

SIX MODELS TO UNDERSTAND CREATIVITY IN ORGANIZATIONS

Kastika, Eduardo

Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina
ekastika@gmail.com

Date of Receipt: 24/02/2025 – Date of Acceptance: 25/04/2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36995/j.visiondefuturo.2025.29.02.001.en>

This article provides an in-depth review of six key conceptual models of organizational creativity, aiming to clarify what creativity truly means in the business context and how it can be strategically managed. Through a critical analysis, it explores both common perceptions and frequent misconceptions surrounding the term ‘creativity’, highlighting its excessive or imprecise use in organizational language. The paper proposes concrete approaches to overcome these biases by fostering a deeper and more structured understanding of the creative phenomenon. It closely examines Amabile’s Componential Model, Kaufman and Beghetto’s 4C Model, Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligences, Csikszentmihalyi’s Systemic Perspective, the Creative Problem Solving model, and the Open Innovation approach. Taken together, these models allow creativity to be approached as a dynamic process involving both individual and contextual factors. They also emphasize the importance of combining flexible structures with validation criteria, promoting a creativity management approach that is rigorous, inclusive, and focused on achieving tangible results within organizations.

KEY WORDS: Creativity; Innovation; Organizational Creativity; Creative Problem Solving; Open Innovation.

INTRODUCTION

Creativity is discursively valued as a driver of organizational change and innovation, although in practice it is often resisted due to the risk and uncertainty inherent in novelty. This phenomenon is exacerbated in organizational contexts where structures favor the status quo prevail. This paper seeks to clarify distorted perceptions of creativity in organizations by reviewing six prominent models that offer more precise insights for its understanding and effective management. It is approached from different theoretical and practical perspectives, providing concrete tools for strategically managing creativity and overcoming simplistic or superficial views.



DEVELOPMENT

Creativity is valued, but not always invested in

One of the main topics of interest regarding the promotion and application of creativity in organizations is the (often considerable) gap that often exists between discourse and reality: creativity is praised as a driver of change, innovation, and growth (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010), but numerous studies reveal a widespread tendency to reject creative ideas, especially in contexts of uncertainty (Mueller, Melwani, & Goncalo, 2012; Devi, 2024; Magni, Park, & Chao, 2024).

This rejection appears to arise from an inherent tension: while creative ideas are valued for their practicality, the attribute of novelty, essential for creativity, generates discomfort due to its association with uncertainty and risk (Eidelman, Crandall, & Pattershall, 2009; Zajonc, 2001). Although there is a social norm that supports creativity and people tend to perceive themselves with positive attitudes toward it, these attitudes can be ambivalent and influenced by an implicit bias against creativity, which is particularly difficult to diagnose due to social desirability (Greenwald et al., 2009). This bias manifests itself when, even in environments that seemingly promote creativity, such as scientific institutions, innovation organizations, and companies, evaluation structures tend to favor the status quo, demanding precise and practical ideas that reduce uncertainty (Mueller et al., 2012).

The research, tools, and models developed in the field of creativity since 1950, and especially in organizational creativity from 1990 to the present, offer insights that can help organizations recognize and attempt to correct these biases based on a deeper understanding of what creativity means in organizations and how management can help enhance it.

The purpose of this paper is to review various distorted perceptions about creativity that have persisted within organizations for decades; to analyze the contributions of various models and conceptual frameworks in the field of organizational creativity; to clarify and correct these perceptions; and to highlight how the administration can use these models and conceptual frameworks to manage creativity more robustly and effectively.

The excesses and inaccuracies in the use of the terms creative and creativity

Superficial and biased perspectives on terms related to creativity have existed since before it began to be seriously studied as an analyzable and improveable phenomenon, starting in the 1950s.

In his article "The Cults of 'Research' and 'Creativity,'" Jacques Barzun, president of Columbia University, questioned the ease with which any idea or expression was labeled as creative, warning that this could lead to a degradation of creativity's true value (Barzun, 1964).

In response to Barzun, James Melvin Rhodes published his canonical article on the 4 P's of creativity (creativity as a Product, Process, Personal Attributes, and Connection to



Context - Press). In this article, the author admitted the imprecise and excessive use of the word creativity, recognizing that, in many cases, it only implies aspects such as emotional freedom, relaxation of tension, disinhibition, or absence of censorship. He illustrated this by citing expressions such as creative dance to describe simple movement to music, or creative art for the mere activity of finger painting, or creative writing to refer to stories that follow predetermined formulas, and he also made a detailed review of Barzun's criticisms (Rhodes, 1961).

Rhodes's proposal was to resort to definitions that take into account that creativity is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that goes beyond the emotional component of a certain process that we feel is creating or that certain individual components make us creative. Thus, with his 4 Ps model, he attempted to provide a solid foundation for comprehensive and robust research on the topic of creativity.

However, Barzun's criticisms continue to resonate today. The evolution of research on what creativity is, how to study it rigorously, and how to effectively enhance it has, over the years, provided solid answers to each of his objections. We can summarize Barzun's criticisms in six key postulates, accompanied by a verbatim illustrating how each criticism would manifest itself in practice. To emphasize the problematic nature of each postulate, we have assigned each a recognizable name.

a. Creativity can become an alibi to turn a lack of technique into a virtue. (The Problem of Mediocrity)

You don't have to be an electromechanical engineer to solve this problem; we've solved hundreds of similar cases with ingenuity and creativity.

b. Small, everyday virtues of any kind can automatically be an expression of creativity. (The Problem of Banalization)

How creative! He responded to the message at just the right time.

c. The expression "we can all be creative" can be confused with "we are all creative." (The Problem of Uniformity)

We are all creative. Each person does things in their own way, and that is creativity.

d. The label "creative" of an idea or solution can be used to avoid seriously evaluating it. (The Problem of Escape)

We need creative ideas; whether they are good or bad doesn't matter. What matters is that they are disruptive.

e. The development of creativity can be reduced to a mere tool for achieving ideas that seem innovative, regardless of whether they are. (The problem of irrelevance)

The important thing is not that the solution is revolutionary, but that it seems so.

f. Creativity can be understood as synonymous with expressiveness. (The problem of inaction)

Fostering creativity is essential in our organization: we need people to express themselves.

The contributions of research in creativity and organizational creativity to clarify and delimit the use of the terms creative and creativity

In recent decades, the administration has had access to various models that facilitate the integration of creativity into organizations, linking it to the development of human capital, the implementation of innovative solutions, team building, improving the work environment, and strengthening strategic thinking. However, in many cases, these approaches have been underestimated or applied superficially.

Kaufman and Beghetto's 4Cs model has differentiated everyday creativity from transformative creativity, clarifying its organizational impact (Kaufman, 2016). Amabile's componential model has shown that creativity requires both technical knowledge and an environment that fosters divergent thinking (Hennessey & Amabile, 2018). Csikszentmihalyi and Glaveanu's systemic perspectives have shown that creativity is not only individual but the result of interaction with the field and domain, highlighting the importance of organizational structures that validate new ideas (Glaveanu, 2020). Design thinking, focused on customer experience and early validation, has transformed creativity into a practice focused on implementation rather than simply generating ideas (Brown, 2009). In parallel, studies on multiple intelligences have shown that creativity manifests itself in different types of talent, allowing for more diverse strategies to foster innovation in teams (Gardner & Moran, 2017). The emphasis on experimentation and rapid iteration has driven flexible management models, where creativity is valued both in ideation and in execution and continuous improvement (Thompson & Bruk-Lee, 2021). Furthermore, the incorporation of persuasion as the fifth P of creativity is an example of how the importance of communicating and selling ideas within organizations has been highlighted, beyond generating them (Simonton, 2018).

The limited integration of these models into management and administration training helps explain why creativity continues to be viewed in the shadow of Barzun's criticisms. Despite theoretical and methodological advances, many organizations still perceive creativity in an imprecise and limited way, celebrating it in discourse but lacking a deep understanding. This may be because organizational practices and training programs often focus on disseminating the benefits of creativity and learning techniques for generating ideas, but not



on dismantling the biases that have distorted its meaning. As a result, the problems Barzun pointed out more than half a century ago persist: creativity continues to be confused with improvisation without rigor, expression without impact, and innovation without purpose.

Six models that help clarify what creativity is and how to effectively enhance it in organizations.

1. Teresa Amabile's componential model: delving deeper into a discipline is one of the ways to foster creativity

The detachment from technical knowledge characterized the emerging creativity tools of the 1960s. In reality, these techniques deliberately sought to dispense with specific expertise in a given field, as that is precisely what they were intended to challenge (or complement), bringing a fresh perspective to problems that already had a solid technical foundation. An example of this is the so-called Molière method, also known as the "call to the layperson" or "clean eyes" technique, which consists of exposing a problem to people outside the field to elicit ideas without prior conditioning (Hermida, Serra & Kastika, 1992). As Parnes (1992) points out, creativity involves breaking away from habitual thinking patterns and seeking new ways of seeing things. However, this approach eventually led to the erroneous notion that creativity could exist without deep mastery in a specific area. Currently, this view has evolved toward hybrid approaches, which recognize the value of spontaneous creativity, but also the importance of integrating it with specialized knowledge.

Teresa Amabile's componential model (Amabile, 1996) establishes that creativity arises from the combination of three individual factors—expertise, processes relevant to creativity, and intrinsic motivation—and one contextual factor. Expertise, also known as expertise, refers to the knowledge and skills accumulated in a specific area. Although the three terms are often used interchangeably, "expertise" is the most common in English and emphasizes the depth of practical and theoretical knowledge, while "experticia" is used in some Spanish-speaking contexts to emphasize skills acquired through experience. In fact, recent studies have indicated that expertise not only facilitates the generation of viable ideas but also improves the ability to evaluate and develop novel ideas in practice (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). This reinforces the idea that creativity is enhanced when a person with high expertise and flexible thinking works in an environment that stimulates innovation.

While creativity techniques are characterized by their appeal and simplicity, allowing them to be used by anyone (remember that the idea of many of these techniques is to demonstrate that "everyone can be creative"), there are techniques that are applied with great sophistication and require deep technical knowledge. Examples of this are TRIZ (Theory of Inventive Problem Solving), which is based on the analysis of invention patterns and requires



considerable technical knowledge for its effective application (Altshuller, 1996), or the Circept technique, created by French author Michel Fustier, which is the fusion of two words: "circle" and "concept," in French: Circulaire Concept (Fustier, 2003). Unlike more generalist tools, these methodologies have been specifically designed for contexts where expertise is essential. While they can be introduced in a basic way, they reach their full potential when applied by subject matter experts, who can extract the maximum value from their principles and adapt them to complex scenarios.

From this perspective, management can enhance creativity by combining traditional training in specific skills and knowledge with training in creativity tools. Kastika (2013) warns that many organizations train without considering the impact that greater technical knowledge can have on the creativity of an individual or team. This is further enhanced by combining specific technical training with strategies such as internal hackathons, idea competitions, intrapreneurship, and collaborative workspaces, promoting knowledge sharing and the generation of solutions.

2. The creativity gradient: from everyday creativity to eminent creativity

James C. Kaufman and Ronald Beghetto's (2009) 4C model allows us to understand how certain "small everyday virtues," as Barzun puts it, can be one expression of human creativity, but by no means the only one.

The key distinction between the lowercase "c" (everyday, personal, or "mini-c" creativity) and the capital "C" (eminent or "Big-C" creativity) is fundamental to the study of creativity in the 21st century. This differentiation is not merely semantic; it has given rise to two distinct fields of study (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009). On the one hand, there is the study of everyday creativity, linked to personal well-being, the resolution of daily problems, and individual expression (Richards, 2010). On the other hand, there is research into eminent creativity, associated with major contributions that transform a field of knowledge or society as a whole (Simonton, 1999). As mentioned in "Everyday Creativity, Eminent Creativity, and Psychopathology" (Andreasen, 2011), there is now a vast literature addressing both ends of the creative spectrum, from everyday creativity and its link to psychological well-being to the study of the characteristics and processes of eminent creativity. This diversity of approaches enriches the understanding of the creative phenomenon as a whole.

The 4Cs model expands this distinction and proposes a "gradient" of creativity, where ideas move from the "mini-C" (personal interpretation of an idea), through the "Pro-C" (professional creativity, development of skills in a specific field), to the "Big-C" (historical creativity, with lasting impact). This gradient, similar to the spectrum that runs from the initial conception of a user interface to the development of a functional and safe air traffic

management system, underscores the importance of progression and the accumulation of knowledge.

In summary:

- Mini-C: Personal creativity, linked to learning.
- Little-C: Everyday creativity, applied to common problems.
- Pro-C: Professional creativity, which requires years of practice and experience.
- Big-C: Eminent, transformative creativity, which leaves a cultural or historical legacy.

In the context of organizations, these four perspectives are relevant and expand creativity management to areas such as personal development, career development, improving the work environment, and building innovative, high-impact projects, among other topics.

Kastika (2015) adapts Kaufman and Beghetto's proposal to the field of organizations, proposing a model of four forms of creativity. Everyday creativity, linked to well-being, enjoyment, and problem-solving, focuses on addressing daily challenges creatively, an approach developed by authors such as Richards, Cameron, Runco, Csikszentmihalyi, and Rodríguez Estrada. Co-creativity, based on the ability to connect, interact, and flex ideas in dialogue with others, has been explored by Sennett, Sawyer, Verganti, Florida, De Masi, and Shenk. Productive creativity, which involves depth, trajectory, and quality within a trade, profession, or career within an organization, has been analyzed by Sennett, Hayes, Weisberg, Boden, Anderson, and Maisel. Finally, entrepreneurial creativity, focused on project management, idea implementation, risk-taking, and innovation-focused leadership, has been developed by Amabile, Simonton, Marina, Hemlin, Allwood, Martin, Mumford, and Sternberg.

This model allows us to understand how different manifestations of creativity can be enhanced within the organizational sphere, facilitating its more strategic and effective application.

3. Multiple talents and why we can all be creative but in different ways

For much of history, the study of creativity was linked to the analysis of genius and gifted individuals. Early approaches focused on exceptional figures such as Leonardo da Vinci and Albert Einstein, linking creativity with extraordinary intellectual ability (Galton, 1869; Terman, 1925). However, in the mid-20th century, cognitive psychology and education began to reframe creativity as a capacity potentially present in all people, susceptible to development (Guilford, 1950; Torrance, 1962).

This shift in perspective significantly impacted management, promoting a broader view of talent management. The idea that "we are all creative" drove creativity development programs in companies. However, while creativity can be enhanced, there are also innate components (Simonton, 1999; Weisberg, 2006). The resistance to considering these innate

aspects often arises from a fear of biological determinism. However, creativity depends on personality traits, intrinsic curiosity, and self-directed motivation.

Howard Gardner (1983), with his theory of multiple intelligences, revolutionized the conception of talent and creativity. Instead of a single intelligence measurable through IQ tests, Gardner proposed the existence of multiple intelligences, or "multiple talents," that are relatively independent of one another. These intelligences encompass diverse areas of human potential, including linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic intelligence. This theory implies that creativity does not manifest itself in a single form but can be expressed through different channels, depending on individual strengths. For example, a person with high spatial intelligence may excel at visual design, while someone with high interpersonal intelligence may be creative in conflict resolution and teamwork. This has influenced talent management, promoting programs that seek to identify and enhance different types of intelligence in teams. In recent years, research has emphasized collective creativity (Sawyer, 2007; Paulus & Nijstad, 2019). The combination of perspectives and skills in collaborative environments produces innovative solutions. Instead of focusing on whether 'everyone' or 'none' is creative, the challenge is to configure teams that maximize group creativity.

The simplistic statement that 'everyone is creative' dilutes the complexity of the phenomenon. Creativity combines talent, experience, learning, and collaboration, and is not a universally generic skill. Understanding its nuances allows for the design of more effective strategies for its development, optimizing talent management and strengthening companies' innovative capacity.

4. The systemic theory of creativity and why quality and creativity are not two separate topics

The perspective from which creativity is synonymous with absolute freedom, spontaneity, play, and the absence of restrictions led, in many areas, including organizations, to a sharp separation between creativity and any form of structured evaluation or analysis. It was believed that imposing criteria or establishing standards limited creative expression and that the only genuine way to innovate was through a process completely free of external restrictions. However, this perspective began to transform as it became clear that creativity, to have a real impact, requires validation, context, and a process of refinement (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996).

Historically, quality management and creativity were separated within organizations. Engineering and production focused on improving quality through specific tools and methodologies, such as the Deming cycle, total quality management (TQM), Six Sigma, and 5S (Deming, 1986; Imai, 1986). On the other hand, creativity used to be more associated with



commercial and marketing areas, where creative techniques for product differentiation and advertising strategies were promoted (Kotler & Keller, 2006). Despite this, some creativity methodologies, such as brainstorming and quality circles, were implemented in factories, but with a limited focus and without deep integration into production processes (Imai, 1997).

At the beginning of the 21st century, organizations began to understand that creativity and quality were not mutually exclusive concepts, but could be integrated within a single innovation system. Instead of keeping them in separate spheres, companies adopted a more holistic approach, integrating continuous improvement tools with creative processes in collaborative environments.

Csikszentmihalyi's (1996) systemic theory of creativity highlights that creativity is not an individual phenomenon, but a process that emerges at the intersection of the individual, the field's knowledge, and a social group that evaluates and recognizes novel ideas. According to this model, a creative idea has no value until it is validated by a community of experts or users, who determine its impact and applicability. This means that creativity depends not only on originality, but also on acceptance and use within a specific environment. In an organizational context, this model has made it possible to combine creativity and quality, ensuring that innovation is not only disruptive but also viable and sustainable over time.

5. From creativity to creative problem-solving: the concern for giving relevance to ideas.

The tools for applying creativity in organizations have evolved significantly over the years, moving from intuitive approaches to structured frameworks that allow for more relevant and systematic results (Brown, 2004). In other words, there are tools that allow creativity to be considered not as a spontaneous act but as a deliberate process with a tangible impact on decision-making.

One of the most significant advances in this evolution has been the consolidation of the creative problem-solving process as a structured sequence of interconnected divergence (idea generation) and convergence (idea consolidation and selection), which allows for the transition from the search for opportunities to the implementation of relevant solutions. This approach ensures that creativity is not limited to a single moment of ideation, but extends to all phases of the process, including the identification of needs, the precise formulation of the problem, and the validation of ideas with well-defined criteria (Perlin, 2000). Beginning in the 1980s and 1990s, these processes began to more actively integrate the customer's perspective, aligning creativity with the generation of real value. In this context, the "convergence" phase of creative problem-solving took on a new meaning: instead of being an internal decision of the innovation team, it became an instance in which the customer actively participated in the selection and validation of ideas (Barton, 1998). This shift was influenced by approaches such as synectics,



which promote the recontextualization of problems from multiple perspectives, facilitating solutions more aligned with the real needs of the end user.

This customer-centric approach was consolidated in subsequent methodologies such as Design Thinking, Lean Startup, and Jobs to be Done, which have maintained the fundamental principle of validating ideas with users before implementing them. Thus, the evolution of organizational creativity has shifted from an abstract exercise to a structured process where relevance is as important as novelty. When we look at a Design Thinking process, for example, we see a manifestation of how creativity has been systematized to ensure it generates real impact on organizations and the end-user experience.

Therefore, the evolution of organizational creativity has shifted from being an exercise focused on generating new ideas to a structured process where relevance is as important as novelty.

6. Creativity and open innovation: from ideation to action within the framework of ecosystems

Creativity in the 21st century has taken on a new meaning when it is linked to action and the transformation of industries. In particular, the technological revolution has marked a paradigm shift, with entrepreneurs like Steve Jobs, Elon Musk, and Jeff Bezos exemplifying the transformation of ideas into reality, displacing the traditional notion of creativity associated exclusively with art or science.

This approach has evolved into an even more radical concept: "idea testing," based on experimentation, prototyping, and market validation. Models like Eric Ries' Lean Startup (2011) have popularized this mindset, emphasizing the creation of a Minimum Viable Product (MVP), continuous iteration, and the acceptance of failure as part of learning. Ries defines a startup as a "human institution designed to create new products and services under conditions of extreme uncertainty," where the Build-Measure-Learn cycle is key to progress. This experimental mindset is articulated with Christensen's (1997) theory of Disruptive Innovation, which explains how innovations initially aimed at niches can eventually transform entire industries. Silicon Valley has embraced this vision, becoming an ecosystem where startups challenge large corporations through experimentation and strategic adaptation. The role of prototyping in this process is fundamental. As Brown and Katz (2011) point out, prototyping is not only a way to test ideas; it is also a way to generate them. Innovation materializes through a continuous cycle of testing, learning, and adjustment, where action becomes the driving force of the creative process.

This paradigm shift has also broadened the notion of who is creative. It is no longer just about the "lone genius," but rather diverse teams with differentiated roles: some generate ideas, others critically analyze them, others implement them, and still others manage the



innovation process. Amabile (1998) highlights that organizational creativity thrives on the interaction between different perspectives and skills, forming an ecosystem where collaboration is key to turning ideas into action.

The concept of Open Innovation, revitalized by Chesbrough (2003), reinforces this view by stating that companies must leverage both internal and external sources of innovation. Associated with this concept is the less widespread Open Creativity.

Steiner (2009) was one of the main authors to propose using the term open creativity to describe a collaborative system of creative problem-solving that incorporates external sources of knowledge and ideas. His approach positions it as an analogue of Chesbrough's open innovation, but focused on the generation and development of creative ideas within a shared ecosystem. During the following decades of the 21st century, several authors delved deeper into this concept. Muzzio, along with Gama (2024) and Gonçalves (2023), proposed that open creativity is not only facilitated by collaborative work environments but is also key to idea generation in the public sector and in coworking spaces, where networking and interaction between different professionals enhance creativity. Brocco, Forster, and Frieß (2011) explored 360° support for open creativity, analyzing its implementation in companies in the ICT sector in Germany and highlighting the need for organizational structures that encourage its application. Rady and Nehmeh (2021) investigated its impact on entrepreneurial performance, suggesting that open creativity contributes to innovation when combined with open innovation strategies and flexible business models. Souad and Sihem (2023) examined its application in the context of NASA, highlighting its role at the intersection of creativity, entrepreneurship, and organizational innovation. Finally, Frieß, Groh, Reinhardt, and Forster (2012) proposed a framework for integrating open creativity into the corporate environment through technological support systems, emphasizing the importance of adapting innovation processes to new digital paradigms.

In terms of management, open creativity can be seen as a strategy to enrich the flow of ideas within a company, while open innovation seeks to transform those ideas into products, services, or processes that generate commercial and strategic impact (Kastika, 2013). What matters to us is that both terms are integrated within this collaborative logic that is strengthened by the creation of networks between companies, universities, and startups, accelerating the materialization of ideas through knowledge transfer and shared learning. From a sociocultural perspective, Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes the importance of open creativity.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the six models of creativity in organizations allows us to overcome reductionist views that limit creativity to the simple generation of ideas, without considering its strategic, structural, and applied dimensions. Throughout this work, various theoretical and



practical approaches have been addressed, demonstrating that creativity, far from being a diffuse or exclusively individual phenomenon, is a structured process that can be effectively managed at the organizational level.

One of the main findings is the need to distinguish between the different levels and manifestations of creativity. Models such as Amabile's componential model, Kaufman and Beghetto's 4C gradient, and Csikszentmihalyi's systemic perspective have made it possible to clarify and define the use of the term "creativity," differentiating between everyday creativity and creativity with an organizational or social impact. This has direct implications for administration, as it highlights the importance of designing specific strategies to foster different types of creativity within organizations. Furthermore, the study has shown that creativity is not an isolated process or an intrinsic quality of certain individuals, but rather depends on the interaction between people, teams, organizational culture, and innovation ecosystems. Incorporating creativity into business management requires not only an environment that stimulates it, but also structures and methodologies that enable its effective application. Models such as Chesbrough's Open Innovation, Ries's iterative Lean Startup experimentation, and design thinking have transformed creativity into an action-oriented practice, where experimentation, prototyping, and user validation play a key role (Table 1).

Table 1: Comparison of Creativity Models in Organizations: Approaches, Applications and Challenges

Model	Main Focus	Application in Organizations	Key Strength	Challenge or Limitation
Amabile's Componential Model	Individual factors and organizational context	Promotion of motivation, knowledge, and creative environments	Links creativity to expertise and intrinsic motivation	Requires a favorable environment, which is hard to implement everywhere
Creativity Gradient (4C Model by Kaufman & Beghetto)	Progressive levels of creativity	Career development, training, and creative impact evaluation	Clarifies the difference between everyday and	May generate confusion regarding levels of creativity and



			eminent creativity	their development
Multiple Intelligences (Gardner)	Diversity of skills and creative expressions	Talent management and diversity in innovation teams	Broadens the view of creativity beyond traditional thinking	Not all intelligences directly translate into organizational innovation
Systemic Theory of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi)	Interaction between individual, field, and domain	Design of structures that validate and adopt new ideas	Integrates creativity within a system validated by society	Depends on external validation, which can hinder disruptive creativity
Creative Problem Solving	Structured process of ideation and validation	Implementation of iterative processes and validation strategies	Structures the creative process for greater effectiveness	Success depends on balancing divergence and convergence effectively

Note: Prepared by the author.

Despite advances in the understanding and application of creativity in organizations, biases and resistance persist that limit its true potential. As noted, creativity is often celebrated in discourse but rejected in practice, especially in environments where uncertainty and risk are perceived as threats. This paradox reinforces the need to integrate creativity models into management training and strategic decision-making, ensuring that organizations not only generate innovative ideas but also have mechanisms in place to effectively implement them.

Ultimately, the models analyzed provide a solid framework for understanding creativity in organizations and its role in value generation. Their application allows creativity to be transformed from an abstract concept into a concrete management tool, capable of enhancing the development of human capital, innovation in products and services, improving the organizational climate, and the evolution of business ecosystems. For creativity to have a real

impact on organizations, it must be managed deliberately, strategically, and aligned with business objectives, ensuring its effective integration into the business dynamic.

REFERENCES

- Altshuller, G. S. (1996). *And suddenly the inventor appeared: TRIZ, the theory of inventive problem solving*. Technical Innovation Center.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to "The social psychology of creativity"*. Westview press.
- Amabile, T. M. (1998). How to kill creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(5), 76–87.
- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in organizational behavior*, 36, 157-183.
- Andreasen, N. C. (2011). Everyday creativity, eminent creativity, and psychopathology: A study of 47 very eminent writers. *Creativity Research Journal*, 23(3), 229–234.
- Barton, T. D. (1998). Creative problem solving: Purpose, meaning, and values. *California Western Law Review*, 34(2).
- Barzun, J. (1964). *The cults of 'research' and 'creativity'*. Educational Forum, 28(3), 273-281.
- Brocco, M., Forster, F., & Frieß, M. R. (2011). 360° Open Creativity Support. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 17(12), 1670-1692.
- Brown, J. G. (2004). Creativity: Creativity and problem-solving. *Marquette Law Review*.
- Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking creates new alternatives for business and society*. Harper Business.
- Brown, T., & Katz, B. (2011). *Change by design*. Harper Business.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Press.
- Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Devi, N. C. (2024). Paradoxical leadership and employee creativity: knowledge sharing and hiding as mediators. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 28(2), 312-340.
- Eidelman, S., Crandall, C. S., & Pattershall, J. (2009). *The existence bias*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(5), 765-775.



- Frieß, M. R., Groh, G., Reinhardt, M., & Forster, F. (2012). *Context-aware creativity support for corporate open innovation. International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations*, 2(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijkbo.2012040101>
- Fustier, M. (2003). *Le Circept: une méthode de créativité*. Éditions d'Organisation.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. Macmillan.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*.
- Gardner, H., & Moran, S. (2017). *The Science of Multiple Intelligences Theory: A Twenty-Year Retrospective*. Psychology Press.
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2020). *Handbook of cultural creativity: Perspectives from the field*. Springer.
- Glaveanu, V. P. (2020). *The Possible: A Sociocultural Theory of Creativity*. Oxford University Press.
- Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2009). *Implicit social cognition: From measures to mechanisms. Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 427-472.
- Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454.
- Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). *Creativity. Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 569-598.
- Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2018). *Creativity: Theories and Themes: Research, Development, and Practice*. Academic Press.
- Hermida, J., Serra, R., Kastika, E. *Administración & estrategia. Teoría y práctica*. Buenos Aires: Macchi. 1992.
- Imai, M. (1986). *Kaizen: The key to Japan's competitive success*. McGraw-Hill.
- Imai, M. (1997). *Gemba Kaizen: A commonsense approach to a continuous improvement strategy*. McGraw-Hill.
- Kastika, E. (2015). *Nuevas estrategias para la creatividad*, Innovar.
- Kastika, Eduardo. (2013). *Las prácticas para la creatividad en las organizaciones: Estado del arte y análisis en organizaciones argentinas*. (Tesis de Doctorado. Universidad de Buenos Aires).
- Kaufman, J. C. (2016). *Creativity 101 (Psych 101 Series)*. Springer Publishing.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). *Beyond Big and Little: The Four C Model of Creativity. Review of General Psychology*.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing Management (12th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Magni, F., Park, J., & Chao, M. M. (2024). *Humans as creativity gatekeepers: Are we biased against AI creativity?* *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 39(3), 643-656.
- Moore, J. F. (1993). Predators and prey: A new ecology of competition. *Harvard business review*, 71(3), 75-86.
- Moore, J. F. (1996). *The death of competition: Leadership and strategy in the age of business ecosystems*. HarperBusiness.
- Mueller, J. S., Melwani, S., & Goncalo, J. A. (2012). *The bias against creativity: Why people desire but reject creative ideas*. *Psychological Science*, 23(1), 13-17.
- Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 705–750.
- Muzzio, H., & Gama, M. (2024). *Collaborative idea generation: An experience of open creativity in the public sector*. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 54(1), 45-62.
- Muzzio, H., & Gonçalves, B. S. C. (2023). *Open creativity: Increased creativity due to network relationships in coworking environments*. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 20(8), 2350056.
- Parnes, S. J. (1992). *Source Book for Creative Problem Solving: A Fifty Year Digest of Proven Innovation Processes*. Creative Education Foundation.
- Paulus, P. B., & Nijstad, B. A. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbook of organizational creativity*. Oxford University Press.
- Perlin, M. L. (2000). Stepping outside the box: Viewing your client in a whole new light. *California Western Law Review*, 37(1).
- Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. Free Press.
- Rady, J. M., & Nehmeh, M. M. (2021). *The effect of open creativity on entrepreneurial performance*. *Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University Journal*, (66), 1-20.
- Rhodes, J. M. (1961). *An analysis of creativity*. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 42(7), 305-310.
- Richards, R. (2010). Everyday creativity: Our hidden potential. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 4(2), 61.
- Ries, E. (2011). *The lean startup: How today's entrepreneurs use continuous innovation to create radically successful businesses*. Crown Business.
- Runco, M. A. (2007). *Creativity: Theories and Themes: Research, Development, and Practice*. Elsevier.
- Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092>
- Sawyer, R. K. (2007). *Group genius: The creative power of collaboration*. Basic Books.

- Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Harper & Brothers.
- Simonton, D. K. (1999). *Origins of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity*. Oxford University Press.
- Simonton, D. K. (2018). *The Genius Checklist: Nine Paradoxical Tips on How You Can Become a Creative Genius*. MIT Press.
- Souad, B., & Sihem, B. (2023). *The problem of adopting open creativity in business organizations to support entrepreneurship: An analytical study of the open creativity model at NASA*. *Journal of Contemporary Business and Economic Studies*, 5(1), 123-140.
- Steiner, G. (2009). *The concept of open creativity: Collaborative creative problem solving for innovation generation—a systems approach*. *International Journal of Business and Systems Research*, 3(3), 302-322.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Terman, L. M. (1925). *Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 1: Mental and physical traits of a thousand gifted children*. Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, M., & Bruk-Lee, V. (2021). *Innovation and Creativity in the Workplace: Strategies for Effective Leadership and Engagement*. Routledge.
- Torrance, E. P. (1962). *Guiding creative talent*. Prentice-Hall.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Weisberg, R. W. (2006). *Creativity: Understanding innovation in problem solving, science, invention, and the arts*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Zajonc, R. B. (2001). *Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal*. *Current Directions in Psychological S*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABSTRACT

Please refer to articles Spanish Biographical abstract.

