Kindai Management Review Vol. 6, 2018 (ISSN: 2186-6961)

Creative Industries: Managers' Perceived Creativity and Innovation Practices

Fernando Cardoso de Sousa

University of the Algarve. Campus de Gambelas, Portugal

Florbela Nunes

University of Evora. Colégio do Espírito Santo, Portugal

Ileana Pardal Monteiro

University of the Algarve. Campus de Gambelas, Portugal

Abstract

This article aims to demonstrate that the relationship between entrepreneurs' perceived attitudes to creativity and business innovation practices is stronger in the case of creative industries. A sample of 454 managers of micro and medium-sized companies (94 belonging to creative industries) was surveyed, using an inventory of innovative business practices, and the scale of attitudes towards creativity. The results, derived from a linear regression model (two factors for the scale of attitudes – leadership and autonomy – and for the inventory of business practices – business and strategy) confirmed the proposition by revealing the influence of the creative attitudes of managers on the company's innovative practices, fundamentally on strategy, especially in the creative industries segment. The innovative manager appeared as a disciplined individual, driven to collaborating with the employees. Because the creative industries include a wide range of businesses, from the public sponsored companies to the growing digital sector, further evidence is necessary to situate the managers who correspond to the interesting characterization found.

Keywords: *Creativity, Innovation, Creative Management, Creative Industries, Cultural Industries*

INTRODUCTION

Following the statements of Coakes and Smith (2007), only innovation can allow a company to continue to optimize the introduction of original products at the right time, in the right market, and with the right distribution network. In turn, Tucker (2008) states that the only thing that separates the company from the competition are the ideas, knowledge, commitment and skills of innovation of employees. So, being innovation the general rule in organizations, creativity becomes not only desired but sought, with companies striving to incorporate it into their culture. Thus, the organizational strategies are increasingly focusing on creativity that, in general, is associated with the innovation practices (Keogh & McAdam, 2004). Creativity thus supports a corporate culture that encourages innovative expression, with a strong relationship with entrepreneurship (Drucker, 1985). In turn, the attitudes of entrepreneurs towards creativity influence the type of leadership exercised, and various authors (e.g. Cummings & O'Connell, 1978; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Wood-

man, Sawyer & Griffin, 1993), point to the influence of leadership on organizational innovation, which McAdam and Keogh (2004) found having a positive effect on micro and small enterprises. This influence between leadership and innovation is seen more often in the so-called "creative industries" (Bilton, 2007) because of the collaborative nature of a business activity connected to art and technology.

Thus, given that in the Portuguese business context one can get examples of such industries, this article aims at demonstrating that the influence of creative attitudes on innovative business practices is evident when considering entrepreneurs running micro-enterprises, and small and medium companies (SMEs), whose activities fall in what is meant by creative industries. Because of this influence, after describing approaches to creative industries, creativity and innovation, and their insertion in a model closer to this type of industry, the article discusses the attitudes of management in the face of creativity and its role in company innovation. After this presentation, the investigation is described, ending with a discussion of the results and conclusions.

CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

The notion of creative industry is associated with economic and social changes that displace the focus of industrial activities to those related with knowledge. It emerged in the early 1990s in Australia, assuming greater importance when integrated in the policies defined in the United Kingdom, the DCMS (*Department of Culture, Media and Sports*), in 1997. Although having its roots in a range of very old activities, the term "creative industry" only came into existence with the advent of digital technology. Its antecedent "cultural industry" became common since Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer mentioned it in their essay "The culture industry: Enlightenment as mass deception", in 1947. The most striking innovation of this terminology, set by the DCMS, was its identification with a "new economy", driven by digital technologies, and closely related with "information" or "knowledge economy". It was the exploitation of intellectual property rights that was seen to provide the crucial link, positioning the creative industries at the forefront of economic competitiveness. The inclusion of appropriate software made the statistics look more impressive and fundamental for the creation of the creative industries as an object of policy (O'Connor, 2010). As a consequence, one key objective of these policies was to get the sector recognize itself precisely as a sector, which may well make us think that the creative industries are not an "industry" at all, but part of the innovation system of the economy.

Associated with economic growth revitalization, "creative industries" is a concept that varies from country to country, turning it almost impossible to make comparisons (Newbigin, 2014). However, it always includes activities in which creativity is incorporated into the core of the business, being simultaneously "art, science and business" (Henry, 2007). These industries include a wide range of activities with a common characteristic: they rely heavily on imagination and individual creativity and, according to Hartley (2005), are associated with skill and talent. Nevertheless, not every job is creative and many outside of its scope are. According with Newbigin (2014), the number of jobs in the non-creative industries is probably greater than in the creative ones.

The DCMS believe that the creative industry is in production and distribution circuits of goods and services that use creativity and intellectual capital as raw materials, as focused by Howkins (2001), connecting the creative industries to value attribution to knowledge, work and intellectual property.

The emergence of the knowledge society (Castells, 2000) is oriented to an economy based on the individual and his intellectual resources, together with information and knowledge exchange capacity, in contrast with an economy centered on the intensive use of capital and work, and oriented to mass production. In a post-materialistic society the interests no longer revolve around the satisfaction of basic needs but around the aesthetic, intellectual, life quality and participation needs, carried out with autonomy.

This change is associated with a discourse about the change in values, disruptions and innovation (Howkins, 2001). In fact, the current trend focuses on the individual and reflects changes in terms of

values, personal preferences, lifestyles and consumption patterns, different and apart from traditional behaviors. The change that puts creativity and innovation as a central element of the organizations is an individual and collective one, being critical to the organizations' development, performance and competitiveness (Mumford, 2012). Similarly, Howkins (2001) associates the creative industries to the "imperatives" of originality, with a focus on creativity and innovation, a creative economy, and presenting ways of turning ideas into money.

The year 2008 also represents a milestone, when UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) (UNESCO, 2008) established the creative economy as a way to boost economic growth, representing an alternative for development, especially for being based on creativity and able to use cultural and social characteristics of each country/region as an advantage for the development and production of unique and competitive goods and services.

In general terms, the benefits of the creative economy can be found in four levels: (a) job creation, exportation, social inclusion and cultural diversity; (b) intertwining of economy, culture and social aspects with technology, intellectual property and tourism objectives; (c) economic system based on knowledge, developing links between elements of macro and micro economy; and (d) development of innovation through multidisciplinary policies. At the same time, support policies by governments become important to enable creative businesses, which have grown over time. Creative industries also reflect small under-capitalized companies that, although providing jobs at twice the rate of the economy as a whole, deal with individuals taking a succession of different jobs, many of which are based on one-off short term projects (Carr, 2009).

We are witnessing an integrated and consistent vision which calls for the growing importance of the creative economy and affirms its value and benefits for growth and socio-economic development (Caves, 2001; Florida, 2002; Bendassolli, Kirschbaum, & Cunha, 2009; UNESCO, 2010; DCMS, 2012). This line highlights four components considered inseparable from the disruptive nature of the creative industries:

- Creativity is the central element, necessary and essential for production.
- Coupled with different resources management, the convergence between arts, business and technology is cultivated.
- The generation of innovative content can be translated into salable products.
- The economic value is based on the cultural and intellectual property.

This phenomenon has in common the ability to generate and trade ideas with "significant value", and Throsby (2004) identifies a set of dimensions to this value:

Aesthetic - reflects beauty, harmony and form.
Spiritual - seeks spiritual meaning shared by all human beings, including understanding, insight and awareness.
Social - creates links between individuals, fostering an environment in which the relationships and identities can thrive.
History - ensures clarity and a sense of continuity with the present.
Symbolic - gives meaning and symbolic value, which will be broadcast by work to the consumer.
Authenticity - stresses the fact that a work of art represents reality, is original and unique.

Indeed, the creative industries represent the economic areas that, in the early years of the twenty-first century, have assumed greater importance, giving place to the growth of central sectors to success and economic development (Fleming, 2008; Henry, 2007). Taking the UK as an example, the creative industries can help transform some cities, as is the case of Manchester and Glasgow, being London a case of higher economic and social weight. Nevertheless, these industries also face the challenge of longer-term growth, together with the improvement of their business models. As some authors (Carr, 2009) indicate, they lack the adoption of business models common in other sectors of the economy.

In Portugal, the dissemination and promotion of the creative economy is a strategic objective and, in accordance with paragraph 8 of the Technologi-

cal Plan Coordination Unit (2005), sectors included in the creative industry concept are: advertising, architecture, art and antiques market, design, fashion, audiovisual productions, educational software and leisure, music, performing arts and entertainment, broadcast through television, radio and internet, writing and publishing, and can include other economic activities involving cutting-edge technologies, such as research in life sciences or engineering. The cultural heritage, tourism and museums are also identified as being close to the creative industries.

The macroeconomic study of Mateus (2010), on the development of a cluster of creative industries, linking innovation to the creative industries and their concentration, responds to the challenge of mapping a region. At the same time, it is also an example of the opportunity to propose a new development paradigm that joins culture and economy, recognizing that creativity, knowledge, innovation and access to information are the engines of development in the global world.

CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

As Woodman & Schoenfeld (1990) recall, the term *creativity* can be seen either as a social concept, expressed by people's implicit theories, or as a theoretical construct, developed by researchers in the field. Considering the theoretical definitions, and after carefully analysing the propositions evidenced by Kasof (1995), it is possible to conclude that the construction of creativity was (and still is) used in scientific literature to designate something perceived by others. Stein (1953) maintains that, "creativity is a process that results in novelty which is accepted as useful, tenable, or satisfying by a significant group of others at some point in time." Amabile (1983) states that, "a product or response is creative to the extent that appropriate observers independently agree it is creative. ...and it can also be regarded as the process by which something so judged is produced." These examples illustrate what may be designated as "hetero-attributed creativity", something pertaining to the communication process.

As the product of that communication process, creativity appears connected to what is perceived as new by someone other than its originator, or as the putting to use of an idea (Kanter, 1983; West & Farr, 1990), in the domains of production, adoption, implementation, diffusion, or commercialisation of creations (Rogers, 1983; Spence, 1994). In these cases, creativity is seen as innovation.

As explained in Sousa (2008), creativity seems then to acquire its full meaning as a process of communication between the creator (or the product) and the judges or audience (hetero-attributed), or between the creator and the product (self-attributed). Innovation seems to be more appropriate to designate the resulting attribution made by the audience *a propos* the product. As a consequence, hetero-attributed creativity can only be measured through socio-cultural judgements, and is therefore context-dependent. Quoting Csikszentmihalyi (1991), "creativity is located in neither the creator nor the creative product but rather in the interaction between the creator and the field's gatekeeper who selectively retains or rejects original products."

As to innovation, Ghoshal and Bartlett (1987) classify it into broadly two categories: those that see innovation as the final product—the idea, practice, or material artifact that has been invented or that is regarded as novel independent of its adoption or non-adoption—and those who see it as a process, which proceeds from the conceptualization of a new idea to a solution of the problem and then to the actual utilization of a new item of economic or social value. However this distinction between creativity (undoubtedly the source of the whole process), and innovation is a minor issue in the corporate context, since the most important question turns out to be with regards to the system that allows putting the ideas into practice. Therefore, for every creative act producing an idea or a product, a social act is required to promote it in the organization and that is the reason why real innovation in companies is always a team effort (Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993). Every innovation starts with an initial idea but needs a system to expand the individual creativity and install it at the group level. This group will need to solve a wide variety of problems resulting from the adoption, dissemination and implementation of this product.

As Burns & Stalker (1996) explained, if innovation does not necessarily need creativity to emerge,

for it can be reached by introducing new techniques or technologies, it cannot be ignored during the adaptation process required to succeed in the market. Innovation for the sake of innovation can even be harmful to the enterprise, as happened when Coca-Cola tried a different flavor, or it could happen if McDonald's changed its production chain.

Individual creativity seems always to be the starting point, because it may exist even in the absence of innovation. As to innovation (Kilbourne & Woodman, 1999) it depends on a wide number of variables besides creativity, such as autonomy, the available information, the reward system, education or training, the system of authority, participation in decision-making, or the team cohesion.

ATTITUDES AND CREATIVE MANAGEMENT

The construct of "attitude" was formulated by Allport (1935; 810) to designate a *mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive and dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related, activating affective, cognitive and behavioral processes*. Some researchers noted that these three parts are deeply intertwined, thus preferring to adopt a single dimension, defining attitude as a *summary evaluation of an object of thought* (Vogel & Wänke, 2016). In the present work we adopt the latter definition, speaking of attitudes as an evaluation towards a presented social object – in this case, creativity.

The discussion regarding whether such evaluations must be stable and consistent over time, retrieved from long term memory, following the "file-drawer model" (Wilson & Hodges, 1990), or if it may form on temporary or recent information as in the "attitude as construction perspective", in such a way that context is likely to influence individual's attitudes. Allport's seminal work has established attitude formation as a process of organization and sense making of experiences, thus influencing individual behavior. Following the author's work, we may state that information towards present or past behavior may determine the construction of an attitude.

In organizational context, Basadur and Basadur (2012) explain that attitudes towards creativity play a function of adaptation to the environment and may relate to the search of original and valuable strategies of reality interpretation, which promotes innovative practices. Management plays a fundamental role in analyzing the context, identifying problems and searching for corresponding solutions in a way that builds a creative attitude. And Goodman (1995) used the term of management's *creative response* to refer to the way managers give structure to the organizational context, manages team's autonomy in project development, and uses participatory processes. In addition, Gomes, Rodrigues, and Veloso (2015) show the importance of managers' role in bundling the contextual factors that help to create a system in which creativity and innovation become embedded in the organizational culture.

A manager's creative attitude is strongly related to the search for opportunities and differentiated experiences (Florida, 2002), as creativity is the result of hard work and profound knowledge in the domain one is working in. Research focused on creative industries and the management of creative people showed some tensions and paradoxes, as did the need for freedom and total devotion to the art, together with the need to manage the business in very organized terms (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006). These tensions also emerged in Armstrong and Page's (2015) research, aiming at identifying leadership and management of creative people in United Kingdom's creative industries, showing five major tensions of the creative leader. Firstly, the tension between *commercial constraints* – centered on the effort to commercialize the products and on restrictions to experimentation – and *creative freedom* – focused on the creation and experimentation requiring few restrictions. Secondly, management roles fear failure and do not appreciate new experiences, preferring to *stick to the tried and tested*, versus the *appetite for risk*, which drives the creative leader to try new solutions, new products and develop new talents. A third tension refers to *competition* opposed to *collaboration* – competition which imposes secrecy to protect the ideas, the intellectual property keeping business under control and collaboration indispensable to creativity, helping to develop new ideas and maintain openness to others and new opportunities. A fourth

tension deals with *automation*, granting faster results and cost reduction, versus *craft skills*, which uses technology to develop creative processes. Finally, time horizon; *long-term*, dealing with strategy, people management and talent development, and *short-term*, experimenting, improving and project management. The leaders, in Armstrong and Page's (2015) research, highlight the importance of mentors or role models helping them to develop the attitudes suitable to creative industries and creative people.

These considerations allow us to establish the proposition stating that managers' attitude towards creativity and managerial innovation practices is stronger in the creative industry sector, as we try to demonstrate in the following section.

METHOD

To study the research question, a multiple linear regression analysis, with *stepwise* selection of variables, was used to obtain a parsimonious model that allowed to make predictions about the dependent variables.

Subjects

The study was carried out using an opportunity sample consisting of 454 subjects, responsible for micro and SMEs in Portugal. Managers in the sample were predominantly male, representing 71% of respondents. Aged between 23 and 84 years (mean 44), the majority (59%) had higher qualifications and more than 25% had completed secondary education. About half (42%) of the subjects had an entrepreneurial experience higher than 10 years and the vast majority (84%) had previous professional experience (average 6 years).

In the study, micro and small companies were predominant: 61% had fewer than 10 employees and 33% between 10 and 49; only the remaining 6% were medium-sized enterprises, hiring more than 50 people. These companies were headquartered mainly in the North and Centre (30% and 29%, respectively), from Lisbon and Tagus Valley, while the South had the remaining 30%.

Considering the sectors included in the concept of "creative industry", a segment composed of 94 managers was selected. This segment was responsible for companies with consulting activities, media and advertising, social support services and education, crafts, art, recreation and leisure. It represented 21% of the sample described, being similar in terms of gender, previous experience, size, and geographical distribution, in relation to the total sample. Managers of this segment constituted, however, a younger group, with a mean age of 41 years and with a lower level of education, where only 38% had a grade school of higher education and about half (53%) had completed secondary education. Business experience was also lower, as only about a third (34%) was manager for over 10 years.

Instrument

The data collection was carried out with questionnaires consisting of an inventory and a scale. The inventory was intended to identify innovative business practices and, in its preparation, the structure and application form contents of the SME Innovation Network COTEC Portugal (Business Association for Innovation), were considered. The general objectives of COTEC's inventory are to promote public recognition of a group of SMEs by their attitude and innovative activity. This form was adapted to our target population and resulted in an instrument addressing four themes, or dimensions of cross-business innovation:

1. Conditions: involving the strategic aspects susceptible to influence entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors towards innovation, which includes culture, leadership and business strategy.
2. Resources: refers to the contribution of different types of organizational resources to ensure more dynamic and better innovation performance, involving human capital, skills and foreign relations.
3. Processes: concerns the most relevant organizational processes for innovative dynamics of the organization, and its performance in terms of innovation. It involves the management of IDI activities, learning and results.
4. Results: ascertains to what extent conditions, resources and process-oriented innovation translates themselves into results. This

involves the financial and operational aspects, the market and society.

The inventory of innovative business practices consisted of a total of 20 binary questions with dichotomous answers (yes / no). The collection of items took into account the objectives of the original instrument and what was intended with its adaptation, which aimed to verify the existence of certain behaviors, assigning a code for expression of a given characteristic and, the other, the absence of that feature.

This instrument was submitted to the validation of COTEC Portugal, where the person in charge of the SME Innovation Network, responded positively to the adjustments made, having suggested changes in its use. The association was also informed that the inventory would be used along with the scale.

The scale was designed to identify creative attitudes by self-perception. Its development came from the creative investment theory, from Sternberg and Lubart (1991; 1996), which refers to the confluence of different sources of investment in creativity that interact with each other, consisting of six dimensions that describe:

1. Intelligence: points out the theoretical and practical ability to redefine problems, analyze and recognize good ideas and persuade the value of one's own ideas. It involves synthetic capabilities, analytical and practical-contextual.
2. Cognitive styles: relates to the way of thinking and how the person exploits and uses the intelligence. It involves the legislative styles, executive and judicial.
3. Knowledge: concerns explicit or tacit knowledge, acquired by books and documents, and by practice, respectively.
4. Personality: involves the set of features that characterize the individual. It includes aspects such as the willingness to take risks, trust in oneself, tolerance for ambiguity, courage to express new ideas, perseverance and self-esteem.
5. Motivation: refers to the driving force of creative performance. An oriented task determines the passion and concentration, and energy at work.
6. Environmental context: refers to the environment in interaction with the individual, which facilitates creative expression. It involves aspects such as family, school, organizations and society, contributing, directly or indirectly, to creative expression.

The scale consisted of 36 questions, and the answer to the items was carried out using a four-point Likert-type matrix, expressed in terms of agreement: 1- strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 – agree, and 4 - totally agree. We opted for a forced scale in which the average option neither agreed nor disagreed, so that the respondents had to avoid central tendency. The items were written in the positive, for the sake of clarity and simplicity, across the six dimensions, with a total of nine items for each dimension.

Confirmation of the metric characteristics of the instruments was ensured by a pilot study with 180 entrepreneurs who subsequently joined the sample. The descriptive analysis of the results of responses to the instruments showed a normal distribution, mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum for each item.

In order to identify a smaller number of variables, by reducing the complexity of the analysis, we chose the factor analysis of the instruments, using the extraction of the principal components with varimax rotation. The inventory of business practices, after eliminating 10 items, resulted in two factors, explaining 48% of the variance, with Factor 1 - *Performance* (prestige and image, development of the business sector and the creation of skilled employment) with an coefficient alpha 0.75, and Factor 2 - *Strategy* (employee participation, goal setting, human resources management, external cooperation and management, and evaluation of activities), with a coefficient of 0.67. The composition of each factor is shown in Table 1.

As shown in Table 2, from the range of creative attitudes resulted factors with a coefficient alpha of 0.85, for factor 1, and 0.79, for factor 2, obtained after deleting 11 items. The study of dimensionality allowed the definition of two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, which explained 48% of the variance:

Table 1: Saturations of Each Item of Inventory of Innovative Business Practices, After Varimax Rotation, and Respective Percentage of Explained Variance

Items	Factors (% explained variance)	
	Performance (26%)	Strategy (22%)
The innovation activities have a positive contribution to financial performance.	**,68**	,07
The human capital has a positive contribution to financial performance.	**,61**	,15
The innovation activity contributes to the prestige and good image.	**,84**	,15
The innovation activity has a positive impact on their activity sector.	**,79**	,07
The innovation activity has a positive impact in terms of skilled job creation.	**,56**	,12
It has a clear and shared innovation strategy, involving workers in its definition.	,19	**,66**
It has an innovation strategy translated into an action plan with medium and long term goals.	,09	**,72**
It has a human resource management policy geared to innovation.	,06	**,51**
It develops systematic cooperation actions in innovation with external entities	,05	**,60**
It offers process management and evaluation of innovation activities.	,22	**,73**

Table 2: Saturations of Each Item of the Scale Attitudes Towards Creativity, After Varimax Rotation, and Respective Percentage of Explained Variance

Items	Factors (% explained variance)	
	Leadership (29%)	Autonomy (19%)
I seek new solutions to respond to old problems.	**,57**	,08
I easily identify good ideas or projects.	**,56**	,18
I easily expose ideas and projects.	**,51**	,35
I mobilize others to follow my ideas.	**,64**	,03
I value the skills of my staff.	**,63**	,14
I share the idea that are learned every day.	**,63**	,09
If necessary, I change my routines.	**,70**	,13
I adapt myself easily to new environments.	**,75**	,08
I am able to express my ideas, even in unfavorable circumstances	**,63**	,30
Usually I don't give up in the face of difficulties.	**,65**	,26
I organize daily activities in a clear way.	,01	**,79**
I set goals to improve my performance.	,17	**,75**
I dedicate myself to work with method and rigor.	,05	**,79**
I seek to implement clear projects.	,38	**,63**
I concentrate easily on the tasks ahead.	,42	**,54**

- Leadership - defined by imaginative capacity, capacity assessment, exposure fluidity, mobilization of the other, valuing the other, humility, flexibility, adaptability, security and persistence.
- Autonomy - defined by organizational skills, self-assessment, dedication to work, objectivity and ability to concentrate.

This resulted in two instruments, with two factors each, but with different scales (dichotomous for innovation practices and seven points to attitudes towards creativity), and with few effects of collinearity (significant regression coefficients and correlations between factors of different instruments with less than 0.2), which, along with the internal consistency of the factors, came in support of its validity.

Table 3: Values of Explained Variance (R2), and Regression Coefficient (B), and Respective Significance of the Variables "Autonomy" and "Leadership", in Each of the Factors of "Innovation Practices" (N=454).

Factors (Creative Attitudes)		Factors (Innovation Practices)	
		Performance	Strategy
	R^2	.03(**)	.07 (**)
Leadership	β	.13 (**)	.12 (*)
Autonomy	β	.07	.18 (**)

(**) Significant to p<.01; (*) Significant to p<.05

Table 4: Values of Explained Variance (R2), Regression Coefficient (B), and Respective Significance of the Variables "Autonomy" And "Leadership", in Each of the Factors of "Innovation Practices" for Creative Industries (N=94).

Factors (Creative Attitudes)		Factors (Innovation Practices)	
		Performance	Strategy
	R^2	.05 (*)	.14 (**)
Leadership	β	.25 (*)	.19
Autonomy	β	-.10	.26 (*)

(**) Significant to p<.01; (*) Significant to p<.05

PROCEDURE

As mentioned above, the data collection was carried out with a questionnaire consisting of two parts: an inventory of innovative business practices and an auto-perception range of creative attitudes.

About 3,250 Portuguese companies - Micro and SME - based in Portugal, were contacted, regardless of the industry. This process resulted in 454 valid responses (14% of the target population), obtained electronically. As to ethical considerations, the first concern was with the establishment of an agreement with the organizations involved in this research.

RESULTS

Considering the research question of this investigation (*What is the relationship between the creative attitudes of entrepreneurs and their innovative business practices?*), we looked to answer it by means of a multiple linear regression, having the business practices' dependent variables (performance and strategy factors) as a function of the independent variable creative attitudes (factors leadership and autonomy).

The results generally showed the influence of creative attitudes on innovative business practices, verifying that managers' leadership and autonomy influenced their strategy and performance. As indicated in Table 3, and taking performance as the dependent variable, the model explained a significant variance percentage (3%), where Leadership is responsible for this variability, having Autonomy been deleted. Taking strategy as a dependent variable, it was found that the explained variance increased (7%) due to the autonomy factor, but still with both factors identified as predictors.

It was observed that the attitude towards leadership influenced the performance indices and the attitude towards the autonomy (the strategy indices). Finally it was examined till what extent the segment of creative industries differed in the linear regression, and the results are shown in Table 4. In the analysis of this group - 94 managers - it was found that the relationship was strengthened, in particular the attitudes towards creativity and strategy, responsible for 14% of the variance, which placed the perception of autonomy as a key predictor of strategy. Also, with greater intensity than in the global sample (5% of the explained variance), the perception of leadership as a predictor of performance.

Thus, 35% of the managers who were part of the sample allowed the execution of a significant linear

regression model, and the relationship of the influence between the variables was bigger compared with the initial regression model.

In addition, it should be noted that the variables of personal development and context, and the gender, age and education, did not show statistical significance, by contrast with previous experience, business concentration and the business sector of creative industries.

It was concluded that there was a set of mediators that related creativity and innovation, operating at a multilevel (individual, team and organizational), influenced by individual character variables and organizational context.

DISCUSSION

The main results of this investigation came from a linear regression model that revealed the existence of an influence relationship in the variables under study, between attitudes towards creativity and innovation practices in the business context. This relationship is based on the specificity of the influence of the creative attitudes of managers on the company's innovative practices, fundamentally on the strategy. The segment of the creative industries has shown an increasing variance as compared to the initial sample, indicating a dependency between innovative business practices and creative attitudes in an environment conditioned by the context of a particular type of activity.

Thus, we concluded that the breakthrough capacity is influenced by a number of characteristics (e.g. intelligence, personality or motivation), wherein the medium in which it operates, and with which it interacts, also influences innovative orientation. Working in the creative medium seems to favor and stimulate active and creative attitudes and, consequently, the implementation of relevant practices in terms of business innovation. Leadership is assumed as one of the factors that affect innovation, in a line of thought also advocated by Mumford (2012), who mentions the importance of leadership in motivating employees to foster innovation. Indeed, leadership is stated as a determinant of innovation, being the creative leader responsible for business impact and performance (Cummings & O'Connell, 1978; Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993), along with a leading role of creating and maintaining a favorable climate for the creation and sharing of ideas (Robinson, 2001).

Attitudes were worth of a special interest, in face of the importance of the organization and the dedication to work, objectivity and ability to concentrate on practices that result in employee participation, goal setting, human resources management, external cooperation and evaluation activities. There seems to be a real sense of discipline, delivery and humility that determines much of the collaborative attitude in company management. If this seems to be more a marked feature in creative industries, it may be due, not only to a greater specialization and skills of employees, but to the need for greater perseverance and delivery to obtain favorable results in line with what was already identified by Eikhof and Haunschild (2006). The idea that transpires here is that the innovative manager is, above all, a disciplined individual, driven to share decisions with employees. Discipline, persistence and collaboration arise here as the keywords of innovation in companies, especially in the creative industries.

As to the limitations of this study, we found that although the instruments used have revealed good metric qualities, regarding the explanatory power of the items and their grouping factors, consistency was not very significant (Cronbach's alpha was less than 0.70 in the case of Factor 2, Inventory). Another limitation had to do with the fact that the sample was one of opportunity, not enabling to generalize results to similar groups. Also, it should be noted that the studies mentioned, although related to the theme that we tried to develop, giving it sustainability and heuristic value, hinder comparative analysis and systematization of knowledge related to the creative industries. In fact, it may happen that what we designated by "creative industries" provided a list of companies that have little to do with one another, and while some continue to depend upon subsidies, turning its business model less relevant, others reflect all the desirable characteristics of the modern economy. These ones may well be related with the new digital businesses, which have been taking over all others, in terms of development (Newbigin, 2009). If it is the case, we have no way of providing data to support it, as it would require a new investigation.

In view of the conclusions and the limitations

presented, and considering the emerging predictive model, we suggest further research to explain how more and better teachings may be withdrawn from innovative companies, from any industrial sector, and how they can take advantage of the creativity of employees. The link between innovation and the observation of a strict work discipline by management is also of research value.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. (1992). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.). *Handbook of social psychology*. Worcester Mass: Clark University Press.

Amabile, T. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Armstrong, A. & Page, N. (2015). *Creativity and constraint: Leadership and management in the UK creative industries*. Hertfordshire: Ashridge Business School.

Basadur, M.S., e Basadur, T. (2012). Attitudes and creativity. In M. Runko e S. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Creativity* (2nd Ed.). New York: Elsevier.

Bendassolli, P., Jr, T.W., Kirschbaum, C. & Cunha, M.P (2009). Industrias criativas: Definição, limites e possibilidades. Retrieved in 31 July, 2016 from: http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rae/v49n1/v49n1a03.pdf.

Bilton, C. (2007). *Management and creativity: From creative industries to creative management*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Burns, T. & Stalker, G. (1996). *The management of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carr, J. (2009). Creative industries, creative workers and the creative economy: a review of selected recent literature. Scottish Government Social Research Retrived from http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2009/10/29154630/0

Castells, Manuel. (2002). *A Era da Informação: Economia, sociedade e cultura* (Vol. 1). Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Caves, R. (2001). *Creative Industries: Contracts between art and commerce*. Cambridge NY: Harvard University Press.

Cebon, P., Newton, P. & Noble, P. (1999). Innovation in organizations: Towards a framework for indicator development. *Melbourne Business School Working Paper* #99-9, September.

Coakes, E. e Smith, P. (2007). Developing communities of innovation by identifying innovation champions. *The International Journal of Knowledge and Organizational Learning Management*, 14 (1), 74-85.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Society, culture and person: a systems view of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.). *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives* (325-340). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, L.L. e O'Connell, M.J. (1978). Organizational innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 6, 33-50.

DCMS (2012). Creative industries facts and figures. Retirado, em 23 de Agosto, 2012, de http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/creative_industries/default.aspx.

Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper e Row.

Eikhof, D. R. e Haunschild, A. (2006). Lifestyle Meets Market: Bohemian Entrepreneurs in Creative Industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 15 (3), 234-241.

Fleming, T. (Ed.) (2008). *Estudo macroeconómico: Desenvolvimento de um cluster de indústrias criativas na região norte*. Porto: Fundação de Serralves.

Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodman, M. (1995). *Creative management*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Gomes, J., Rodrigues, F. & Veloso, A. (2015). Creativity at work: The role of context. In H. Shipton, P. Budhwar, P. Sparrow, P. & A. Brown (Eds.), *Human Resource Management, Innovation and Performance* (282-297). London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hartley, J. (2005). *Creative Industries*. London: Blackwell.

Henry, C. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the creative industries: An international perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, Ltd.

Howell, J.M., e Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predic-

tors of consolidated business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.

Howkins, J. (2001). *The creative economy: How people make money from ideas*. London: Allen Lane.

Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kasof, J. (1995). Explaining creativity: The attributional perspective. *Creativity Research Journal*, 8, 311-365.

Kilbourne, L. M., & Woodman, R. W. (1999). Barriers to organizational creativity. In R. E. Purser & A. Montuori (Eds.), *Social creativity* (Vol. 2). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Mateus, A. (2010). *Sector cultural e criativo em Portugal*. Lisboa: Ministério da Cultura.

McAdam, R. e Keogh, W. (2004). Transitioning towards creativity and innovation measurement in SMEs. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 13 (2), 126-139.

Mumford, M. (Ed.) (2012). *Handbook of organizational creativity*. USA: Academic Press.

Newbigin, J. (2014). What is the creative economy. The British Council. Retrieved from https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/guide/what-creative-economy/

O'Connor, J. (2010). The cultural and creative industries : A literature review [2nd ed.]. Newcastle: Creativity, Culture and Education. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/43835/

Robinson, K. (2001). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. UK: Capstone Publishing, Ltd.

Rogers, E. M. (1983) *Diffusion of innovations* (3rd Ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Sousa, F. (2008). Still the elusive definition of creativity. *International Journal of Psychology: A Biopsychosocial Approach*. 2, 55-82.

Sousa, F., Pellissier, R. & Monteiro, I. (2012). Creativity, innovation and collaborative organizations. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*. 5, 1, 26-65.

Spence, W. R. (1994). *Innovation: The communication of change in ideas, practices and products*. London: Chapman e Hall.

Stein, M. I. (1953). Creativity and culture. *The journal of psychology*. 36, 311-322.

Sternberg, R. J., e Lubart, T. (1996). Investing in creativity. *American Psychologist*. 51, 677-688.

Throsby, D. (2004). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge University

Tucker, R. B. (2008). *Driving growth through innovation*. San Francisco-Berret-Khoeler Publishers

UNESCO (2008). *Creative economy: Report 2008*. Nova York: United Nation.

UNESCO (2010). *Creative economy: Report 2010*. Nova York: United Nation

Vogel, T. & Wänke, M. (2016). *Attitudes and attitude change*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Wilson, T. D. & Hodges, S. D. (1992). Attitudes as temporary constructions. In L.L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.). *The construction of social judgements* (pp. 37-65). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

West, M. A. & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation at work. In M. A. West & J.L. Farr (Eds.), *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies* (pp. 3-15). Chichester: Wiley & Sons.

Wilson, T. D. & Hodges, S. D. (1992). Attitudes as temporary constructions. In L.L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.). *The construction of social judgements* (pp. 37-65). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Woodman, R. W., & Schoenfeldt, T. (1989). Individual differences in creativity: An interactionist perspective. In Glover, J. A., Ronning, R. R & Reynolds, C. R. (Eds.). *Handbook of Creativity* (77-93). New York: Plenum Press.

Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review*. 18, 2, 293-321.

Dr. Fernando Cardoso de Sousa is researcher at Research Centre for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics, University of the Algarve, Portugal. Email: cardoso_sousa@hotmail.com
Dr. Florbela Nunes is service worker of the IEFP, Colégio do Espírito Santo, University of Evora, Portugal. Email: florbela.nunes@iefp.pt
Dr. Ileana Pardal Monteiro is researcher at Research Centre for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics, University of the Algarve, Portugal. Email: ileanamonteiro@hotmail.com