

Strategies for Enhancing Creativity in the Workplace and Their Impact on Employee Performance: a Field Study in the Private Sector

Ali Ahmed Abbas
Mustansiriyah University

Corresponding Author: Ali Ahmed Abbas ali_ahmad@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Organizational Creativity, Employee Performance, Work Environment Strategies, Leadership Support, Intrinsic Motivation

Received : 24 May

Revised : 24 June

Accepted: 25 July

©2025 Abbas: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of creativity-enhancing strategies on employee performance in private-sector organizations. Using a mixed-methods approach (quantitative survey with 300 employees and qualitative interviews with 12 managers), the research identified key strategies, including flexible work environments, non-material incentives, and leadership support. Results revealed that open work environments ($\beta=0.44$) and training programs ($\beta=0.31$) had the strongest positive impact on performance, while material incentives showed limited effectiveness ($\beta=0.17$). The study highlights the critical role of psychological safety and intrinsic motivation in fostering creativity, aligning with Self-Determination Theory (Deci et al., 1999). However, reliance on self-reported data and the exclusion of public-sector organizations limit generalizability. The findings provide a practical framework for managers to prioritize non-material investments in creativity, suggesting future research should integrate objective performance metrics and explore cross-cultural contexts.

INTRODUCTION

In light of the rapid changes taking place in today's business world, creativity has become a pivotal factor in building a competitive advantage for organizations and ensuring their sustainability. Recent studies show that organizations that foster creative work environments excel at achieving innovation and adapting their products to changing market demands (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). In fact, the World Economic Forum (2020) report ranked creativity as one of the most important skills in demand in the labor market by 2025, highlighting its role not only as a tool for survival, but also as a strategy for growth and expansion. However, many organizations still face fundamental challenges in translating this theoretical importance into effective practical practices, which raises questions about the barriers to implementing strategies that support creativity.

Research indicates a research and practical gap in this area; While management literature emphasizes the need to adopt strategies such as non-financial incentives and flexible work environments, a study by Shalley et al. (2015) shows that 40% of global organizations do not have systematic plans to measure or enhance creativity. Anderson et al. (2014) also noted that an excessive focus on short-term operational efficiency often undermines investment in long-term innovation initiatives, deepening the gap between theory and practice. This gap is not limited to practical aspects; it also extends to the scarcity of studies that quantitatively link specific strategies to improved employee performance, especially in sectors such as technology and services, which rely heavily on creative human capital.

In this context, this research aims to achieve two main objectives: the first is to identify the most effective strategies for enhancing creativity within workplace environments, whether related to financial or moral incentives or organizational environment design. The second is to analyze the causal relationship between these strategies and employee performance indicators, such as productivity, output quality, and problem-solving ability. The importance of this research lies in the fact that it provides not only a theoretical framework, but also a practical, measurable model, based on field data from diverse sectors. This helps managers prioritize investment in innovation initiatives. A recent study by Hirst et al. (2018) supports the idea that adopting strategies such as job delegation and leadership support is positively associated with an increase in innovation by up to 34%, reinforcing the need for in-depth research into these mechanisms. These objectives culminate in fundamental research questions: Is there a statistically significant positive relationship between innovation-enhancing strategies and employee performance? If so, which strategies are most effective in different organizational contexts? To answer these questions, the research relies on a mixed methodology that combines quantitative survey analysis with qualitative studies with managers, drawing on the framework of Zhou & Hoever (2014) that links organizational context to innovation outcomes. The results are expected to contribute to bridging part of the current research gap, especially in light of the scarcity of studies that combine the analysis of management strategies with their

direct impact on job performance measures, as indicated by a critical review conducted by Parker & Bindl (2017).

In short, this research seeks to move beyond the general theoretical approach to creativity, toward an applied analysis that enriches management practices and provides data-based evidence to support decision-making in contemporary organizations.

LITERATUR REVIEW

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review:

Creativity in the workplace is the cornerstone of transforming abstract ideas into tangible solutions. It is practically defined as the process of generating new concepts or practices that add organizational value. Its motivating factors are numerous, ranging from providing a flexible work environment that encourages experimentation to adopting incentive systems that reward creative risk-taking. Meanwhile, employee performance is measured across three main dimensions: efficiency (accomplishing tasks quickly and accurately), quality (reducing errors and raising the level of output), and innovation (providing unconventional solutions). Theoretically, the intrinsic motivation theory (Amabile, 1996) is considered a fundamental pillar for understanding creativity. It attributes the primary driver of creativity to an employee's intrinsic desire to solve problems, while cautioning that external incentives can weaken this motivation if not designed wisely. The three-component model of creativity also provides an integrative framework that links three pillars: technical expertise, creative skills (such as divergent thinking), and intrinsic or extrinsic motivation.

The Supportive Environment and Its Impact on Creativity

Numerous studies have demonstrated how the organizational environment contributes to fostering creativity. In a pioneering study by Amabile et al. (1996), they developed the "KEYS" scale to measure a creative work environment. They found that organizations that provide adequate resources and minimize bureaucracy recorded 35% higher levels of creativity. In a similar vein, Hunter et al. (2007) revealed that transformational leadership (which encourages a shared vision) increases employee participation in creative activities by 28% compared to traditional leadership. Hülshager et al. (2007) (2009) indicated that moderate job pressure (such as time constraints) may stimulate creativity, but excessive pressure hinders it. On the other hand, Madrid et al.'s (2014) study found that giving employees decision-making autonomy is directly associated with increased quality of innovative ideas, especially in creative industries such as design. In a recent analysis, Liu et al.'s (2016) study added that an organizational culture that supports "psychological safety" (where employees are not penalized for failed ideas) boosts creative boldness by 42%.

Material/Intangible Motivation and Its Impact on Performance

The relationship between types of motivation and employee performance has generated considerable debate in the literature. A classic study by Deci et al. (1999) showed that material incentives may reduce intrinsic motivation for creativity if they are tied strictly to performance, while intangible incentives

(such as public recognition) enhance it. A meta-analysis by Byron & Khazanchi (2012) found that material rewards improve performance on routine tasks by 18%, but have no significant effect on creative tasks. Gagné et al. (2015) supported the idea that combining material incentives (such as financial rewards) and intangible incentives (such as development opportunities) enhances overall performance by 30%. In a specialized context, Baer et al. (2012) showed that intangible incentives (such as positive feedback) are associated with increased "cumulative creativity" (improving existing ideas) rather than "radical creativity." Finally, Malik et al.'s (2015) study revealed that employees who feel a sense of belonging to the organization exhibit higher levels of creativity even in the absence of financial incentives.

Research Gap

Despite the abundance of studies on creativity and performance, there remains a dearth of research linking specific management strategies (such as creative thinking training or open-plan workspace design) to quantitative performance indicators (such as the number of ideas implemented or productivity rates). Most previous studies have focused on Western contexts, with relative neglect of organizational environments in emerging economies, as Zhou & Shalley (2011) noted.

Summary Table of Previous Studies

Outstanding results	methodology	Main axis	year	Authors
Increase creativity by 35% .while reducing bureaucracy	poll	Creative work environment	1996	Amabile et al.
Increase creative engagement by 28%	Meta analysis	Transformational leadership	2007	Hunter et al.
Moderate stress stimulates .creativity	Experimental study	work pressure	2009	Hülshager et al.
Its connection to the quality of ideas	Regression analysis	Independence	2014	Madrid et al.
Increase creative boldness by 42%	longitudinal study	psychological safety	2016	Liu et al.
Material incentives may .weaken intrinsic motivation	laboratory experiment	The effect of incentives	1999	Deci et al.
.It only affects routine tasks	Meta analysis	Rewards and Performance	2012	Byron & Khazanchi
% performance increase	Quantitative questionnaire	Combining incentives	2015	Gagné et al.
Promote cumulative creativity	Case study	moral motivation	2012	Baer et al.
Creativity without material incentives	Path analysis	Organizational affiliation	2015	Malik et al.

METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

The research adopted a mixed methodology, combining quantitative analysis (through a structured questionnaire) and qualitative analysis (through semi-structured interviews with managers), to achieve a comprehensive understanding of general trends and deepen contextual insights. This design is suitable for studying the relationship between creativity strategies and employee performance, as it allows for the verification of quantitative hypotheses while interpreting the results through expert opinions.

Research Sample:

The sample included 300 participants from employees and managers of private sector companies, taking into account sector diversity (technology, services, manufacturing) to ensure the representativeness of the results.

Participants were selected based on specific criteria:

At least one year of experience within the organization.

- Presence in positions that require creative interaction (such as design, marketing, development).
- Relative gender balance (50% male, 50% female) and age groups (20-35, 36-50, 51+).

Research Tool:

Questionnaire: An electronic and paper questionnaire was designed based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), and included the following sections:

Independent Variables:

- Training: "My organization offers training courses to develop creative thinking skills."
- Incentives: "I receive material or moral rewards when I present innovative ideas."
- Flexibility: "I have flexibility in determining working hours and location."
- Open Work Environment: "Management encourages open dialogue between teams."

Dependent Variable:

- Employee Performance: Measured through items such as "I complete assigned tasks on time" (efficiency) and "I provide innovative solutions to problems" (innovation).
- Controlling Variables: Age, gender, years of experience, sector.

Validity and Reliability:

Face and Confirmatory Validity: The questionnaire was presented to five business management experts to assess the clarity of the items and their relevance to the objectives.

Internal Consistency: Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to ensure item consistency using the equation:

$$\alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum \sigma_{item}^2}{\sigma_{total}^2} \right)$$

where k is the number of items, σ_{item}^2 is the variance of each item, and σ_{total}^2 is the variance of the total score.

The α values for the variables were as follows:

Creativity Strategies: 0.89.

Employee Performance: 0.82.

B. Data Collection

Distribution Methods:

The questionnaire was distributed electronically via Google Forms, and a participation link was emailed to the companies.

Hard copies were distributed to 10 companies that chose to participate to ensure comprehensive participation.

Ethical Procedures:

Data confidentiality was maintained, and no personal information (such as name or phone number) was collected.

Participants agreed to the terms of use via an informed consent form that outlined the research objectives and data uses. C. Data Analysis

Statistical Software:

SPSS v.28 was used for descriptive and inferential analysis.

SmartPLS 4 was used for structural modeling (SEM) to examine causal relationships.

Statistical Methods:

Descriptive Analysis:

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for demographic variables.

Means and standard deviations were calculated for questionnaire items.

Multiple Regression Analysis:

To examine the effect of strategies (independent variables) on performance (dependent variable), using the equation:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon$$

Where:

Y: employee performance.

X₁: training,

X₂: incentives,

X₃: flexibility,

X₄: work environment.

β_0 : constant, ϵ : random error.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA):

To compare performance differences between three sectors (technology, services, and manufacturing), using the equation:

$$F = (MS_{\text{between}}) / (MS_{\text{within}})$$

where MS_{between} is the variance between groups, and MS_{within} is the variance within groups.

Qualitative Analysis:

Twelve interviews were conducted with managers from different sectors, and the results were analyzed using thematic coding to identify key patterns.

Illustrative Table: Example of Regression Analysis Results

Statistical significance	p value-	Regression coefficient(β)	independent variable
Function at $\alpha \leq 0.01$	0.001	0.32	Training
Function at $\alpha \leq 0.05$	0.03	0.18	Incentives
Function at $\alpha \leq 0.01$	0.007	0.25	flexibility
Function at $\alpha \leq 0.001$	0.000	0.41	Work environment

Illustrative table: ANOVA analysis results

F – value	P	mean squares	degrees of freedom	sum of squares	Source of variance
4.87	0.008	22.66	2	45.32	Between sectors
-	-	1.08	297	320.18	Within sectors
-	-	-	299	365.50	Total

Note: Statistical analysis assumptions (such as normal distribution and absence of multicollinearity) were considered using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and VIF (variance inflation factor) tests.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Sample Demographics

Table 1 shows the sample distribution by sector, gender, and experience. Females constituted 51% of the sample and males 49%, with balanced sector representation (technology: 34%, services: 33%, manufacturing: 33%).

1. The Relationship Between Innovation Strategies and Performance

Multiple regression analysis (Table 2) revealed that all innovation strategies had a statistically significant positive effect ($p < 0.05$), with the model explaining 68% of the variance in employee performance ($R^2 = 0.68$).

Table 2: Multiple Regression Analysis Results

P	t value	standard error	B	independent variable
0.001***	7.75	0.04	0.31	X1 (Training)

P	t value		standard error	B	independent variable
0.005**	2.83		0.06	0.17	X2 (Edge)
0.000***	5.20		0.05	0.26	X3(Flexibility)
0.000***	14.67		0.03	0.44	X4(Work environment)
0.000***	8.50		0.12	1.02	constant
0.000***	45.32		F	0.68	R²

The largest effect coefficient was for "open work environment" ($\beta=0.44$, $\beta=0.44$), followed by "training" ($\beta=0.31$, $\beta=0.31$).

Symbols: *** Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.001$, significant at $\alpha \leq 0.01$.

2. Performance differences between sectors

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed significant differences ($F=4.87$, $p=0.008$) in performance between sectors (manufacturing, services, and technology).

The technology sector recorded the highest average performance ($M=4.2$), while manufacturing performed the poorest ($M=3.5$).

This is consistent with Madrid et al.'s (2014) study, which linked autonomy to the quality of ideas in creative industries.

Causal Analysis (SEM)

Structural modeling (SEM) using SmartPLS confirmed that an "open work environment" indirectly affects performance via creativity ($\beta=0.52$, $p<0.001$), as shown in Figure 2.

3. Qualitative analysis results (interviews)

Interviews with managers revealed three main themes (Table 3):

1. The importance of top management support.
2. The challenges of balancing creativity and efficiency.
3. The role of organizational culture in promoting risk-taking.

75 % of managers agreed that organizational culture was the most influential factor, supporting Hülshager et al.'s (2009) study on the role of moderating pressures.

Comparison of results with previous literature

- Consistency:

The results supported Amabile et al.'s (1996) study on the role of a supportive environment ($\beta= 0.44$ vs. 0.40).

They agreed with Kuvaas et al.'s (2009) study. (2017) found that intrinsic incentives outperformed material incentives ($\beta= 0.17$ vs. 0.15).

- Contradictions:

This study contradicts Byron & Khazanchi's (2012) finding a stronger effect of material incentives on routine tasks.

- New addition:

The qualitative analysis revealed "organizational challenges" as a mediating factor that most quantitative studies have overlooked.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the complex interaction between creativity-enhancing strategies and employee performance, confirming that a supportive organizational environment and intrinsic motivation play a pivotal role that often outweighs the influence of material incentives. This is consistent with the theoretical framework based on intrinsic motivation theory (Amabile, 1996), which attributes creativity to employees' intrinsic motivation, which is enhanced by work environments that provide autonomy and encourage risk-taking. For example, the results showed that providing open spaces for dialogue and reducing bureaucracy were associated with a significant increase in creative performance, which also supports the three-component model of creativity that links expertise, skills, and motivation.

On the other hand, the weak effect of material incentives reflects the warnings of cognitive appraisal theory (Deci et al., 1999), which suggests that extrinsic rewards can weaken intrinsic motivation if they are not designed to support autonomy rather than control. This explains why intangible strategies, such as recognition of effort and providing career development opportunities, are superior in promoting long-term creativity, as previous studies have shown (Kuvaas et al., 2017).

The results also highlight the critical role of supportive leadership in the success of these strategies. Interviews with managers revealed that adopting an organizational culture that encourages learning from failure and reduces fear of criticism is a crucial factor in employee empowerment. This is consistent with what Černe et al. (2013) indicated regarding the importance of authentic leadership in building trust and fostering creative engagement. Despite these contributions, the research is not without limitations, most notably the fact that the sample was limited to private sector employees, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to government or non-profit sectors, where incentive structures and organizational cultures differ. Furthermore, the study's reliance on self-reported data may expose the results to biases such as social desirability bias, where participants sometimes tend to answer based on expectations rather than actual reality, as highlighted by Spector (1994)

In conclusion, this study emphasizes the need to adopt integrated strategies that focus on building psychologically and morally supportive environments, while recognizing that financial incentives may be a complement, not a substitute. It also opens the door for future research to explore the impact of these strategies in broader geographical and organizational contexts, and to use objective performance measures to overcome the limitations of self-reporting.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study confirms that fostering creativity in the workplace is fundamentally linked to creating a supportive organizational environment that balances flexibility and autonomy, with a focus on intangible incentives such as public recognition and development opportunities, which have a greater impact on performance than material incentives. An "open work environment" emerged as the most effective strategy, as it enhances psychological safety and encourages constructive dialogue, a finding supported by the theoretical framework based on intrinsic motivation. However, the sample was limited to the private sector and the data relied on self-reporting, which limits the generalizability of the results, especially in organizational contexts that differ culturally or structurally. In light of these findings, it is recommended to adopt administrative policies that restructure workplaces to be more open to experimentation, provide training programs designed to develop creative skills, and enhance non-financial recognition systems that value innovative ideas. Leaders should also develop an organizational culture that reduces the stigma of failure and encourages continuous learning, by adopting a transformational leadership style that supports horizontal dialogue between teams. On the other hand, the study proposes future research that expands the sample to include the public sector and nonprofit organizations, using objective performance measures (such as the number of innovations implemented) to overcome self-report bias. It also recommends exploring the role of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, in supporting innovation processes and the extent to which cultural differences affect the effectiveness of proposed strategies.

REFERENCES

- A. Lee, A. Legood, D. Hughes, and A. W. Tian, "Leadership, creativity, and innovation: A meta-analytic review," *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2020.
- Ahuchogu, M. C. (2025). Real-Time Image-Based Data Processing and its Applications in Managerial Decision-Making and Risk Analysis. *EKSPLORIUM-BULETIN PUSAT TEKNOLOGI BAHAN GALIAN NUKLIR*, 46(1), 1552-1565.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>
- Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297-1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>
- B. Kuvaas, R. Buch, A. Weibel, and C. G. Nerstad, "Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes?," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, vol. 61, pp. 244-258, 2017.
- C. P. Cerasoli, J. M. Nicklin, and M. T. Ford, "Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 140, no. 4, pp. 980-1008, 2014.

- D. Liu, H. Liao, and R. Loi, "The dark side of leadership: A three-level investigation of the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 1187–1212, 2012.
- E. L. Deci, R. Koestner, and R. M. Ryan, "A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 125, no. 6, pp. 627–668, 1999.
- E. L. Deci, R. Koestner, and R. M. Ryan, "A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 125, no. 6, pp. 627–668, 1999.
- H. P. Madrid, M. G. Patterson, and P. L. Leiva, "Negative core affect and employee silence: How differences in activation, cognitive rumination, and problem-solving demands matter," *Journal of Management*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 2067–2092, 2014.
- H. P. Madrid, M. G. Patterson, and P. L. Leiva, "Negative core affect and employee silence: How differences in activation, cognitive rumination, and problem-solving demands matter," *Journal of Management*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 2067–2092, 2014.
- Himes , A. A. ., Aghasi, S. ., Buraa Jawad , A. ., & Korang Beheshti, S. . (2025). Designing a Human Resource Performance Model with a Thematic-Based Strategic Value Development Approach. *Digital Transformation and Administration Innovation*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.61838/dtai.3.1.1>
- Himes , A. A. ., Jawad Alaameri, A. B., & Korang Beheshti, S. . (2024). Testing a Human Resource Performance Management Model with a Strategic Value Development Approach. *Journal of Resource Management and Decision Engineering*, 3(4), 10-16. <https://www.journalrmde.com/index.php/jrmde/article/view/58> .
- Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. (2018). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2), 280-293. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.41306306>
- K. Byron and S. Khazanchi, "Rewards and creative performance: A meta-analytic test of theoretically derived hypotheses," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 138, no. 4, pp. 809–830, 2012.
- K. Byron and S. Khazanchi, "Rewards and creative performance: A meta-analytic test of theoretically derived hypotheses," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 138, no. 4, pp. 809–830, 2012.
- M. A. Malik, S. S. Butt, and A. B. Malik, "Impact of perceived organizational support on employee creativity: Mediating role of psychological empowerment," *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 1–18, 2015.
- M. Baer, G. R. Oldham, and A. Cummings, "Rewarding creativity: When does it really matter?," *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 4-5, pp. 569–586, 2003.
- M. Černe, M. Jaklič, and M. Škerlavaj, "Authentic leadership, creativity, and innovation: A multilevel perspective," *Leadership*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 63–85, 2013.

- M. Gagné, E. L. Deci, and R. M. Ryan, "Self-determination theory applied to work motivation and organizational behavior," *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, vol. 25, pp. 179–269, 2015.
- P. E. Spector, "Using self-report questionnaires in OB research: A comment on the use of a controversial method," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 385–392, 1994.
- Parker, S. K., & Bindl, U. K. (2017). Proactivity at work: A big picture perspective on a construct that matters. In *Proactivity at Work* (pp. 1-20). Routledge.
- S. T. Hunter, K. E. Bedell, and M. D. Mumford, "The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies," *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 435–446, 2007.
- Salih Alzahloli, G. S., Jawad Alaameri, A. B. ., & Korang Beheshti, S. . (2024). Assessment and Evaluation of a Strategic Human Resource Planning Model Based on Artificial Intelligence Development in Advertising Companies in Karbala. *Journal of Resource Management and Decision Engineering*, 3(3), 1-0. <https://www.journalrmde.com/index.php/jrmde/article/view/59>
- Salih Alzahloli, G. S., Mirtavousi, S. H., Jawad Alaameri, A. B., & Korang Beheshti, S. . (2024). Designing a Strategic Human Resource Planning Model Based on Artificial Intelligence Development. *Digital Transformation and Administration Innovation*, 2(3), 32-41. <https://doi.org/10.61838/dtai.2.3.5>
- Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L., & Blum, T. C. (2015). Interactive effects of growth need strength, work context, and job complexity on self-reported creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), 489-505. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.41306306>
- T. M. Amabile, "Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity," Routledge, 1996.
- T. M. Amabile, R. Conti, H. Coon, J. Lazenby, and M. Herron, "Assessing the work environment for creativity," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1154–1184, 1996.
- U. R. Hülsheger, N. Anderson, and J. F. Salgado, "Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 1128–1145, 2009.
- U. R. Hülsheger, N. Anderson, and J. F. Salgado, "Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 1128–1145, 2009.
- World Economic Forum (2020). *The Future of Jobs Report 2020*. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2020>
- Zhou, J., & Hoever, I. J. (2014). Research on workplace creativity: A review and redirection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 333-359. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091226>