



THE INFLUENCE OF CREATIVE STYLE PREFERENCE ON CREATIVE BEHAVIOR OF INDONESIA' CREATIVE INDUSTRY WORKERS

Nugroho J. Setiadi^{1*} and Regina Inderadi²

Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, Bina Nusantara University

Abstract

This study explored the role of creative style preference on employees' involvement in creative behavior and the moderating effect of creative style preference on the relationship between organisational culture and employees' creative behavior. The study sample included 128 creative industry workers from 6 small and medium enterprises in Indonesia. Data was collected at Jakarta in early 2018 and gathered by using a questionnaire consisted of 2 cultural behavior dimension to measure workers' creative behavior, namely presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas and presenting creative suggestions. Questionnaire was using Likert scale and the result was analysed with Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) method. The analysis indicted that the two distinct dimensions of creative behavior (presenting creative and practical ideas and presenting creative suggestions) were determined workers' creative behavior. These two dimensions reflected the level of incremental improvement and presenting radical ideas in their activities. It is concluded that Indonesia' creative industry workers are creative people who contributed to the productivity of an organization. It is suggested that organisations should create an organizational culture that motivates workers to improve their creativity level.

Keywords: *creative behavior, creative style preference, presenting practical ideas, presenting creative suggestions*

INTRODUCTION

Creativity and innovation in an organization are viewed as the most

important element of a success of an organization in business nowadays. Organizations are required to compromise with strengths such as product acceleration, technology changes, global competition, deregulation, political instability, demographic changes, and new trend towards society's information service (Buckley & Ghauri, 2004).

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 12 March 2018

Accepted: 28 May 2018

Email Addresses:

nugroho.setiadi@binus.ac.id (Nugroho J. Setiadi)

regina@binus.ac.id (Regina Inderadi)

*Corresponding author

Increase in organizational' chaos, technology pace, changes in society, labor needs, unions' movement, and attitude to adapt creative behavior (Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993) had encouraged organization to motivate their employees' motivation in order to achieve a sustainability in competition (Amabile, 1988; Kanter, 1988; Shalley, 1995). Creativity can become a key success factor in the field of product development, product marketing, and sales. Creativity and innovation are not just vital features for organizations but also important for society economic development (Hitt, Ireland, Sirmon, & Trahms, 2011). Many studies had suggested that improving the creative performance of employees was an imperative stage if an organization wanted to achieve a competitive advantage in the dynamic society and technology (Amabile, 1988; Chen & Chang, 2013; Setiadi, Boediprasetya, & Wahdriaman, 2012). A number of approaches had been used to understand how creative workers shape the production of new ideas and the subsequent development of new ways based on their ideas. For example, studies of creativity studies of creativity by Baer, Oldham, and Cummings (2003) and Mumford, Connelly, and Gaddis (2003) emphasized not only on expertise, but also the cognitive processes (problem finding, conceptual combination, and idea generation); by which people work with knowledge in generating new ideas and new solution. This study examined several aspects of creative style preferences in measuring creative behavior of workers in the Indonesian creative industry. Creativity was

conceived to be a consequence of personal characteristics when condition was contributive to come up with new and useful ideas as a response to the existed personal characteristics.

Capability to advance creativity and innovation are part of competence needed by managers today (Kleef & Roome, 2007). It was argued that creative workers or employees were foundation to build new ideas and to yield purposeful products and to produce an effective procedure and implementation (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). As a result, description, prediction, and understanding of creativity had become were able to work creatively, they will be able to propose new ideas and substantial ideas, also able to offer a new efficient procedure for raw material inventory control to enable a further development and implementation (Amabile, 1988; Staw, 1990; Woodman et al., 1993). Introduction and application of those products may raise organization's capability to utilize opportunities in the market or industry particularly to adapt, grow, and compete (Wang & Ahmed, 2007).

Most literatures about creativity out looked it as an individual phenomenon (Benedek, Jauk, Sommer, Arendasy, & Neubauer, 2014). In this research, main focus was emphasized on individual variables such as personality, character, skills, experience, and thinking process from each individual as an idea creator. However, it was important to learn and comprehend context where creative style preference constructed by workers. A study showed that social environment can influence a level and frequency of

creative behavior. In addition, there was an opinion that creativity performance emerged from an interaction between the potential creator and the operational context (Amabile, 1988; Ford, 1996; Woodman et al., 1993). Individual who owned innovation and creativity adequacy will have more capability to implement innovation and creativity when they received strong motivation and support from their workplace compared with individual who received low support from their workplace (Wu, Parker, & Jong, 2011).

This study was aimed to identify creative style preference dimension which promoted organizational' creativity. Moreover, this research was aimed to explore dimensions where individual aspects may influence and determine a creative behavior of an individual. Furthermore, this research suggested that creative style preference will not be the same to all workers, which all workers will not be able to possess the same level of creative behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Creativity was a complicated context and uneasy to be understood without a universal agreement toward the definition of creativity (Mumford, 2000) due to the reason that creativity was a complex construction and was expanded as intelligence (Stenberg, 1999). Torrance (1988) defined creativity in the term of interaction between skills, motivation, and competence. Brown (1989) suggested that creativity consisted of four components, namely: creative process, creative product, creative people, creative situation. Therefore, there were several

definitions of creativity, which one of those defined it as an individual's characteristic and people's process (Amabile, 1988). Moreover, Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, and Herron (1996) defined creativity as a "peculiar production" and "functional ideas" in all concerns, whilst innovation defined as "successful implementation emerged from creative ideas in an organization". Creativity always became a starting point for innovation (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014). This research accepted the definition of creativity from Amabile (1988) which was based on practical, unique, and result-oriented concept.

Creative behavior was defined as "behavior that generated original identification and better method to achieve an objective" (Sarkar & Chakrabarti, 2011). Another researcher defined individual creative behavior as a method to develop solution for task related to issues marked as something new and to issues marked as related to current situation (Reiter-Palmon, & Illies, 2004). Hayes and Mellon (1990) advised three crucial criteria to be evaluated as creative behavior: (1) a behavior should look original or unique; (2) a behavior should be viewed as interesting or valuable; (3) a behavior should be reflected perfectly to God. This study conceptualized creative behavior as a behavior which conceived product and service creation, ideas creation, procedure creation, and new valuable and beneficial process by either individual or group of people in the work organization.

In addition, creative style preference was also the main part of this study. Study about creativity had been focused on

consideration and determination of personal characteristic and attribute related to creative achievement. Meanwhile, some researches about creativity focused on behavior and personality (Amabile, 1983, 1996; Guilford, 1954). Another research focused on intelligence and cognition (Gardner, 1996; Stenberg, 1999). These studies described creativity as a personal characteristics, such as broad interests, interest in complexity, intuition, esthetic sensitivity, ambiguity tolerance, self-confidence, where all these aspects were positively and consistently connected to measure creative performance (Barron & Harrington, 1981; Gough, 1979; Martindale & Dailey, 1996). According to Woodman et al. (1993), a person who possessed innovative talent tended to be different with others in the term of expertise, skill in creative thinking, and intrinsic motivation.

There were several distinct methods to measure a creativity level. Creative Style Preference or CSP concept was one measurement to help people to understand individual's creativity level. This concept was aligned with a study conducted by Kirton (1989) which identified adaptation innovation as a common approach for creative decision making. Furthermore, Kirton (1989) identified cognitive style as a favorable natural orientation or a problem solving technique ranging from innovative to adaptive. An innovator, a person with innovative-cognitive style, will do his task by searching and integrating various information, redefining the problem, and producing ideas which were deviated from norms. An adaptor, a person with cognitive-

adaptive style, tended to use data in stable area, accept problem as defined before, and produce ideas consistently with approved convention.

A theory stated that each individual maybe different in the way he preferred to react to a change, creativity, decision making, and problem solving (Sandler-Smith and Badger, 1998). Certain cognitive style condition was probably better than the other work condition in a different work environment. Generally, adaptor was indicated by a precision reliability, efficiency, discipline, and conformity. Adaptors tended to adapt existing process and product to develop a new solution. On the other hand, innovator was characterized by undisciplined thought and identified as a possible practice to develop new ideas for problem solving.

According to the interactionists model of individuals' creativity (Woodman et al., 1993), a necessary condition under which personal characteristics can lead to creativity. As a worker in creative industry who has many activities in creating communal links among people through the process of communication, creativity is often reflected as an expression of voice to come up with new ideas of doing things or make suggestions on how to improve things. Presenting ideas to creative leaders induces reflection on these ideas. As being stated by Alexander (1979), the most comprehensive presentation of workers' creativity was displayed in two ways. The first was a search process aimed at discovering existing solutions, and the second was a process of designing or creating solutions that did not preexist.

Consistent with the result of factor analysis of creative performance in the present research, two dimensions of creative performance were reflected as the two ways of people creativity presentation. Results of the present research showed that there were two distinct dimensions of behavioral creativity: (1) presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas, and (2) presenting creative suggestions.

Presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas as the first dimension of creative behavior was measured to examine workers' intention on generating creative solution that do not preexist. The following items were used to measure presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas: "Exhibits creativity on the job"; "Searches out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or product ideas"; "Develops adequate plans and schedules for the implementation of new ideas"; "Often has a fresh approach to problems"; "Comes up with creative problem solving", and "Is a good source of creative ideas". On the other hand, presenting creative suggestions as the second dimension of creative behavior was measured to examine workers' intention to present a search process that was emphasized at discovering existing solutions. The following items were used to measure presenting creative suggestions: "Suggests new ways of performing work tasks"; "Suggests new ways to achieve goals or objectives" and "Suggests new ways to increase quality".

This study was aimed to test the psychometric properties to determine dimensions of creative behavior in an organization in the field of Indonesia'

creative industry. Moreover, this study utilized creative behavior instrument based on Woodman's (1993) study. Questionnaire was distributed to assess cultural dimensions, namely: presenting creative and practical ideas and presenting creative suggestions. There were no hypotheses were made in this research since this research was conducted in exploration method.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Respondents were employees from 6 sub-sector organizations in creative industry. A convenience sample of 128 workers was collected, with ages ranging from 19 to 46 years ($M = 30.538$, $SD = 9.34$). The respondents were averagely having 5.67 years of work experience ($SD = 9.0$) and consisted of 85.5% males and 14.2% females. 51.8% were graduated from various studies such as engineering, business, science, IT, textile, art, while 48.2% were post-graduated with science and business major.

Creative behavior of respondents was measured by a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5(always). Each scale contained five statements, and allows respondents to evaluate themselves with regard to how they usually deal with their routines. The average of the five items answered was the score for that scale with reliability coefficient of 0.75.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Factor analysis of employees' creative behavior was examined according to supervisor's rating as shown in Table 1. The result indicated two factors solution with *eigenvalue* of 5.72 and 1.13 (>1.0) and the total variance explained was

62.26% of the total variance. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test showed that there was a sufficient inter-correlation (0.91) whilst the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity showed a significant correlation (Chi Square=1612.44, $p < 0.01$). Result showed that 2 of the 13 items should be deleted because of the cross loading. Factor 1 was accounted for 51.97% of the common variance after rotation. It consisted of eight items with significant

loadings ranging from 0.63 to 0.85. these items belonged to the presenting creative and practical ideas dimension. On the other hand, factor 2 was accounted for 10.29% of the common variance after rotation, composed by three items, which these items had significant loadings ranging from 0.73 to 0.77. These items belonged to the dimension of presenting creative suggestions.

Table 1. Result of the Creative Performance Factor Analysis

Items	Component	
	1	2
Presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas:		
He/she often has new and innovative ideas	.85	.13
He/she always comes up with creative solutions to problems	.83	.22
He/she always searches out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or product ideas	.79	.15
He/she always develops adequate plans and schedules for the implementation of new ideas	.79	.18
He/she is always a good source of creative ideas	.72	.29
He/she always exhibits creativity on the job when given the opportunity to	.68	.22
He/she often has a fresh approach to problems	.65	.31
He/she always comes up with new and practical ideas to improve performance	.63	.32
Presenting creative suggestions:		
He/she often suggests new ways to achieve goals or objectives	.30	.77
He/she always suggests new ways of performing work tasks	.06	.75
He/she always suggests new ways to increase quality	.39	.73
Eigenvalue	5.72	1.13
Percentage Variance (62.26%)	51.97	10.29
Cronbach's alpha	.91	.70
KMO	.91	
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	1612.44	

Reliability defined as an extent to which measurement of a particular test were repeatable (Nunnally, 1981) and it means that the measuring procedure should yield consistent result on repeated test. However, the most recommended measurement of internal consistency was supported by Coefficient Alpha or Cronbach's Alpha, as it provided an acceptable reliability estimation. Impeccably, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.7. Sekaran (2016) suggested that the minimum acceptable reliability was set at 0.60. In certain condition, a slightly lower reliability level of 0.60 was accepted by applying the theory from Ary and Suen (2014). Although the coefficient ranging between 0.50 to 0.60 was considered as poor, the reliability score may still be accepted on the early stage of research (George & Mallery, 1999). The Alpha coefficient for different figures were computed using the reliability procedure on SPSS as shown on Table 2.

Table 2 illustrated that the two cultural dimensions of creative behavior indicated a higher value of alpha. It was not an

astonished result since most of the instrument usages in creativity research indicated the same result. As a comparison, Setiadi (2007) developed the revised creative behavior evaluation for Indonesia, proving that the alpha coefficients for each aspect or factor of the two cultural dimensions between Indonesia and United States' samples were different. The alpha coefficient for Indonesia's sample was lower than United States' normative sample (Setiadi, 2007).

In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of creative behavior for the first dimension was 0.91 and 0.70 for the second dimension (Table 2). When compared to the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of United States normative group and two south east Asian countries (Malaysia and Philippines), the alpha coefficients number were relatively similar. It was considered that these two dimensions were important factors to determine creativity level since they reflected some characteristics of a typical person such as broad-minded, active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, and intellectual curiosity.

Table 2 Reliability Coefficient for Cultural Dimension Variables

Variables	Number of items	Items dropped	Cronbach's alpha (1st order)	Number of items after FA	Cronbach's alpha (2nd order)
Creative Behavior:					
• Presenting creative, concrete and practical ideas	10	-	.91	8	.91
• Presenting creative suggestions	3	-	.70	3	.70
Notes:					
1 st order: results before factor analysis					
2 nd order: results from factor analysis (FA)					

CONCLUSION

Empirical findings described two cultural dimensions of Indonesia's creative industry workers which reflects the level of incremental improvement and presenting radical ideas in their activities. According to the supervisors' rating (Table 1), the level of workers' intention to present creative suggestions (incremental improvement) are higher than the level of their intention to present creative, concrete, and practical ideas. It is conceivable since presenting radical ideas during their activities is more difficult than presenting incremental improvement in a normal setting. Nevertheless, both of the two dimensions of creative behavior shows high level of score. It can be concluded that Indonesia's creative industry workers are considered as creative who possess important contributions in the organizational productivity. These empirical findings are also important contributions of the present research to the literature by focusing explicitly on creativity in managerial activities.

It is also implied that this study is giving a huge implication to organisations which is aimed to identify relevant cultural dimension in order to increase the creativity level of workers and to identify constraints for creativity development. This study shows that employees are normally possess abilities to be creative at their workplace, however some of those are unable to utilize them at work. Furthermore, this study illustrates that organizational culture influences creative behavior of employees. Somewhat, organizational culture may give huge influence to employees if the culture itself

motivates employees to be creative. In addition, these findings give implication for employees' recruitment. As stated by Kirton (1989), cognitive style as a relative stable characteristic can be a determination for a useful employees' selection, task supervision, and group work. If an organization aims to be a creative organization, therefore it must employ creative workers while creating a creative work environment.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, E.R. (1979). The designed of alternatives in organizational contexts: a pilot study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 382-404.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In Staw B. M. Cummings L. L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 10, 123-167. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Amabile, T.M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 357-376.
- Amabile, T.M. Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M., (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1154-1184.
- Ary, D., & Suen, H.K. (2014). *Analyzing quantitative behavioral observation data*. New York: Tailor & Francis.
- Baer, M., Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (2003). Rewarding creativity: when does it really matter? *The*

- Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5), 569-586.
- Barron, F.B., & Harrington, D.M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 439-476.
- Benedek, M., Jauk, E., Sommer, M., Arendasy, M., & Neubauer, A.C. (2014). Intelligence, creativity, and cognitive control: The common and differential involvement of executive functions in intelligence and creativity. *Intelligence*, 46, 73 – 83.
- Brown, R.T. (1989). Creativity: What are we to measure? In Glover, J.A., Ronning, R.R., & Reynold, C.R., (Eds). *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buckley, P. & Ghauri, P. (2004). Globalisation, economic geography and the strategy of multinational enterprises. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(2), 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400076>
- Chen, Y.S., & Chang, C.H. (2013). The Determinants of Green Product Development Performance: Green Dynamic Capabilities, Green Transformational Leadership, and Green Creativity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(1), 107–119.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). Society, Culture, and Person: A Systems View of Creativity. *The Systems Model of Creativity*, 47-61.
- Ford, C. M. (1996). A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1112–1142.
- Gardner, H. (1996). *Creating minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (1999). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gough, H.G. (1979). A creative personality scale for the Adjective Check List. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1398-1405.
- Guildford, J.P. (1954). *Psychometric Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Hayes, J.R., & Mellon, C. (1990). Cognitive processes in creativity. *Occasional Paper, No. 18*.
- Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., Sirmon, D.G., & Trahms, C.A. (2011). Strategic Entrepreneurship: Creating Value for Individuals, Organizations, and Society. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(2), 57-75.
- Kanter, R. M. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, and social conditions for innovation in organizations. In Staw B. M.Cummings L. L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 10, 169–211. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kirton, M.J. (1989). Adaptors and innovators at work, in Kirton, M.J., (ed), *Adaptors and Innovators: Styles of Creativity and Problem Solving*, (pp. 1-36), New York: Routledge.
- Kleef, J.A.G., & Roome, N.J. (2007). Developing capabilities and

- competence for sustainable business management as innovation: a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 15(1), 38-51.
- Martindale, C., & Dailey, A. (1996). Creativity, primary process cognition and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20(4), 409-414.
- Mumford, M. D. (2000). Managing creative people: Strategy and tactics for innovation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10, 313–351.
- Mumford, M.D., Connelly, S., & Gaddis, B. (2003). How creative leaders think: Experimental findings and cases. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4–5), 411-432.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1981). *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Oldham G. R., & Cummings A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 607–634.
- Reiter-Palmon, R., & Illies, J.J. (2004). Leadership and creativity: Understanding leadership from a creative problem-solving perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 55-77.
- Sandler-Smith, E., & Badger, B. (1998). ‘Cognitive style, learning and innovation’. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 10, 247-265.
- Sarkar, P., & Chakrabarti, A. (2011). Assessing design creativity. *Design Studies*, 32(4), 348-383.
- Sekaran, U. (2016). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Setiadi, N.J. (2007). “*Personal Characteristics and Creative Performance of Indonesian Radio Station Operating Managers: The Impact of Leader-Member Exchange*.” Ph.D thesis, University Science Malaysia.
- Setiadi, N.J., Boediprasetya, A., & Wahdianan (2012). Boosting Indonesia’s creative industries: Identification of people’s characteristics and creative behaviour. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 31(4), 53-62. DOI: [10.2478/v10117-012-0035-3](https://doi.org/10.2478/v10117-012-0035-3), January 2013.
- Shalley, C. E. (1995). Effects of coaction, expected evaluation, and goal setting on creativity and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 483–503.
- Staw B. M. (1990). An evolutionary approach to creativity and innovation. In West M. A. Farr J. L. (Eds.), *Innovation and creativity at work*: 287–308. Chichester, UK: Wiley
- Stenberg, R.J. (1999) (ed.). *Handbook of Creativity*, New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Torrance, E.P. (1988). The nature of creativity as manifest in testing. In Stenberg, R.J. (Eds) *The nature of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, C.L., & Ahmed, P.K. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: A review and

research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 9(1), 31-51.

Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 293–321.

Wu, C.H., Parker, S.K., & Jong, J.P.J. (2011). Need for Cognition as an Antecedent of Individual Innovation Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 40(6), 1511-1534.

