (39)]; (6) Collaborate unconscientiously ["Wise leaders understand a tug exists between efficiency--making a list, working on it with no outside feedback, influences or suggested
modifications--and crafting new, practical approaches. So they carve a balance of time for both individual productivity and creative back-and-forth" (39)."

A creative individual of the sort I’m studying is often found in professional creative settings like advertising agencies; and in that sense, the agency is part of the person’s environment and therefore an influential component of his lifestyle. So I read this article to learn more about management and enhancement of creativity within an organizational setting.

Sasser and Koslow explain that two recent creative controversies among advertising researchers involve the value of management support and encouragement in agencies and the value of expertise in knowing the client’s business. They make two arguments: (1) “Support for agency creativity”—encouragement and workplace support—“amplifies the effect of passion on creativity rather than delivering an independent effect.” (2) The effect of expertise is moderated by the presence of organizational politics . . . “hence, high levels of organizational politics suppress the positive influence of expertise on creativity” (p. 6).

Then they form two hypotheses to test their claims: (1) A higher level of agency support enhances the positive influence of passion [i.e., intrinsic motivation] on advertising creativity; (2) The presence of organizational politics suppresses the positive influence of expertise on advertising creativity.

Upon their review of 1,188 advertising campaigns from major U.S. agencies, reported by 413 respondents, the researchers found support for hypothesis 1. Therefore, passion seems to have “an interaction with support in predicting creativity” and “when there is support for creativity [in an agency], the influence of passion on creativity almost doubles” (p. 11). As for the second hypothesis, the findings show that when organizational politics is low, expertise has a positive influence on advertising creativity; but when organizational politics is high, expertise has very little effect. The difference means hypothesis 2 is also supported.

“Passion changes everything,” they write in discussion. Of the four constructs studied, they found passion increases creativity most consistently and drives the strongest
effect after individual differences. Stifling passion would undermine both creativity and success, while supporting passion might lead to even more creativity, based on the results (p. 13). Their other key finding, which I find interesting, was that expertise might actually have a negative effect on creativity.

The authors of this report review prior research, literature, and theories that focus on creative personality. Their larger research interest is the study of creativity and its relation to problem-solving, which they seem to perceive as being the central component of creativity: they even use the term “problem-solving” interchangeably with the word “creativity” throughout the paper.

After reporting the findings of prior researchers—all of whom are psychologists—the authors present a newer way of looking at creative personality and problem solving. It is not their original idea, but it seems apparent from the way they discuss this construct that the idea is new to most readers. They call it “creative style research.” They are praiseworthy of this new way, and see it as a positive development not only for researchers studying creativity but also for instructors who teach creative disciplines and are on the lookout for talent, especially in students. Creative style research relates to traditional creative research in its study of how “affective traits or characteristics” of a creative person can “come into play during creative problem solving”, but it differs because it focuses “less at how much creativity an individual displays, but on how individuals use their creative skills in response to the conditions confronting them” (306). The shift in creative focus is important, especially for educators, because it opens them up to identifying talent in all students, not just the exceptionally talented.

Using the creative style guide, an instructor can place any student on one of four creative performance levels and more effectively teach toward their style. The levels are “not yet evident”, “emerging”, “expressing”, and “excelling” (310). The “not yet evident” creatives, the authors say, would benefit more from being exposed to foundational skills and instruction, aided by the teacher’s own use of such skills in a domain and pointing out how the skills could be used practically in other domains. “Emerging” creatives would most benefit by focusing on domain-specific skills and individual and small group work in that domain, learning to work with a particular audience in mind. “Expressing” creative learners have shown growing competence and skill and also exhibit a growing
passion that will aid them in higher-level work, and should be assigned to realistic, manageable problems with “low level of risk”. Lastly, the “excelling” creatives would gain the most from “opportunities to work with real, self-initiated and self-directed challenges, identifying and applying the skills, process, and tools they have studied to a variety of tasks both individually and with groups” (310).
Based on Simonton’s review of creativity research literature since 1950, I have a better understanding of the four main categories and key findings in the field. For reference sake, I have included this overview in my bibliography.

Four main areas of contemporary cognitive science have led to further understanding of the creative act: insightful problem solving, creative cognition, expertise acquisition, and computer simulation. Most striking in insightful problem solving is empirical research showing “intuitive information processing as a regular manifestation of the cognitive unconscious,” (152). Creative cognition considers creativity a mental phenomenon resulting from the application of ordinary cognitive processes, which opens the possibility of anyone experiencing creative thought. Expertise acquisition research shows that “exceptional talents are less born than made” (152). Computers hold promise for testing.

Empirical literature on personal characteristics of creatives shows two categories of research: intelligence and personality. Early research showed that a certain level of intelligence was required for personal creativity, but beyond that threshold, it did not matter much; later research ( Guilford, Sternberg, and Gardner) demanded that a “more complex, inclusive, and multi-dimensional conception” of intelligence was required, even some beyond the measure of standard psychometric tests. The creative personality research shows such persons are “disposed to be independent, noncomformist, unconventional, even bohemian . . . have wide interests, great openness to new experiences, a more conspicuous behavioral and cognitive flexibility, and more risk-taking boldness” (153). Research in this area supports a relationship between psychopathology and creativity, but does not show that all creative persons suffer from mental disorders.

Life span development is a creative research topic focused on the acquisition and actualization of creative potential. Acquisition research has studied family environments
and individual circumstances that have preceded creative acts, and both seem to show that “exceptional creativity does not always emerge from the most nurturing environments” (153); instead, diversifying and challenging experiences are more likely to foster creative growth. Nature and nurture are both involved, however. The actualization of creativity shows “the picture for creativity in the later years of life is optimistic rather than pessimistic” (154).

The fourth area of creativity research is the newest and has received much attention since the late 1970s. It concerns the social context of creativity: interpersonal environment, disciplinary environment, and sociocultural environment. Key findings in this area include the value of intrinsic motivation in creativity, neutral conclusions regarding brainstorming, the importance of discipline-oriented creativity, and the interaction of individual, field, and domain. Such findings show “creativity is a systemic rather than a totally individualistic phenomenon” (155). The sociocultural environment research on creativity has shown that political environments can affect a population’s level of creativity, and—according to one of this author’s own papers—that “nationalistic rebellion encourages cultural heterogeneity” (155).
Psychologist Robert J. Sternberg claims that creativity is the result of a set of attitudes held by an individual, and that any individual can choose to have such attitudes—meaning, in essence, anyone can be creative. Indeed, he says, “Creative giftedness is not a fixed trait, but a decision-making skill that can be developed.” According to his understanding, all that a person needs to be creative is the right mentality, and that mentality is not limited to a few persons with innate/God-given talent—it can be acquired by anyone upon making ten decisions.

In the article, Sternberg lists the ten decisions; and after each decision, he provides a teaching example (mostly anecdotes of psychology professors) and a teaching activity. It’s clear from these additions that that the main audience of the paper are creative teachers and researchers, and that the goal is to help students develop creatively.

I learned Sternberg recognizes his theory is different from the “traditional notion of creativity as a fixed ability” [he cites Guilford, 1968]. He sees creativity as a “modifiable ability” and “ability” as a “form of developing expertise…represent[ing] an interaction between genes and the environment.” He summarizes his theoretical position by stating: “Anyone can develop their abilities, at least to some extent, with broad limits set by genetic endowment.” With context in mind, here is Sternberg’s list of “ten decisions characteristics of people who decide for creativity”:

1) Redefine problems; 2) Analyze your own ideas; 3) Sell your ideas; 4) Knowledge is a double-edged sword” [Here he means, I think, recognize it’s not possible to be creative with insufficient knowledge, but too much knowledge can hinder creativity]; 5) Surmount obstacles [i.e., have the courage to overcome obstacles, to face opposition]; 6) Take sensible risks [i.e., resist temptation to give standard, safe solutions]; 7) Be willing to grow [i.e., don’t rest on laurels of former creative ideas]; 8) Believe in yourself; 9) Tolerate ambiguity; 10) Find what you love to do, and do it.

This book discusses practical strategic thinking that can help a person with creative tasks. The author went to art school for undergraduate, went into advertising as a creative, had some success, and then became a psychologist. The book fits my research needs: it gives psychological insight on creativity, describes important studies, and points out the key findings from each study that can help a person create better solutions to their problem. The target audience of this book is two-fold: 1) creative persons who are determined to pursue a career in one of several creative domains, and 2) professionals who study creativity, such as educators and psychologists.

The main idea of the book, as the title indicates, is that constraints promote creativity; they are creative tools. It is desirable to have a strong strategy at the start of creative work, strong enough to set limits on creative freedom in order to solve the problem at hand. According to the author’s conception, a creativity problem has three defining characteristics: (1) “the problem is ill-structured” [meaning it is not fully specified due to missing operators or missing goal state]; (2) “its solution depends on strategic specification of paired constraint;” (3) “the selected constraints structure the problem space to preclude (or limit search among) familiar, reliable responses and promote (or direct search among) novel, surprising ones” [p. 5].

I learned that there are four main constraints applicable to creative problem solving, based on Stokes’ problem-solving process: domain and cognitive constraints, which “limit the number of ways something can be done;” variability constraints, which “stipulate how differently something should or must be done,” and talent constraints. Stokes says variability (“how differently”) depends on how difficult it is to learn something. A difficult problem usually requires more approaches, and so it would be high-variability. As for talents, Stokes says those are “two-sided”, promoting and precluding interest and skill acquisition in different domains at the same time [p. 10].

The two other constraints, discussed later in the book, include task constraints specific to a given domain (which specify materials and conventions) and for masters, goal constraints. “Once mastery is reached, the path diverges. One fork leads to the
reliability of an expert; the other, to the unpredictability of the creator. For the [creator], influential creativity depends on the specification and realization of novel goal constraints that expand his or her domain” (p. 124).

Unsworth regrets that “most” creativity researchers have discussed creativity as though it were a homogeneous phenomenon, a unitary construct. He claims that a more accurate analysis of creativity shows that creativity consists of two dimensions, both related to an individual’s engagement in creative activity.

The first dimension is “drive” (or motivation). It is either “internal” or “external” and provides an answer for why a person is engaged in the creative activity. The objective manifestation of internal drive presents a volunteered solution; external drive, on the other hand, involves the demand for a required solution. The second dimension of creativity is “problem type.” This dimension is either “open” or “closed”, and it characterizes the nature of the problem to be solved and pinpoints what initially compelled the person to engage in the creative activity. An open problem means the problem is discovered; a closed problem is specified (291).

Based on these two dimensions, Unsworth develops a matrix of creativity. Each axis represents one dimension by which an individual engages the creative process. The x-axis is the driver; the y-axis is the problem-type. Due to the crossing axes, the matrix forms four regions with the following traits and names [starting with top-left region and moving clockwise]:

1) **Expected creativity**--external drive/open problem, required solution to a discovered problem; an example of expected creativity is creating artwork.

2) **Proactive creativity**--internal drive/open problem, volunteered solution to discovered problem; an example includes unprompted suggestions for solutions.

3) **Contributory creativity**--internal drive/closed problem, volunteered solution to specified problem; an example of contributory is contribution by a non-project member.

4) **Responsive creativity**--external drive/closed problem, required solution to specified problem; this type is most often studied, and is the form found in occupational creativity when a problem is assigned which requires creative persons to find a solution.

I found his summary of the differences in the processes rather insightful. Unsworth says, “Expected and proactive creativity involve scanning and defining
activities that are not included in responsive or contributory creativity and that are ignored in accounts of the creative process. Further, proactive and contributory creativity involve a selling component that is not found in response or expected creativity” (294).
What combination of factors can lead creatives at advertising agencies to continuously create award-winning work? To find an answer, the researchers collected and analyzed data from 68 Dutch agencies and their 1,450 clients over four years. Based on the data analysis and interpretation, the researchers identified a few key qualities that help predict if an agency will generate award-winning creative work over a long period of time. If these creative climate factors are present at an agency, the odds are good: high organizational encouragement, high workload pressure, low work group support, and low sufficient resources. The research also found a second predictor for creative award-winning output by an agency over time: the agency’s portfolio of clients. Agencies that do best include a portfolio of market leaders and operate within a limited amount of industries (limited heterogeneity) [page 121].

The report explains that two hypotheses were tested, the first having two components. H1a postulated that “the higher the ad agency’s score on organizational encouragement, supervisory encouragement, challenging work environment, work support, sufficient resources, and freedom dimensions, the higher [the agency’s] probability of winning awards” (page 124). The data analysis showed that only organizational encouragement had a positive effect on the agency winning creative awards; but challenging work environment and freedom dimensions had no significant effect; and work support and sufficient resources actually had a negative effect on the agency’s likelihood of winning creative awards (page 126).

Hypothesis 1b postulated: “The higher the ad agency’s score on organizational impediments and workload pressure dimensions, the lower its probability of winning awards” (page 124). Statistical results rejected that. It turns out the higher the workload, the more awards an agency is likely to win, and organizational impediments have no significant effect on agency’s likelihood of winning creative awards (page 126).
The second hypothesis postulated: “If ad agencies win creative awards, this increases their likelihood of receiving awards in the future” (page 124). This hypothesis the data did support (page 127).

An insight I learned from this paper is about one management theoretical tool for assessing an agency’s creative climate. It’s called KEYS: *assessing the climate for creativity*, and it consists of eight dimensions of an agency’s internal climate that should help “stimulate people to combine acquired knowledge in new ways to strengthen, over time, the creative capabilities of the ad agency”: The authors attribute the research on this to Amabile et al. (1996). The eight components are: 1) organizational encouragement, 2) supervisory encouragement, 3) work group support, 4) sufficient resources, 5) challenging work, 6) freedom, 7) low organizational impediments, 8) low workload pressure [page 123].

I read this chapter to gain insight on the extent to which a person can personally develop or advance his creativity.

This chapter in The Handbook of Creativity presents a study by a late psychology professor at University of Calgary, Canada, who discusses the nature-versus-nurture debate as it relates to the research of creativity. The author expresses frustration that so little discussion on the issue existed in his research field [at least at the time], and he thinks the reason is due to the issue's complexity. So he has basically decided through this 15-part research article to sort out for other academic creativity researchers the various positions that research in their own field had already put forth on nature-nurture issue, in effort to jump start discussion. The chapter gives an overview of creative theories, explains the relationships between them, and emphasizes the points they make about genetic and environmental influences on an individual's creativity. The result of the inquiry consists of twelve conclusions and recommendations about future research on creativity that could advance the discussion.

In talking about many theories, the author gives some good definitions of terms and explanations of concepts in creativity that are helpful, such as the definition for creativity: "Creativity means a person's capacity to produce new or original ideas, insights, restructurings, inventions, or artistic objects, which are accepted by experts as being of scientific, aesthetic, or technological value" and he notes that "acceptability" and "appropriateness" of the creative product should be added but says those are "valuations" and therefore subject to change in time (94). An explanation I like was his distinction between scientific and artistic creativity. The difference concerns progression. Scientific creativity always adds to what's been before (knowledge), so discovery in science is always a matter of improvement. Artistic creativity, on the other hand, can be achieved without progressing from earlier art (94).

According to research database, the author works at the Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, University of California College of Medicine, Irvine. I have included this article in my bibliography because it reviews and discusses the term "lifestyle." That term is present in my research topic--i.e., managing a creative lifestyle, so it is necessary for me to establish what it means. I had not planned to explore the term in much depth; but after researching the definition in a few respected dictionaries, I still found its meaning to be too vague for potential use in a research paper that focuses on the term. After some more research, I learned the word "lifestyle" actually originated as a psychology term. That insight initiated my search for peer-reviewed psychology articles discussing "lifestyle." I settled on this article. I am less interested in the psychology discussion of the author than I am in extracting from the paper a solid understanding of what "lifestyle" means in the context of the academic discipline from which it originated.

The author says that it would be "advantageous" if there existed greater awareness of how lifestyle factors affect physical and mental health; he then sets out to presumably create greater awareness by reviewing prior literature that discusses such effects. The review and discussion gravitate toward a set of eight lifestyle factors that are grouped by psychologist under the term "therapeutic lifestyle changes" (TLC’s). I found the eight mentioned at different points in the article. As far as I know, the eight lifestyle factors of most interest to psychologists are: exercise, diet/nutrition, meditation, relaxation/stress management, recreation, time in nature, social support, religion/spirituality.

In my research I should consider these questions based on this information: Do these lifestyle factors affect a creative person any differently than someone less creative? When a person is involved in a creative task, does that person relate any differently to these lifestyle factors than times when he or she is not creating? It should be noted that all eight factors are not equally influential on psychopathology, mental and social wellness, and the brain; only some of the eight-lifestyle factors influence each of those; but each lifestyle component does affect an individual on at least one of those three regards.

The authors of this review article want to investigate the phenomena of creative behavior and creative persons in order to find an explanation for individual differences in creativity. But theoretical problems underlying much creativity research prevented them. So they decided to create a new theoretical framework from which to investigate the topic—an “interactionist model of creative behavior. The framework is unique in its effort “to combine elements of personality, cognitive, and social psychology” explanations of creativity into a single theoretical model that accounts for several constructs established by different disciplines.

In their elaboration of the model, the researchers make two comments that help me better understand their new framework: “From an interactionist perspective, the behavior of an organism at any point in time is a complex interaction of the situation and something else—this something else is the nature of the organism itself” (80). They also note that the interactionist perspective maintains that there is “always more to understanding behavior than just describing observed behavior, per se. That ‘something more’ is the “essence of the organism and its behavioral potentiality” (80).

From a theoretical standpoint, the interactionist model is very clear. Think A, B, C. The letter A stands for “antecedent conditions;” letter B stands for (creative) Behavior; and letter C stands for Consequences. [Figure 1 on page 81 is a great visual reference.] Between the Antecedent conditions and the creative behavior are two other constructs of the model: The person and the situation in which he or she behaves creatively. According to construct terms of the model, “Person” is an individual organism with cognitive style and personality, and “Situation” should be understood to include both contextual and social influences. As a last note on the interactionist model, the consequence of the creative behavior will have a direct effect on either the creator, his or her social influence, or his or her contextual influence. In other words, the creative act will have a consequential effect on either the person or his or her situation.
The conclusion basically states that “individual differences in creativity . . . [are] inextricably bound to issues of definition and assessment, and that “individual differences are a function of the criteria used to characterize creative behavior.” The interactionist model brings together the diverse perspectives of creative researchers in various fields and shows specific areas where future research could prove fruitful.
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