



The Impact of Culture on Creativity: How Cultural Tightness and Cultural Distance Affect Global Innovation Crowdsourcing Work

Administrative Science Quarterly
XX (X)1–39
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/
journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0001839214563595
asq.sagepub.com
 SAGE

Roy Y. J. Chua,¹ Yannig Roth,² and
Jean-François Lemoine^{2,3}

Abstract

This paper advances a new theoretical model to understand the effect of culture on creativity in a global context. We theorize that creativity engagement and success depend on the cultural tightness—the extent to which a country is characterized by strong social norms and low tolerance for deviant behaviors—of both an innovator’s country and the audience’s country, as well as the cultural distance between these two countries. Using field data from a global online crowdsourcing platform that organizes creative contests for consumer-product brands, supplemented by interviews with marketing experts, we found that individuals from tight cultures are less likely than counterparts from loose cultures to engage in and succeed at foreign creative tasks; this effect is intensified as the cultural distance between the innovator’s and the audience’s country increases. Additionally, tight cultures are less receptive to foreign creative ideas. But we also found that in certain circumstances—when members of a tight culture do creative work in their own or culturally close countries—cultural tightness can actually promote creativity success. This finding implies that some degree of convergent thinking as engendered by tight cultures could be beneficial for creativity, challenging the dominant view in creativity research that divergent thinking is a prerequisite for creative performance.

Keywords: cultural tightness, cultural distance, creativity, globalization, social norms, crowdsourcing

¹ Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University

² Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne

³ ESSCA Ecole de Management

Scholars have begun to examine the critical notion that an individual's creativity—the production of ideas that are simultaneously novel and useful (Amabile, 1983, 1996)—is intimately linked to the cultural environment in which the individual is embedded (Lubart, 1990; Varsakelis, 2001; Chiu and Kwan, 2010; De Dreu, 2010; Morris and Leung, 2010; Wang, 2011). Culture, conceptualized as a set of shared knowledge, values, norms, and beliefs that unite a collective group, such as a country (Chiu and Hong, 2006), shapes cognition and motivation and consequently how one approaches creative problem solving (Leung et al., 2008; Chiu and Kwan, 2010; Morris and Leung, 2010).

With the globalization of business, creative tasks themselves have begun to transcend national boundaries (Chiu and Cheng, 2007; Chua, Morris, and Mor, 2012). Many business challenges today entail solving problems creatively not just within but also outside one's own country (Gibson and Gibbs, 2006). For example, an American brand manager has to think creatively about how best to position brands both within the U.S. and in emerging economies such as China or India. Companies are also increasingly going abroad to source knowledge to fuel innovation (Almeida, 1996; Frost, 2001). Recently, organizations have turned to global creative crowdsourcing, using the Internet to source creative ideas from across the globe to speed up their innovation cycles (Howe, 2008; Brabham, 2013; King and Lakhani, 2013). When a well-known Brazilian consumer product brand sought new ways to support social causes with the help of its customers online, the most creative ideas came from France, the United States, and Brazil. Cross-border creativity, if used well, has considerable potential to increase business competitiveness in the global marketplace (IBM Corporation, 2010; Gartner Inc., 2013; Deloitte University Press, 2014).

Despite recent growth in research that examines culture's influence on creativity, work in this area is still at a nascent stage; our understanding of how people think creatively and innovate in a global setting is still developing.¹ We still lack a theoretical exposition and empirical demonstration of how a country's culture influences its people's motivation and ability to innovate both within and outside their own country. Research is also scant on how a country's culture affects the likelihood that locals and foreigners will successfully innovate there. Recent theorizing by Gelfand and colleagues (2006) has suggested that a particular cultural dimension, cultural tightness—the extent to which a society is characterized by strong social norms and low tolerance for deviant behavior—is a relevant antecedent to creativity because it socializes individuals to develop psychological adaptations characterized by caution, predictability, and discipline. Useful in some contexts (e.g., improving efficiency), these psychological adaptations generally inhibit creativity (Gelfand, Nishii, and Raver, 2006).

Gelfand and colleagues' (2006) theorizing on cultural tightness is a useful first step toward understanding culture's impact on creativity, yet it is not clear that cultural tightness is always detrimental to creativity. Tight cultures promote convergent thinking by socializing individuals to conform to social norms and rules. Although convergent thinking is often thought of as the antithesis of creativity, some scholars have proposed that it can also enhance creativity,

¹ Because innovation is commonly defined as the successful implementation of creative ideas, creativity is often seen as a precursor to innovation, but creativity plays a role throughout all phases of organizational innovation (Ford, 1996: 1113).

such as by facilitating the selection of creative ideas to suit a given context (Crompton, 2006; Goncalo and Duguid, 2011). Thus it is worth investigating when and how tight cultures could be beneficial to creative performance. In addition, Gelfand, Nishii, and Raver's (2006) argument focused on the innovator's culture and was silent on the role of the audience country—the locale for which an innovation or creative idea is intended. Various scholars have acknowledged that the success of creativity depends in part on the extent to which an audience is receptive to the proposed new ideas (e.g., Ford, 1996; Csikszentmihalyi, 2003; Elsbach and Kramer, 2003; Mueller, Melwani, and Goncalo, 2012). This notion is derived from the theoretical premise that whether an idea is considered creative is socially constructed within the domain or field in which creative work takes place (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 2003; Ford, 1996). The audience country's culture, including how different it is from that of the innovator's country, is particularly relevant in a globalized business environment in which people increasingly do creative work across national borders. Yet the effect on creative performance of an audience's cultural attributes is often underemphasized in organizational research.

Our present research aims to address the above gaps. We introduce a new theoretical model—the cultural alignment model of global creativity—to explicate how culture affects creativity in a global context. We argue that three cultural characteristics are particularly relevant in understanding creativity in a global context: (1) the level of cultural tightness in the innovator's country, (2) the level of cultural tightness in the audience country, and (3) the extent to which the audience country's cultural content is close to that of the innovator's country (i.e., cultural distance). For an innovator to be successful in any given context, there must be "cultural alignment" (i.e., cultural fit or agreement) between the proposed solution and what the intended audience of the creative idea would find appropriate and acceptable (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999, 2003; De Dreu, 2010). Cultural distance between the innovator's country and the audience country, as well as the degree of cultural tightness in each country, would determine whether there would be cultural alignment.

In this paper, we develop theory and hypotheses on how culture affects creativity. Our theory development is founded on the premise that a country's culture exerts a general effect on its people, though individual and situational differences might render some people more susceptible than others to culture's influence. We further differentiate creative engagement from performance. Engagement has to do with one's motivation and self-efficacy to attempt a creative task whereas performance has to do with one's effectiveness at the task. Little research to date has explicitly examined creative engagement—whether an individual takes on a creative challenge in the first place—but attempting a creative task does not necessarily guarantee success. Cultural tightness and distance may differentially influence creativity engagement and success. We test our theory with data from a creative crowdsourcing platform that spans multiple countries on several continents, an ideal context in which to investigate research questions on global engagement and success in creative endeavors.

THE IMPACT OF CULTURE ON CREATIVITY

The rapid pace of globalization has sparked a surge of research on how culture influences creativity. Early research took a country-comparison approach to

document cultural differences in creative performance, often finding individuals from Asia (e.g., Japan and China) to be less creative than those from the West (e.g., U.S.) at a variety of laboratory tasks (Torrance, 1969; Ng, 2000; Niu and Sternberg, 2001, 2002, 2003; Noriko, Fan, and Van Dusen, 2001). One explanation is that the East–West difference might reflect stronger emphases on usefulness and practicality in the East and on novelty and originality in the West (Lubart, 1999; Noriko, Fan, and Van Dusen, 2001). Because conventional creativity tests developed in the West prize originality, Easterners often fall short on them. This explanation highlights the importance of taking into consideration the audience effect, in particular how creativity is judged in different cultures.

Another stream of research uses a values-based approach toward conceptualizing culture when studying its impact on creativity (e.g., Schwartz, 1999; Hofstede, 2001; Rank, Pace, and Frese, 2004; Erez and Nouri, 2010). Such research has proposed explanations that invoke value-based constructs, such as collectivism/individualism (Shane, 1992; Bechtoldt et al., 2010) and uncertainty avoidance (Shane, 1995). For example, using Hofstede's cultural values data and patent data, Shane (1992) found that individualistic and non-hierarchical societies were more inventive than collectivistic hierarchical ones. Despite these scholarly efforts, evidence that cultural differences in creativity can be explained by stable values attributable to cultural conditioning is scant and inconsistent (see Leung and Morris, 2010).

Recent developments in cross-cultural psychology suggest that culture also resides in the social norms that guide behaviors (Zou et al., 2009). Norms are shared expectations about what constitutes appropriate behaviors in a given culture (Cialdini, Reno, and Kallgren, 1990; Zou et al., 2009). Individuals conform to social norms in their respective cultures in part because of the epistemic need to be assured that their judgments and behaviors are validated by the salient reference group (Festinger, 1950; Hardin and Higgins, 1996; Fu et al., 2007). Zou and colleagues (2009) found that well-documented cultural differences in cognition and behavior could be explained by individuals' perceptions of shared social norms within their cultures. Mok and Morris (2010) showed that bicultural individuals' creativity shifts depending on whether Asian or Western cultural norms are cued, suggesting that creative performance depends on the cultural context. When encoded as routines, procedures, and mental habits, social norms could very well shape how individuals perceive, approach, and solve creativity problems.

Research on organizational innovation also provides promising evidence that cultural norms might influence creativity processes and outcomes (e.g., Moorman, 1995; Varsakelis, 2001; Khazanchi, Lewis, and Boyer, 2007). For instance, Nagaoka and Walsh (2009) found that inventions are more likely to arise from unexpected discoveries in unrelated R&D efforts in the U.S., a culture characterized by loose social norms, than in Japan, a culture characterized by tight social norms. This finding implies that American inventors might be more willing than Japanese inventors to deviate from plans, explore unexpected routes, and take risks in the innovation process. Taken together, findings from prior research seem to suggest that cultural norms in organizations and societies at large could indeed affect creative thinking and the innovation process. The thesis that shared norms influence creative behaviors and performance does not imply, however, that cultural differences in values play no role in determining creativity. Clearly, values can shape social norms, but

conceptually, values and norms are distinct. Values are relatively fixed, stable, and internalized; a values-based approach to culture suggests, therefore, that individuals approach creativity in accordance with their ingrained values regardless of social context. A norms-based approach focuses on how shared expectations within individuals' social environments shape their creative behaviors and, subsequently, their performance.

Cultural Tightness

Cultural norms have many dimensions, but the construct of cultural tightness is especially relevant to creativity. Gelfand, Nishii, and Raver (2006) defined cultural tightness as the strength of social norms and the degree of sanctioning within a given society. High population density, resource scarcity, and a history of territorial conflict and environmental threats tend to contribute to an increase in a country's cultural tightness (Gelfand et al., 2011). These ecological challenges increase the need for strong norms and punishment of deviations to regulate and coordinate behavior to ensure the collective's survival. In societies with tight cultures, social norms are clear and reliably imposed and enforced, often with severe sanctions. In societies with loose cultures, social norms are usually unclear, and society as a whole tends to be tolerant of behaviors that deviate from norms (Triandis, 1989). Compared with tight cultures, loose cultures tend to be less predictable, less orderly, and less efficient because they lack clear norms and consistent enforcement to regulate behavior (Gelfand, Nishii, and Raver, 2006). A recent 33-nation study by Gelfand and colleagues (2011) found that countries such as Pakistan, Malaysia, Japan, Norway, China, and Singapore scored high on a cultural-tightness scale the researchers developed, whereas countries such as Ukraine, Hungary, Brazil, and Australia scored relatively low. The level of cultural tightness in a country shapes the way individuals are socialized, which in turn affects psychological adaptations at the individual level, influencing creative engagement (i.e., attempts at creative challenges) and success.

Cultural tightness is reflected in a society's institutional practices, influencing individual-level cognition, motivation, and behaviors. Social institutions such as schools, families, religious bodies, and the justice system work in concert to foster certain psychological adaptations in individuals (Harrington and Gelfand, 2014). Tight cultures promote narrow socialization, with highly developed systems of constraining, regulating, and monitoring behaviors (Arnett, 1995), and deviation from established norms is readily identified and sanctioned. Additionally, justice systems in tight cultures often impose stiff punishments for crimes (e.g., the death penalty for corruption in China). In terms of everyday life, tight cultures are also linked to situational constraints that embody a restricted range of appropriate behaviors (e.g., in Singapore, eating and drinking are not allowed in the subway). Over time, these institutional practices collectively foster individual-level psychological adaptations, such as self-regulation, cognitive styles, and propensity toward change, all of which have implications for creativity.

Creativity-relevant psychological adaptations. Because socialization in tight cultures imposes constraints and limits behaviors, individuals in these

societies develop a heightened sense of felt accountability and a prevention-focused self-regulation characterized by caution about avoiding mistakes (Higgins, 1996). They behave according to shared norms, and over time they develop high impulse control, self-monitoring, and self-censorship. Yet deviation from established norms is often required for creative performance (Warren, 2003; Morris and Leung, 2010). Prior research has shown that prevention-focused individuals are less adept at creative thinking than those who are more promotion-focused, because creativity requires pushing boundaries and taking risks, behaviors that prevention-focused individuals tend to avoid (Friedman and Forster, 2001).

A country's cultural tightness also influences its residents' cognitive style. Cultural tightness/looseness coincides with adaptor/innovator cognitive styles, respectively (Kirton, 1976, 1994). Individuals with an adaptor cognitive style tend to accept the assumptions, theories, norms, and practices of the system in which they are embedded as a valid and legitimate starting point. Adaptors also prefer to build on rather than overhaul established solutions and procedures when solving problems. By contrast, individuals with an innovator cognitive style have a greater appetite for radical change, often challenging current norms and the assumptions that accompany them. Prior research has offered some evidence linking these two cognitive styles to creative behaviors. Foxall and Haskins (1986) found that the adaptor/innovator styles correlate with several personality traits associated with innovativeness and have high validity in predicting creative behaviors in consumers. Janssen, De Vries, and Cozijnsen (2014) found that individuals with the innovator cognitive style are more likely than those with the adaptor cognitive style to voice unconventional and novel ideas.

With regard to the propensity to change, individuals from tight cultures are likely to be more resistant to change because such cultures promote adherence to existing norms and rules. In a study of the emergence of female leadership around the world, Toh and Leonardelli (2012) found that fewer women reach top leadership positions in tighter cultures. These researchers reasoned that such cultures engender resistance to changing the organizational practices that traditionally prefer to place men in leadership roles.

The effects of cultural tightness on creativity should depend on whether an individual is engaging in a foreign or a local creative task. For foreign creative tasks, cultural distance—the degree to which two cultures differ—would intensify the negative effect of cultural tightness on creativity. The degree of cultural tightness in the audience country also plays an important role—it is harder for foreigners from distant cultures to do creative work successfully in a culturally tight country. This effect should be accentuated when cultural distance increases. Conversely, for local creative tasks, familiarity and adherence with the local culture should confer advantages for the innovator, resulting in a positive relationship between cultural tightness and creativity.

Foreign Creative Tasks

Foreign creative tasks entail developing novel and useful ideas for a foreign audience or solving a foreign problem. As global organizations increasingly adopt localized innovations and strategies to succeed in different national and regional markets, an increasing number of workplace creative projects are both

culture-specific and foreign to the people tasked to complete them. For instance, an American company might want to increase the adoption of its technology in foreign markets, which was the case when a credit card company was looking for innovative ways via online crowdsourcing to increase the usage of its contactless payment technology in developing countries. Conversely, emerging brands might look for new ways to advertise in the global marketplace, as a Chinese health and beauty supplement brand did when sourcing ideas for its global advertising strategy.

Effects of the innovator's country's cultural tightness. Foreign creative projects are inherently challenging because they call for creative solutions suited to a less-than-familiar audience. Research on the challenges faced by expatriates has found that working in an unfamiliar cultural context can be psychologically daunting (Earley and Ang, 2003). Even a foreign creative task that does not require the problem solver to travel overseas or to interact directly with foreigners calls for grappling with ideas and information from a culture different from his or her own. While such a challenge could be exciting to some, others might shun it.

An individual's origins in a tight culture or a loose one may determine how motivated he or she will be to engage in foreign creative tasks. Individuals from tight cultures are socialized in environments that emphasize adherence to local rules and norms; failure to adhere could result in sanctions. For these individuals to take on a foreign project and pursue divergent thinking effectively, they need to shed constraining local norms. The tighter the local norms, the harder it is for individuals to break away, having been socialized to think and behave within set parameters (Smith and Blankenship, 1991). Faced with a foreign creative task, an individual from a tight culture might experience low creative self-efficacy—the confidence that one has the ability to produce creative outcomes (Tierney and Farmer, 2002). One important antecedent to creative self-efficacy is having sufficient domain knowledge and experience for the task at hand. Domain knowledge represents a valuable resource that individuals can draw on for creative performance (Gist and Mitchell, 1992). Experiences in a given domain prepare one to engage in the complex process of generating and evaluating creative ideas (Amabile, 1988; Weisberg, 1999). But when an individual is doing creative work in an unfamiliar culture, critical knowledge about the cultural context might be lacking; additionally, if an individual comes from a tight culture that discourages deviation and change, he or she might find it harder to learn an unfamiliar cultural context. All of these factors would lower the likelihood that one would attempt a creative challenge (engagement). Hence the tighter the culture of an individual's country, the less likely he or she may be to engage in a foreign creative task.

It likely also matters how different the foreign culture is from one's own. When creative work transcends country boundaries, an important factor to consider is how culturally different the audience country is from the innovator's country. In organizational research, cultural distance between nations is typically operationalized in terms of differences between stable value systems, which are a proxy for a broader range of differences, such as traditions, norms, customs, and local business environments (Shenkar, 2001; Tihanyi, Griffith, and Russell, 2005). When the cultural distance between two countries is wide,

the challenges of intercultural motivation and learning should be concomitantly greater. Furthermore, due to a greater knowledge gap, it is also more difficult for the innovator to grasp the preferences of the culturally distant audience and develop solutions that fit them. Dachs and Pyka (2010) found that cultural distance between a company's home and foreign host country is negatively related to the number of cross-border patents and that cultural similarity (e.g., sharing a common language) between two countries can considerably spur overseas innovation activity. Using patent data in the U.S. biotechnology industry, Phene and colleagues (2006) found that the geographic origin of new knowledge matters for innovation: they found that it can be difficult to understand, learn, and absorb foreign knowledge because unfamiliar institutional and cultural factors influenced how the knowledge was originally derived, though they considered only whether the knowledge source was local or foreign to the U.S., not the cultural distance between the U.S. and the foreign knowledge's country of origin.

But cultural distance may influence whether individuals are likely to engage in and succeed at creative tasks globally. When the cultural distance between one's own country and an audience country is wide, individuals from tight cultures might feel uncertain of succeeding there because the local context embodies knowledge, values, norms, preferences, and other conditions that differ strikingly from their own. This lowers their creative self-efficacy, decreasing the likelihood that they would attempt the task. Conversely, when the cultural distance is close, individuals from tight cultures would be less concerned about the cultural differences and hence more likely to attempt the foreign creative task.

Hypothesis 1a (H1a): The tighter the culture of an individual's country, the less likely he or she will be to engage in foreign creative tasks.

Hypothesis 1b (H1b): The relationship in hypothesis 1a is moderated by the cultural distance between the individual's country and the creative task's audience country. The greater the cultural distance between the two countries, the stronger the negative effect of cultural tightness on engagement in foreign creativity tasks.

Even if an individual from a tight culture gamely attempts a foreign creative task, the path to success is fraught with challenges. To better understand how cultural tightness might undermine creativity success, we draw on creative cognition research. The creative cognition approach toward creativity focuses on how individuals use cognitive resources and processes to produce new and useful ideas (Finke, Ward, and Smith, 1992; Ward, 2001). Creative ideas arise from the interplay between two key cognitive processes: the generative process focuses on acquiring and accessing information and knowledge and then recombining them to produce new ideas; the exploratory process focuses on searching one's knowledge space for novel and potentially useful combinations of ideas, as well as judging the viability of potential solutions. The psychological adaptations engendered by tight cultures influence these two cognitive processes. When dealing with a creative task, individuals from tight cultures are less adept at searching the idea space to generate novel potential solutions because their prevention-focus self-regulation restricts how expansively they would explore an unfamiliar idea space. When choosing from among potential solutions, these individuals' adaptor cognitive mindset and low propensity to

change would push them to go for solutions that do not deviate too much from those currently known. The result would be lower creativity.

These challenges are compounded when the task at hand calls for thinking outside of one's own cultural domain. Moreover, innovators need to be able to foresee the preferences of their audiences when generating new ideas or solutions (Ford, 1996; Hempel and Sue-Chan, 2010). A deep understanding of the audience's local culture is crucial for developing ideas that will be effective for them (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Chiu and Hong, 2005), but such understanding is elusive if the audience's culture is different from one's own. Thus we expect that individuals from tight cultures will be less likely to succeed at foreign creative tasks than those from loose cultures.

We also expect cultural distance to play a role. The more culturally distant an audience country is, the harder it would be for individuals from tight cultures to succeed there, because their cultural influences render them less apt to think divergently and to take risks, and yet doing so is required if they are to perform creative work successfully. Hence we expect the negative effect of cultural tightness on creativity success in foreign tasks to be accentuated when cultural distance increases.

Hypothesis 2a (H2a): The tighter the culture of an individual's country, the less likely he or she will be to succeed at foreign creative tasks.

Hypothesis 2b (H2b): The relationship in hypothesis 2a is moderated by the cultural distance between the individual's country and the creative task's audience country. The greater the cultural distance between the two countries, the stronger the negative effect of cultural tightness on success at foreign creativity tasks.

Effects of the audience country's cultural tightness. Creativity scholars have recognized that innovators do not have complete control over the likelihood of their ideas' success in the marketplace; success depends in part on the audience's receptivity to novel ideas (Chiu and Hong, 2005; Hempel and Sue-Chan, 2010; Mueller, Melwani, and Goncalo, 2012). This recognition rests on the theoretical premise that creativity is socially constructed. In developing a systems view of creativity, Csikszentmihalyi (1990, 1999, 2003) highlighted that the field (audiences within a specific domain) evaluates and selects ideas produced by individuals within the domain. Whether an idea is accepted as creative depends on the field's evaluations according to its rules, norms, and preferences. Ford (1996) similarly argued that market preferences determine the viability of new products and services. Products or services that are too novel often fail in the marketplace because they lack legitimacy within the domain (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994). Psychological research suggests that the marketplace of ideas exhibits a bias toward ideas that are not overly counterintuitive, so as to maintain some continuity with existing knowledge (Norenzayan et al., 2006).

Cultures differ in their propensities to accept novelty and embrace change (Hofstede, 1980; Schneider and De Meyer, 1991; Buck and Shahrin, 2005), with tight cultures more resistant to change than loose cultures and less receptive to novel ideas that deviate sharply from existing norms (Gelfand, Nishii, and Raver, 2006; Toh and Leonardelli, 2012). It is also more difficult to do creative work in tight cultures because new ideas and solutions must accord to the

right degree with local norms. But the degree and type of novelty and usefulness that will work in a tight culture can be hard to calibrate, especially for a cultural outsider. International business research has found that many U.S. retailers have been unsuccessful in Asian markets with tight cultures, such as South Korea and China, in part because their business models or products were incompatible with local cultures (Bianchi, 2008; Gandolfi and Strach, 2009; Gao, 2013). Hence we expect that the cultural tightness of an audience country will be negatively associated with creativity success.

Further, the negative effect of an audience country's cultural tightness on the likelihood of success should be moderated by the cultural distance: when the cultural distance decreases, the innovator should be more adept at developing new and useful solutions for the audience country because of his or her familiarity with its knowledge and norms. Thus, though it can be difficult to do creative work in a tight culture, innovators from similar cultures should enjoy an advantage over those from distant cultures.


Hypothesis 3a (H3a): The tighter the culture of the audience country, the more difficult it is for foreign innovators to succeed.

Hypothesis 3b (H3b): The effect specified in hypothesis 3a is moderated by cultural distance, such that the narrower the cultural distance between the innovator's country and the audience country, the weaker the negative effect of cultural tightness on the likelihood of success.

Local Creative Tasks

For local creative tasks, individuals from tight cultures may have an advantage in coming up with novel and useful ideas that are meant to target and eventually be implemented in their home countries. For an innovator to do well in a given creative domain, he or she must understand the rules and opinions of the domain, generate and choose the most promising ideas to work on, and do so in a manner that would be accepted by the intended audience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 15). Because tighter cultures tend to have stronger and more restrictive norms with regard to ideas considered appropriately novel and useful, it is more difficult for foreign innovators to develop solutions suited to the local context. But individuals from those same tight cultures have the distinct advantage of knowing their own local norms well due to strong socialization, increasing their likelihood of engaging in and succeeding at local creative tasks.

Individuals from tight cultures, compared with those from loose cultures, should feel more confident and experience higher creative self-efficacy when attempting creative projects within their own cultures. They are acculturated to adhere to clear social norms, and audiences within their own cultures are more likely than those from loose cultures to adhere to the same norms, making it easier for them to grasp the preferences of the local audience and increasing their confidence of success. Communications research suggests that an idea widely shared by a given audience can be effectively used to establish common ground for purposes of persuasion (Krauss and Chiu, 1998; Lau, Chiu, and Lee, 2001). In loose cultures, by contrast, norms are often unclear and not widely shared (Triandis, 1989); thus audiences' preferences are more pluralistic (Au, 1999), making it harder even for a local innovator to predict what solution

Figure 1. Cultural alignment model of global creativity.

will be well received. Moreover, individuals from looser cultures are less wedded to shared norms and thus gravitate less strongly toward culturally familiar tasks.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): The tighter the culture of an individual's country, the more likely he or she will be to engage in creative tasks in his or her own country (local creative tasks).

Individuals from tight cultures might also have greater chances of success when doing creative work in their own cultures because successful creativity in such cultures requires a deep understanding of local norms and preferences. Tight cultures may be unreceptive to novel ideas that do not fit their strong local norms (Toh and Leonardelli, 2012). The usefulness of potential solutions to problems must also meet highly specific local criteria. Because any new idea or solution must be acceptable to the intended audience to be considered a success (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 1999, 2003), individuals from tighter cultures should enjoy an advantage when doing creative work in their own cultures given their intimate knowledge of widely shared local norms. From a creative cognition perspective, this means that they are better equipped to navigate the idea space in which they are searching for insights and evaluate whether potential ideas would be a fit for the local cultural context. Individuals from loose cultures might be adept at divergent thinking and also familiar with their own cultures, but the lack of clear and widely shared local norms makes audiences' preferences and, consequently, success less predictable (Triandis, 1989; Au, 1999). Thus individuals from loose cultures may not enjoy any distinct advantages when doing creative work in their own cultures. Moreover, loose cultures confer a more even playing field for both local and foreign innovators given their less restrictive norms about what would constitute an

appropriate solution. Thus local innovators in loose cultures are likely to face stiffer competition from foreign innovators, dampening their home field advantage.

Hypothesis 5 (H5): The tighter the culture of an individual's country, the more likely he or she will be to succeed at creative tasks in his or her own country (local creative tasks).

Taken together, the above hypotheses constitute a comprehensive theoretical framework on how culture might influence creativity engagement and success in a global context. By making the distinction between local and foreign creative tasks, we are able to develop new insights on when cultural tightness might harm or promote creativity. We indicate these hypotheses in the model presented in figure 1.

METHOD

We tested our hypotheses using data from a global creative crowdsourcing platform that we will call CrowdSourceInc (a pseudonym), which organizes creative contests for consumer-product brands and broadcasts them via the Internet to a community of over 280,000 registered members from more than 160 countries. Client companies typically approach CrowdSourceInc with specific creative business problems, such as generating ideas for new products or services, product designs, brand positioning, or advertising campaigns. The problems featured on CrowdSourceInc typically entail product innovation (e.g., reinventing instant coffee for home consumption in Australia), packaging (e.g., designing a water bottle that embodies a French region's identity), marketing (e.g., persuading Malaysians to use a credit card company's contactless payment technology), or advertising (e.g., developing videos or print advertisements to illustrate the close relationship between a supermarket chain and Turkish families). These problems, which mirror those handled by innovation consulting firms, require substantial creativity to solve.

A team of strategic planners at CrowdSourceInc transforms the clients' business problems into creative briefs that are then posted online as contests and broadcast globally. Participation is not restricted by gender, age, or country of residence, except for creative contests with legal restrictions, such as contests for alcohol or tobacco products, none of which are included in our data. Every project is organized as a contest with one or more potential winners; participants must submit their entries by a stipulated deadline, and the format ranges from raw sketches to polished video advertisements, depending on the project. Ordinarily, each contest has a predefined number of prizes for winning submissions, but the client company exercises complete discretion about choosing more winners, depending on the quality of submissions. Prizes are typically monetary rewards, ranging from 1,000 euros for idea-submission contests to 15,000 euros for contests that require video production.

Participants must be registered members of the CrowdSourceInc crowdsourcing platform, though both registration and participation in contests are free. Members read the creative brief on a given contest and decide independently whether to submit an entry to address the stated problem. Members choose contests on the basis of personal interest, availability, and personal

assessments of whether they can tackle the task effectively enough to have a chance of winning (Parvanta, Roth, and Keller, 2013). Participants work independently on individual submissions.

At the end of a contest, the client company has access to all the submissions via a dedicated online platform. The client company then independently chooses the contest winners based on the originality and relevance of the submissions' central ideas; the richness and quality of the submissions are also considered.² Because the clients are typically large international firms with global operations, their evaluators tend to be domain-area experts knowledgeable about the local culture of the audience country. The panel of evaluators may or may not be residents of the audience country; they are chosen because they are highly familiar with the culture of the audience country and thus well equipped to assess whether the proposed ideas would work in that context. Thus, when assessing whether a submission is relevant to a given country, the evaluators consider the likelihood that it would be accepted and effective in that country's culture (its potential for implementation success).

Since its inception in 2006, CrowdSourceInc has organized more than 600 contests and received over 75,000 submissions. We obtained access to 99 creative contests between January 2010 and December 2011. A total of 11,671 members (68 percent male) were deemed active during that period (i.e., had entered at least one contest since joining the CrowdSourceInc platform) and are included in our analyses.

Key Measures

Engagement in and success at creative tasks. Our key dependent variables were whether an active member engaged in a particular creative task and whether he or she subsequently succeeded at it. We operationalized engagement by whether an individual submitted an entry to a given contest (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise). Individuals rarely enter a given contest more than once given the significant effort a submission requires. We measured success as whether an individual's submission was selected as a winner (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise). Winning a prize suggests that one's submission is both original and useful, assessed in terms of relevance and quality. Because there is a monetary reward associated with the prize, it can be construed as a tangible form of creativity success for the participant. As noted earlier, the number of winners varies with the quality of submissions to a given contest. The client company may award more prizes than was originally advertised so it can legally own the ideas embodied in the good submissions: under CrowdSourceInc rules, intellectual property rights in the submissions are transferred to the client company when rewards are distributed and accepted. In our dataset, the number of prizes

² Since 2012 (the year after we stopped collecting data), CrowdSourceInc's clients have been asked prior to launching a contest to distribute 100 points among four criteria: quality, relevance, originality, and narrative (whether the solution "tells a good story"). This exercise enables client companies to reflect on their expectations, CrowdSourceInc to tailor the creative brief to meet those expectations, and community members to gain a better understanding of the judging criteria. Aggregate data on the judging criteria for 85 contests indicate that, on average, originality is the most highly weighted criterion (29 points), followed by relevance (28 points), narrative (23 points), and quality (20 points).

Table 1. Creative Contests' Audience Countries and Percentages of Participants in the Dataset from These Countries

Countries	Number of contests with these audience countries	Percentage of participants in the dataset from these countries
Australia	1	0.5%
China	6	18%
Egypt	2	—
Finland	1	—
France	20	25%
Germany	1	2%
Hong Kong	2	1%
India	3	4%
Indonesia	1	11%
Italy	1	2%
Malaysia	1	2%
Netherlands	2	2%
Singapore	20	3%
South Korea	1	0.5%
Spain	3	2%
Switzerland	7	—
Turkey	1	—
United Kingdom	14	5%
United States	12	6%
Other	—	16%
Total	99	100%

ranged from 1 to 20, and each contest on average awarded 5.29 prizes. A key strength of our measures of engagement and success is that they are based on actual behavior and performance outcomes.

Foreign versus local contests. The creative contests in our dataset were culture-specific in that each task description asked for creative ideas targeting a specific country; table 1 lists the audience countries and the percentage of entrants from the different countries in our dataset. Examples of the tasks include promoting a tourist destination to Americans, persuading Chinese consumers to try a new brand of premium whiskey, proposing design ideas for a shopping mall in Spain, and creating a TV advertisement aimed at Egyptian consumers. We defined a creative contest as foreign or local depending on the profile of the CrowdSourceInc member considering it. For example, a contest that targets Chinese consumers is defined as a foreign creative task for a non-Chinese member and as a local creative task for a Chinese member. As shown in table 1, participants in our dataset represented numerous countries: the largest numbers (25 and 18 percent, respectively) were from France and China, while 5 percent were from the United Kingdom, which was the audience country for 14 contests. Similarly, 3 percent of the total number of participants was from Singapore, the audience country for 20 contests. As a result of such variety, 91 percent of contest-participant pairs were intercultural (foreign) in nature.

A participant's country was defined as his or her stated country of residence. We used data obtained from CrowdSourceInc: when participants register on

the platform, they specify their country of residence. According to our interviews with CrowdSourceInc executives and participants, a participant's country of residence is also his or her country of citizenship in most cases. It is thus safe to assume that participants have been socialized by the social norms of their country of residence.

We determined the creative task's audience country by coding the task descriptions. Most task descriptions in our dataset clearly specify the market of interest. Four coders from CrowdSourceInc who were familiar with the contests independently coded the data; interrater agreement was high (Fleiss's kappa for four raters = 0.90), and differences were resolved by discussion.

Cultural tightness. Data on countries' cultural tightness were gathered from a recent study by Gelfand and colleagues (2011), who surveyed 6,823 respondents representing a range of occupations from 33 countries and five continents. Cultural tightness was assessed on a six-item Likert scale that taps the extent to which social norms are clear, pervasive, and reliably imposed in a given country. Sample items include "In this country, if someone acts in an inappropriate way, others will strongly disapprove," "There are many social norms that people are supposed to abide by in this country," and "People in this country almost always comply with social norms." A higher score signifies a tighter culture. In our dataset, the countries that scored highest on cultural tightness were Pakistan (12.3), Malaysia (11.8), India (11.0), Singapore (10.4), and South Korea (10.0); those that scored lowest were Ukraine (1.6), Estonia (2.6), Hungary (2.9), Israel (3.1), and the Netherlands (3.3).

Gelfand and colleagues (2011) painstakingly verified construct validity and the reliability of the scale. They found high within-country agreement in every country (within-group $r = 0.85$) and high between-country variability (ICC(1) = 0.13); the scale also has good reliability at the country level ($\alpha = 0.87$). The cultural-tightness construct is related to, but distinct from, other known cultural dimensions (e.g., Hofstede's cultural values and Schwartz's value dimensions). For example, cultural tightness is moderately correlated with Hofstede's concepts of individualism ($r = -0.47, p < .01$) and power distance ($r = 0.42, p < .05$) but not significantly correlated with uncertainty avoidance ($r = -0.27, n.s.$), masculinity ($r = -0.08, n.s.$), or long-term orientation ($r = -0.05, n.s.$). Importantly, cultural tightness is correlated in expected ways with ecological variables, such as population density and natural-disaster vulnerability, and with socio-political variables, such as a history of territorial conflicts and openness of media (for details on these analyses, see Gelfand et al., 2011). Emerging research is beginning to link Gelfand and colleagues' cultural-tightness data in theoretically meaningful ways to organizational outcomes, such as emergence of female leadership (Toh and Leonardelli, 2012), and to psychological outcomes, such as subjective well-being (Plaut et al., 2012). We are confident that the cultural-tightness measure is well validated and reliable.

We matched the 33-country cultural-tightness data to the participants' countries of residence and to the creative tasks' audience countries in our own dataset. Data points whose countries lacked a tightness score were treated as missing data. Overall, our data are matched with 32 of the 33 cultural-tightness scores.

Cultural distance. We computed the cultural distance between a participant's country and a creative task's audience country by using Hofstede's set of five cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov, 2010)—individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and long-term orientation—which is arguably one of the most comprehensive collections of cultural dimensions documented in our field, spanning a large number of countries. We adhered to Kogut and Singh's (1988) procedure in computing an aggregated score that represented the cultural distance between two countries based on their distances on the five dimensions. Cultural distance is zero for local contests and positive for foreign contests. This method of computing cultural distance has gained acceptance and is widely used in international business research (e.g., Kogut and Singh, 1988; Benito and Gripsrud, 1992; Shane, 1994; Barkema, Bell, and Pennings, 1996).³ To further verify that this approach is valid, we examined sample scores for key countries derived from our dataset and found them to have face validity. For instance, the cultural distances between the United States and China (4.61), Singapore (4.03), India (1.87), and the United Kingdom (0.43) are in an order that one would expect. Hence we are confident that the measure we used adequately captures cultural differences between countries.

Control Variables

Several other factors might also influence individuals' likelihood of engaging in and of winning creative contests on CrowdSourceInc. Some of these control variables apply exclusively to the likelihood of engagement, such as the amount of the reward and the number of concurrent contests; others apply exclusively to the likelihood of success, such as the creative contest's audience country.

We controlled for *gender*, *prior experience*, and *expertise*. Prior research by Jeppesen and Lakhani (2010) suggests that being an outsider to a given problem domain (that is, being female or non-expert) increases the likelihood of winning online scientific problem-solving contests. Our empirical context is different—consumer-product-oriented innovation rather than scientific problem solving—but it is nevertheless useful to control for the potential influence of these variables. We did not expect gender to exert any particular impact, but expertise and prior experience submitting entries on CrowdSourceInc seemed apt to increase an individual's self-efficacy and thus his or her likelihood of engaging in and winning creative contests. We coded the gender variable 1 if male and 0 if female. We quantified expertise in the field of media, marketing, and advertisement using a self-report categorical scale (4 = professional, 3 = semi-professional, 2 = amateur, 1 = student). Prior experience was operationalized as the number of an individual's prior submissions on CrowdSourceInc.

The monetary reward for winning a given contest can motivate participants to enter. We measured *reward (log)* in thousands of euros. Following Jeppesen and Lakhani (2010), we controlled for the reward amount only when predicting submission to contests; the size of the reward is likely to play a more significant role in motivating engagement than in winning. We also controlled for the *number of ongoing concurrent contests*. Typically, multiple contests are

³ There are many versions of cultural-distance computations (e.g., Drogendijk and Slangen, 2006; Newman, 2012). We used the most widely adopted method, that of Kogut and Singh (1988), to maintain continuity and facilitate comparison with the existing literature.

underway simultaneously on CrowdSourceInc. Because participants are unlikely to enter multiple contests at the same time, we expected that the greater the number of concurrent contests, the lower the likelihood that a given contest would be chosen. We measured the number of concurrent contests by counting the average number of other “live” contests, those whose deadlines had not yet arrived, throughout the duration of a focal contest. This variable is relevant only to our prediction of engagement in creative tasks.

Our data cover countries with vastly different local conditions, including wealth and access to education and other resources; thus it is important to control for the influences of these factors. We used a country’s 2010 per-capita *gross domestic product (GDP)* as a proxy for access to resources that would facilitate creative thinking. We controlled for the GDP of the participant’s country when predicting engagement and for that of both the participant’s country and the audience country when predicting success. We generally did not control for country effects (cultural tightness and GDP) on the audience-country end when predicting engagement. Interviews with CrowdSourceInc executives revealed that participants rarely think about such factors when deciding whether to enter a contest. Instead, submission decisions are based on the amount of the reward, personal interest, and self-efficacy.

Analytical Strategy

Activity on the CrowdSourceInc creative crowdsourcing platform entails two main stages: (1) submission to contests (engagement) and (2) selection of winners (success). Thus, when predicting success, there is an inherent self-selection bias that would not be taken into consideration by simple regression analyses. Performing simple regression analyses would result in biased coefficient estimates, due to omitted variables, that would affect both the decision to participate and the results (Hamilton and Nickerson, 2003). To control for this self-selection bias, we used a two-stage Heckman-Probit model, whose first stage predicts submission to a contest and whose second stage predicts winning. To facilitate this analysis, we first matched each of 99 contests to every active member of the CrowdSourceInc community (at the time, 11,671 individuals), resulting in 1,155,429 contest–participant pairs. We next compared the contest end dates with the dates of the participants’ enrollment in CrowdSourceInc, eliminating instances in which the contest ended before the participant joined, resulting in 850,435 usable data points. For all valid contest–participant pairs, we then matched the data with our external data sources, such as GDP and Gelfand and colleagues’ (2011) cultural tightness. After taking into consideration missing data from various sources, we ended up with 636,710 contest–participant pairs (74.9 percent of the valid dataset).

We used STATA’s *heckprob* command to run the two-stage analyses, clustering at the participant level because error terms for a participant who entered multiple contests might be correlated.⁴ The first stage models participants’

⁴ Multiple participants enter a given contest, but they complete their creative work and submission independently; thus there are unlikely to be strong correlations among the error terms associated with multiple participants’ entry into the same contest. Nevertheless, we ran corresponding analyses clustering at the contest and found the same results.

self-selection as part of the submission sample; the second stage models the discrete outcome in which a given submission is or is not selected as a winner. The second-stage estimation includes an error-correction term obtained from the first-stage estimation. As noted above, the first-stage estimation examines a member's decision to enter a contest as a function of his or her country's cultural tightness and cultural distance (our key predictors), alongside such control variables as reward amount, gender, prior experience, expertise, number of concurrent contests, and GDP. The second-stage estimation examines the selection of winners as a function of cultural tightness (of both the participant's country and the contest's audience country) and cultural distance, taking into account control variables such as gender, prior experience, expertise, and GDP. This type of analysis has been used in similar research on online crowdsourcing platforms (Cassiman and Veugelers, 2006; Jeppesen and Lakhani, 2010).

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Tables 2a and 2b present the correlations and descriptive statistics for variables used in first- and second-stage Heckman probit regressions, respectively. Table 3 presents the results. Model 1 presents a baseline analysis involving cultural distance and the key control variables. The stage-1 estimations indicate that the greater the cultural distance between a participant's country and the contest's audience country, the less likely he or she is to enter that contest; for those who did enter (stage 2), the greater the cultural distance between a participant's country and the audience country, the less likely he or she is to win the contest. Unsurprisingly, the larger the reward, the more likely a participant is to enter a contest. The more concurrent contests there are, the less likely it

Table 2a. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for Stage-1 Estimation

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Has submitted	.01	.12	0	1										
2. Cultural distance	2.19	1.41	0	11.00	-.02*									
3. Cultural tightness of participant's country	7.08	1.78	1.60	12.30	.01*	.06*								
4. Reward (log)	1.63	.72	-0.69	3.91	.07*	.12*	.00							
5. Gender	.68	.47	0	1	.01*	-.02*	.02*	-.00						
6. Amateur	.25	.43	0	1	-.01*	-.02*	-.05*	-.00*	-.01*					
7. Semi-professional	.23	.42	0	1	.00*	-.01*	-.07*	-.00*	.07*	-.31*				
8. Professional	.21	.41	0	1	.01*	.01*	-.06*	-.00	.06*	-.30*	-.28*			
9. Prior submissions	4.54	11.06	0	356	.07*	-.01*	.00	-.01*	.02*	.01*	.01*	.01*		
10. Average number of concurrent contests	7.74	2.34	1	12.43	-.06*	-.03*	.01*	-.03*	-.00*	-.01*	-.01*	-.01*	-.01*	-.02*
11. GDP of participant's country (in thousands)	23.82	18.14	.32	103.57	-.02*	-.10*	-.54*	-.02*	-.06*	.06*	.02*	-.02*	.02*	-.05*

* $p < .05$.

Table 2b. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for Stage-2 Estimation

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Has won	.04	.20	0	1										
2. Cultural distance	1.92	1.43	0	7.84	-.02*									
3. Cultural tightness of participant's country	7.16	2.01	1.60	12.30	-.03*	-.19*								
4. Cultural tightness of audience country	8.23	2.10	3.30	11.80	-.12*	-.07*	.12*							
5. Gender	.71	.46	0	1	.02	-.03*	.04*	.05*						
6. Amateur	.22	.42	0	1	-.04*	.01	-.04*	-.04*	-.04*					
7. Semi-professional	.24	.43	0	1	.03*	.01	-.02	-.03*	.01*	-.30*				
8. Professional	.24	.43	0	1	.04*	.03*	-.03*	-.01	.06*	-.30*	-.32*			
9. Prior submissions	11.07	22.76	0	356	.08*	.00	.07*	-.12*	.05*	-.00	.07*	-.01		
10. GDP of audience country (in thousands)	39.73	14.12	1.40	70.57	-.03*	.13*	-.04*	-.03*	-.02*	.03*	-.01	-.01	-.02*	
11. GDP of participant's country (in thousands)	20.34	18.07	.32	103.57	.07*	.12*	-.47*	-.12*	-.03*	.08*	-.01	-.01	.02*	.05*

* $p < .05$.


is that a participant will enter a given contest, presumably because there are more options to choose from.

The GDP per capita control variables for the participant's country and audience country showed some interesting effects. For stage-1 estimation, we included only the GDP for the participant's country because submission is more likely to be influenced by the economic condition of the participant's country than by that of the audience country. For stage-2 estimation (winning), we included the GDP of both the participant's country and the audience country. Results indicate that per-capita GDP in a participant's country is negatively associated with likelihood to enter a given contest but positively associated with the likelihood of winning a contest once entered; participants from richer countries are less likely to enter a creative contest, presumably because they have less motivation to pursue monetary rewards and thus are more selective about entering contests, but those who do so are more likely to win, presumably because better resources help them hone their submissions.

A participant's expertise and prior submission experience also affect engagement and success in expected ways. Self-reported expertise predicts both first-stage submission and second-stage success. The number of prior submissions also matters in that participants with more prior submissions to CrowdSourceInc are more likely to enter and win creative contests.

Hypotheses Testing

We first focused on predictions pertaining to foreign creative contests, examining how the cultural tightness of a participant's country affects submission and success (H1a and H2a) and whether these relationships are moderated by cultural distance (H1b and H2b). We then investigated how the cultural tightness


Figure 2a. Interaction effects for stage-1 estimation: Entering creative contests.

of an audience country influences foreign innovators' likelihood to succeed there (H3a and H3b). Next, we turned to hypotheses on local creative contests, testing whether participants from tighter cultures are more likely to engage and succeed in creative tasks in their own countries (H4 and H5).

Model 2 adds the cultural tightness of the participant's country to both stage-1 and stage-2 estimations and adds the audience country's cultural tightness to the stage-2 estimation. Results indicate that the tighter the culture of a participant's country, the less likely he or she is to enter a given contest. Upon entry, the cultural tightness of a participant's country did not have any main effect on the likelihood of winning a given contest.

Model 3 adds the participant's country's cultural tightness \times cultural distance interaction term to both stage-1 (submission) and stage-2 (success) estimations to test H1a, H1b, H2a, and H2b. The interaction terms are significant in both stage-1 and stage-2 estimations. The patterns of interaction are depicted in figures 2a and 2b, respectively. Figure 2a shows that, for foreign creative tasks, when the cultural distance between a participant's country and the audience country is equal to the mean or +1 standard deviation, the greater the cultural tightness of the participant's country, the less likely he or she is to enter the contest (simple slope analyses at mean level cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 25.49$, $p < .01$; simple slope analyses at +1 S.D. cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 90.59$, $p < .01$). When cultural distance is low (i.e., -1 S.D.), the cultural tightness of the participant's country had a positive effect on his or her likelihood of entering a foreign contest ($\chi^2 = 14.70$, $p < .01$). This finding for low cultural distance is consistent with our prediction for local contests in which cultural distance is zero.

The effects of cultural distance on winning show a similar pattern. Figure 2b shows that, for foreign creative projects wherein the cultural distance between

Figure 2b. Interaction effects for stage-2 estimation: Winning creative contests.

a participant's country and the audience country is equal to + 1 standard deviation, the greater the cultural tightness of the participant's country, the less likely he or she is to win (simple slope analyses at + 1 S.D. cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 5.89, p < .05$). Cultural tightness of the participant's country, however, has no significant effect on winning at mean-level cultural distance ($\chi^2 = 0.17, p = .68$). At low cultural distance (i.e., -1 S.D.), the effect of the cultural tightness of the participant's country on winning a foreign contest is positive and significant ($\chi^2 = 5.34, p < .05$), suggesting that participants from countries with tight cultures are more likely to succeed in creative contests from foreign countries that are culturally close to their own. These findings jointly offer partial support for H1a and H2a, in that cultural tightness is negatively associated with engagement in and success at foreign creative tasks. But the hypotheses seem to apply mainly to situations in which the cultural distance between a participant's country and the audience country is moderate to high. When cultural distance is low, the effects are consistent with our predictions for local contests.

The analyses thus far also offer considerable evidence that H1a and H2a are moderated by the cultural distance between a participant's country and the audience country such that the greater the cultural distance, the stronger the negative effect of cultural tightness on engagement in (H1b) and success at (H2b) foreign creative tasks. For foreign creative contests, the negative effect of cultural tightness on submission is significantly stronger at a high level (+ 1 S.D.) of cultural distance than at the mean level (moderate cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 25.49, p < .01$; + 1 S.D. cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 90.59, p < .01$; χ^2 difference = 65.10, $p < .01$). As for winning foreign contests, the negative effect of cultural tightness gains strength as we move from moderate to high cultural

Table 3. Heckman Probit Model for Predicting Entering and Winning a Contest*

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Second stage: Win a contest				
Constant	-3.307** (0.101)	-3.140** (0.171)	-3.185** (0.167)	-3.209** (0.166)
<i>Key predictors</i>				
Cultural distance	-0.067** (0.015)	-0.063** (0.019)	-0.043* (0.019)	-0.047* (0.019)
Cultural tightness of participant's country	-	-0.003 (0.020)	-0.008 (0.020)	-0.015 (0.020)
Cultural tightness of audience country	-	-0.078** (0.017)	-0.091** (0.019)	-0.089** (0.019)
Cultural tightness of participant's country × Cultural distance	-	-	-0.042** (0.011)	-0.040** (0.011)
Cultural tightness of audience country × Cultural distance	-	-	-	0.013 (0.009)
<i>Control variables</i>				
Gender (1 = male)	0.044 (0.051)	0.052 (0.062)	0.052 (0.062)	0.0053 (0.061)
Amateur	-0.129 (0.068)	-0.086 (0.083)	-0.089 (0.083)	-0.086 (0.083)
Semi-professional	0.168** (0.065)	0.220** (0.080)	0.208** (0.080)	0.211** (0.079)
Professional	0.254** (0.060)	0.226** (0.075)	0.215** (0.074)	0.217** (0.074)
Prior submissions	0.008** (0.002)	0.007** (0.002)	0.007** (0.002)	0.007** (0.002)
GDP of participant's country (2010)	0.006** (0.001)	0.007** (0.002)	0.007** (0.002)	0.008** (0.002)
GDP of audience country (2010)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.003)
First stage: Submission to a contest				
Constant	-2.141** (0.027)	-2.189** (0.035)	-2.164** (0.035)	-2.164** (0.034)
<i>Key predictors</i>				
Cultural distance	-0.073** (0.004)	-0.088** (0.004)	-0.062** (0.004)	-0.062** (0.004)
Cultural tightness of participant's country	-	-0.022** (0.006)	-0.034** (0.007)	-0.034** (0.007)
Cultural tightness of Participant's country × Cultural distance	-	-	-0.041** (0.003)	-0.041** (0.003)
<i>Control variables</i>				
Reward (log)	0.319** (0.008)	0.337** (0.010)	0.326** (0.010)	0.326** (0.010)
Gender (1 = male)	0.013 (0.014)	0.039* (0.016)	0.034* (0.016)	0.034** (0.016)
Amateur	0.004 (0.017)	0.009 (0.019)	0.009 (0.019)	0.009 (0.019)
Semi-professional	0.050* (0.017)	0.064** (0.023)	0.059** (0.023)	0.059** (0.023)
Professional	0.094** (0.019)	0.084** (0.021)	0.079** (0.021)	0.079** (0.021)

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Prior submissions	0.009** (0.002)	0.008** (0.001)	0.008** (0.001)	0.008** (0.001)
Number of concurrent contests	-0.086** (0.002)	-0.082** (0.003)	-0.082** (0.003)	-0.082** (0.003)
GDP of participant's country (2010)	-0.005** (0.000)	0.007** (0.000)	-0.007** (0.001)	-0.007** (0.001)
Number of observations (Stage 1)	806873	636710	636710	636710
Number of censored observations	795595	629023	629023	629203
Number of uncensored observations (Stage 2)	11278	7687	7687	7687
Wald's test of indep. Equations (χ^2)	116.29**	99.77**	103.15**	108.76**
χ^2 difference (compared with previous model)	-	31.54**	175.85**	2.47

• $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

* Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

distance (moderate cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 0.17$, $p = .68$; +1 S.D. cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 5.89$, $p < .05$).

Considering H3a and H3b, model 2 in table 3 shows that the tighter the audience country's culture, the less likely a given participant is to win the contest. Because client firms can award as many winners as there are good submissions, we regressed the number of winners at the contest level on the audience country's cultural tightness, controlling for the number of submissions; results indicate that contests in tighter cultures tend to award fewer winners ($b = -0.41$, $p = .05$). Additionally, we found that an audience country's cultural tightness did not significantly influence the number of submissions. These findings support H3a, which predicted that a tight culture in an audience country makes it more difficult for creativity efforts to succeed there because of more stringent selection criteria. In model 3, the negative association between an audience country's cultural tightness and general creativity success remains significant and in the expected direction.

To check whether the effect of the audience country's cultural tightness interacts with cultural distance (H3b), we added this specific interaction term in model 4. Results indicate that the interaction effect is not significant, suggesting that cultural distance did not matter. Simple slope analyses further revealed that at low (-1 S.D.), moderate (mean), and high (+1 S.D.) cultural distance, tighter audience-country cultural tightness was associated with lower creativity success (low cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 9.65$, $p < .01$; moderate cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 23.32$, $p < .01$; high cultural distance: $\chi^2 = 25.68$, $p < .01$). Taken together, there is support for H3a but not H3b: the tighter the culture of the audience country, the more difficult it is for foreign innovators to succeed there, but cultural distance between the participant and the audience did not matter.

To test the hypotheses concerning local contests (H4 and H5), we examined the effect of the cultural tightness of a participant's country on entering and winning local creative contests, those in which the cultural distance between a participant's country and the audience country is zero. Figure 2a shows that at zero cultural distance, the greater the cultural tightness of a participant's country, the more likely he or she is to enter a creative contest. Simple slope

analysis is significant ($\chi^2 = 62.45, p < .01$). A similar pattern characterizes winning, such that the greater the cultural tightness of a participant's country, the more likely he or she is to win a creative contest (simple slope analysis: $\chi^2 = 9.48, p < .01$). Taken together, these results provide support for H4 and H5: individuals from tighter cultures are more likely to engage in and succeed at creative tasks from their own country.

Robustness Checks

Missing data analyses. Because we combined our data from CrowdSourceInc with secondary data on cultural tightness and cultural distance, there are inevitably missing data. We addressed missing data concerns using the multiple imputation strategy (Rubin, 1987). In this approach, rather than filling in a single value for each missing value, one replaces each missing value with values drawn from a set of plausible values based on other variables in the dataset. In our analyses, we focused on missing values for cultural tightness (on both the participant and audience end) and cultural distance because these are our key predictors taken from secondary sources and have the highest rate of missing values. We conducted 15 imputations in our analyses using the *mi* command in STATA, imputing missing values for the three key variables 15 times to generate 15 "complete" datasets. Next, these 15 datasets were analyzed using our original analytical model, and the results were subsequently combined to derive a single set of results for inference purposes. The results showed that all the main effects involving cultural distance, cultural tightness (participant and audience), and the associated interaction terms are statistically significant and consistent with the results reported in table 3. Thus we are confident that missing secondary data would not materially change our findings.

Other cultural values. We also took further steps to verify whether the hypothesized effects would hold up after controlling for other cultural values and dimensions. We ran two additional models including, respectively, Hofstede's five cultural dimensions (individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and long-term orientation) and some of Schwartz's creativity-related cultural values (freedom, creativity, respect for tradition, broadmindedness, and curiosity) as control variables in both stages. All of the previously reported effects remained significant despite including these numerous additional cultural variables. Thus we are confident that our findings are highly robust and unlikely to be explained away by other cultural factors.

SUPPLEMENTARY INTERVIEW EVIDENCE

To deepen our understanding of the findings of our quantitative study, we conducted interviews to learn why most submissions to online creative contests fell short and did not win an award. As described in the Online Appendix (<http://asq.sagepub.com/supplemental>), we asked three marketing experts to evaluate a selected set of submissions and found that among reasons for failure were the submission's usefulness, novelty, execution, difficulty of implementation, and competition for the award. Table A.1 in the Online Appendix provides illustrative evidence from the interviews for each of these reasons. Consistent with our main thesis, many submissions seem to fail because either they

lacked understanding of the audience market or the degree of novelty was not accurately calibrated for the intended audience. There is also evidence that individuals from tight cultures might be less prone to thinking divergently when doing creative work overseas.

DISCUSSION

We developed and tested a new theoretical model, a cultural alignment model of global creativity, on how culture influences creativity in the global context. Using data from a global crowdsourcing platform, we found that an individual from a tight culture is less likely than a counterpart from a loose culture to engage in and succeed at foreign creative tasks that are culturally distant. The greater the cultural distance, the stronger the negative impact of cultural tightness. Further, our results suggest that the tighter the culture of the audience country, the lower the likelihood of creativity success in that country for foreign entrants. For local creative tasks, contrary to what current theorizing would predict, cultural tightness increases the likelihood of engagement and success. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the impact of cultural norms on creativity on a global scale.

This research makes several theoretical contributions. First, it contributes to current understanding of the impact of culture on creativity by developing a new theoretical model outlining culture's influence on both the innovator's and the audience country's ends. We also considered the cultural distance between the innovator's country and audience country. Our model is the first to take a comprehensive view of global creativity, emphasizing the importance of considering the audience country's culture as well as the cultural gap between the innovator's country and audience country, whereas existing work tends to compare country effects. Rather than simply pinpointing differences between countries, we unpack the effects of culture by examining the construct of cultural tightness. A key strength of this approach is that it identifies a specific dimension of cultural norms and then builds arguments on theories associated with this cultural dimension.

Our theoretical model highlights how culture affects cross-border creativity engagement and success. Current research has paid limited attention to the impact of an innovator's cultural background on his or her ability to do creative work across national borders. Our research addresses this important gap by highlighting that in the global economy, producers and receivers of creative products may very well come from different cultural backgrounds, and there is therefore a need to better understand how the degree of cultural differences between countries influences creativity success. The finding that the greater the cultural distance, the less likely one is to engage in and succeed at foreign creative tasks underscores the challenges in global creative work. Creativity engagement and success depend in part on whether there is some degree of cultural alignment between the innovator's country and the audience country. Our unexpected finding that individuals from tighter cultures are more likely to engage and succeed in foreign creative tasks from culturally similar countries provides further support for this cultural proximity argument. Individuals from tighter cultures have greater adherence to their local norms, giving them a creativity advantage when the norms of a foreign country are highly similar to those of their own. Additionally, observations from field interviews of experts

examining non-winning submissions supported our argument that the lack of cultural alignment (both in terms of usefulness and novelty) between submissions and the audience context causes ideas to be rejected.

Our theoretical model is also one of the few that directly examines the effect of an audience's culture on creativity success. We found that the tighter a given culture, the harder it is to do creative work successfully within it, presumably because tight cultures' rules and norms are hard to satisfy. We had expected this effect to be stronger when the cultural distance increases between an innovator's country and the audience country (H3b), but we did not find support for this hypothesis. Further analyses revealed that, within a tight culture (+ 1 standard deviation from the mean), cultural distance does not appear to matter much for creativity success. This finding suggests that tight cultures are equally unforgiving to foreign innovators, regardless of how culturally similar the countries of these foreign innovators are to that of the audience culture. One explanation could be that audiences in tight cultures are somewhat xenophobic and therefore generally unreceptive to any foreign ideas, even if the ideas come from a culturally similar place. Another explanation could be that an audience country's tight culture constitutes a strong situation (e.g., Benjamin and Simpson, 2009) that is difficult to overcome regardless of how familiar one might be with the culture. Our theoretical model and findings can spur other scholars to further develop theories on cross-border creativity.

Second, the present research also speaks directly to current theorizing about how cultural tightness affects creativity. Gelfand and colleagues (2006) theorized that cultural tightness generally undermines creativity. Although we found some evidence supporting this proposal, we also found the relationship between cultural tightness and creativity to be more complex than previously thought. One finding that enriches existing theory pertains to the moderating effect of cultural distance when a creative task is foreign to the innovator. That the negative effect of cultural tightness on creativity engagement and success increases with cultural distance implies underlying mechanisms such as motivation (perceived creative self-efficacy) and cognitive ability to engage with unfamiliar ideas. From a motivational perspective, it could be that individuals from tight cultures find it challenging to work with unfamiliar foreign ideas and thus experience low creative self-efficacy with respect to foreign tasks, deterring them from engaging in such tasks. Moreover, even if these individuals attempt a creative task in a culturally dissimilar context, they lack the ability to generate creative solutions to foreign problems because their adaptor cognitive style and prevention-focused self-regulation constrain their cognitive flexibility. More broadly, empirical evidence that tight cultures can inhibit individuals' ability to generate novel ideas is consistent with the notion that a culture of tolerance is an important predictor of cities' creativity (Florida, 2002). Our work, in combination with that of Florida (2002), emphasizes the importance of a society's cultural norms and cultural climate in nurturing creative talent.

Third, the present research has implications for creativity theories. Creativity research to date has greatly emphasized the importance of divergent thinking (Guilford, 1956; McCrae, 1987; Baer, 1993, 1996; Torrance, 1998), but some scholars have argued that convergent thinking has a critical role to play as well. Goncalo and Duguid (2011) found that in teams whose members are not particularly creative, conformity to individualist norms boosts creative performance, and Cropley (2006) argued that convergent thinking helps an innovator evaluate

ideas with an eye to practicality and implementation. Divergent thinking is great for the generation of novel ideas, but convergent thinking is required to ascertain if these ideas would be useful for a given problem context. Our finding that individuals from tight cultures are especially apt at doing creative work in their own cultures is consistent with this argument. Tight cultures have little tolerance for overly novel solutions. Thus the innovator needs to be able to correctly sift through a set of novel ideas to identify those that would work in the given local context. This effort requires intimate knowledge of the local cultural norms and a willingness to adhere to them. Our work adds to a small but growing effort that highlights the importance of convergent thinking in the creativity process.

Fourth, our research has implications for a related but separate body of research that examines how experiences with foreign cultures affect individuals' creative performance (e.g., Leung and Chiu, 2008). A central theme in this research is that experiences with foreign cultures have the potential to promote creativity via increased access to diverse perspectives and knowledge. But whether such benefits are realized depends on a range of individual-level moderating factors, such as degree of cultural-identity integration (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, and Lee, 2008) and intercultural learning (Maddux, Adam, and Galinsky, 2010). Our research suggests that socio-environmental factors, such as the cultural tightness of the society in which one is embedded, also play a critical role. Innovators from tight cultures appear less likely than those from loose cultures to draw on ideas from foreign cultures while performing creative work. This finding, together with recent evidence that indirect experience of intercultural conflict in one's social environment can undermine multicultural creativity (Chua, 2013), highlights the effects of the broader socio-cultural context on creativity.

Our work also speaks to recent research on intercultural creative collaboration in dyads (Chua, Morris, and Mor, 2012). Although our theory about cross-border creativity focuses on the individual level of analysis, it inherently involves applying one's own cultural perspectives and knowledge in a different cultural context. Chua and colleagues (2012) found cultural metacognition—awareness of one's own and others' cultural assumptions—to be an important predictor of success at intercultural creativity. Our research is consistent with this finding in that, to the extent that a tight culture socializes individuals to adhere to established norms, it can make it harder for them to question assumptions about their own culture and those of the audience country. The result is lower effectiveness at drawing on multiple cultural perspectives and knowledge during creative work. This study and prior research emphasize the importance of overcoming the normative constraints of one's own culture before one can be effective at creative work in a multicultural environment.

Fifth, our findings suggest that it is fruitful to differentiate engagement from performance in creativity research. Greater motivation to undertake local creative tasks does not necessarily result in greater success, but engagement is a necessary condition for success. Our results show that the point of inflexion for cultural distance's moderating effect on creativity engagement and success differs. At the mean level of cultural distance, individuals from tighter cultures are less likely to engage foreign creative tasks, yet once they attempt these tasks, they are not necessarily less likely to succeed than counterparts from less tight cultures. These results suggest that culture's impact on creativity

engagement and success might not directly mirror each other in terms of the magnitude of influence. It therefore behooves creativity researchers to distinguish creativity engagement and success.

Lastly, our findings contribute to research on open approaches to innovation through mechanisms such as creative crowdsourcing. Thus far, the literature on open and distributed innovation has considered crowds as relatively homogenous sets of individuals or companies (e.g., Zheng, Li, and Hou, 2011; Prpić et al., 2014). To our knowledge, our work is the first to investigate how the cultural heterogeneity of crowds (participants) and companies (clients) affects participation and performance in global creative problem solving. Prior research had found that social marginality (being a woman and thus an outsider to the scientific establishment) and technical marginality (being an expert in a field other than the task's focal field) could enhance performance in distributed scientific problem solving (Jeppesen and Lakhani, 2010). Our results indicate that cultural marginality seems to have the opposite effect if one comes from a tight culture—the greater the cultural distance, the lower the likelihood of creativity engagement and success at foreign creative tasks. This negative effect disappears for innovators from loose cultures. This finding suggests that the effects of marginality on performance on crowdsourcing platforms is likely to be contingent on other factors, such as the cultural environment that the innovator comes from.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Like all research, this work has some limitations. First, we treat cultural tightness as a unidimensional construct, though two countries may have similar degrees of cultural tightness but qualitatively different norms and rules. For example, Singapore and South Korea have similar cultural-tightness scores (10.40 and 10.00, respectively), but Singapore's cultural tightness stems primarily from laws and norms promulgated by the government to regulate behavior, whereas South Korea's stems from the strong norms that characterize a culturally homogenous society. It is plausible that qualitatively different forms of tight culture have different effects on creative outcomes. Depending on the source of norm regulation and the particular domain in which society is tight, different types of creativity could be at stake. For example, though it is a culturally tight society, Singapore has one of the world's most innovative cuisines. Thus it would be worthwhile for future research to unpack the cultural-tightness construct into more nuanced dimensions, possibly identifying specific social domains (e.g., family life, work life) in which to measure cultural tightness. It would also be interesting to find out how cultural tightness in different spheres of life correlates. This new research direction is consistent with recent work by Chatman et al. (2014) arguing that it is important to consider the content of cultural norms and not just their intensity and level of consensus.

Another shortcoming of the prevailing treatment of cultural tightness is that data were collected at the country level (Gelfand et al., 2011), thus overlooking regional differences within a country. For example, research by Plaut and colleagues (2012) found Boston and San Francisco to exhibit different levels of cultural tightness: people in Boston are more likely to perceive clear prevailing social norms than people in San Francisco. The researchers attributed this difference to the two cities' different historical and institutional roots. More recent

research by Harrington and Gelfand (2014) mapped wide variations in cultural tightness across 50 states in the U.S., further demonstrating within-country differences. Given this evidence, documentation of within-country differences would make for more precise predictions in future research.

Second, although our measure of creativity success has the strength of being a concrete real-world outcome—whether or not a prize was awarded to a solution—this measure does not capture whether the solution would in fact work well for the client in the targeted culture. But our supplementary interview data evidence revealed that implementation issues such as costs, complexity, and risks are clearly taken into account during the winner selection process. Thus our creativity success measure is not completely devoid of implementation-related considerations. Nevertheless, the research site we worked with had not systematically tracked implementation of winning solutions. Should these data become available, future research should investigate whether cultural tightness affects the actual successful implementation of proposed solutions. This approach will have to take into consideration additional implementation-related factors, including the organization's ability to absorb external knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990) or political processes such as gaining access to resources and obtaining executives' buy-in (Katz and Allen, 1982).

Additionally, our creativity measure does not differentiate between incremental versus path-breaking ideas. Incremental ideas extend and improve upon existing ones, whereas breakthrough ideas bring about whole new perspectives or insights. Innovation research has made this distinction, suggesting that different kinds of organizational routines and procedures, some of which might be influenced by national culture, could foster different types of innovation (e.g., Nelson and Winter, 1982; Herbig and Palumbo, 1996; Nagaoka and Walsh, 2009). Thus a fruitful area of future research is to investigate how cultural tightness and cultural distance affect the types of ideas that are generated. One speculation is that creative ideas from tight cultures might be more incremental than those from loose cultures.

Third, our measure of cultural distance is also a possible limitation. Although Kogut and Singh's (1988) formula for computing cultural distance has been widely used in international business research, it has also been subject to critiques. For instance, scholars have argued that this measure is based on Hofstede's dated cultural dimensions (1980), which might not apply to contemporary contexts (Shenkar, 2001; Taras, Steel, and Kirkman, 2012). But some researchers have argued that it is premature to dismiss this widely used computation. Drogendijk and Slangen (2006) compared computations using different sets of value dimensions, including Schwartz's (1994) world value dimensions, and values data based on a survey of managerial perceptions; they found the explanatory power of the Hofstede-based and Schwartz-based measures to be comparable, and those based on managerial perception to be lower. Moreover, research that has used other formulations has often found empirical results similar to those generated when using Kogut and Singh's (1988) method (e.g., Barkema and Vermeulen, 1997; Berry, Guillen, and Zhou, 2010; Newman, 2012). Future research could attempt to replicate our findings if a more compelling method of computing cultural distance is developed.

Fourth, it should be noted that our research did not measure individual differences in multicultural experience and cross-cultural competence. Prior research

has established that individual differences, such as cultural metacognitive ability (Chua, Morris, and Mor, 2012), overseas experience (Maddux and Galinsky, 2009), and multicultural experiences (Leung and Chiu, 2008, 2010), matter for creativity. Given the scale of our dataset (more than 11,000 participants), we were unable to measure these variables without having to discard a substantial portion of valuable data due to non-responses. Future research in other empirical settings could examine how individual-differences variables interact with cultural tightness. For example, individuals with high intercultural competence might find a foreign creative project less intimidating, weakening the negative effect of cultural tightness.

We believe that this research provides a good starting point for scholars to further study the impact of culture on creativity. One fruitful future direction might be to differentiate between organizational culture and national culture (Tellis, Prabhu, and Chandy, 2009). Gelfand and colleagues (2006) argued that national culture to some extent shapes organizational culture, but organizational culture might at times trump national culture (Nelson and Gopalan, 2003). It would be interesting to explore how cultural tightness at the country and organizational level interact to influence creativity and other outcomes of interest. One possibility is that a loose corporate culture might compensate for, or even overcome, the detrimental effects on creativity of a tight national culture. Another avenue for future work is to examine how tight cultures might be used strategically to gain an advantage in innovation.

Although the present findings highlight the creativity pitfalls of cultural tightness, one might wonder what the effects would be if a tight culture contains strong norms that foster creativity. For example, Toh and Leonardelli (2012) found that although fewer women reach top leadership positions in tight cultures, if the culture espouses egalitarian values, tight cultures have even more women in leadership positions. In a similar vein, it is possible that tight cultures with creativity-fostering norms might actually have positive effects on creative performance. Future research should investigate what these creativity-fostering norms might be and how they interact with the general effect of cultural tightness that involves strong rules and sanctions. Additionally, future research can look at cultural tightness's effect on innovation implementation. To the extent that tight cultures are efficient and well regulated, they might perform especially well at implementation of creative ideas. The challenge then is to pinpoint how societies or organizations can, at the same time, mitigate the negative effect of cultural tightness on creative idea generation.

There is no doubt that culture shapes creative thinking and innovation, but pertinent research is still in a nascent stage. Given the critical roles of globalization and innovation in determining individual and business success in the twenty-first century, we hope that future research will build on our findings to further understand how culture influences creativity.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Associate Editor John A Wagner and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions throughout the review process. We are also grateful to colleagues and friends who have read early versions of our manuscript and given us insightful and constructive feedback, specifically Joshua

Margolis, Teresa Amabile, Lakshmi Ramarajan, Chris Marquis, Shira Mor, Canny Zou, Mehdi Arfaoui, Cedric Chaffois, Stephane Salgado, and Frederick Wehrle.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, H. E., and C. M. Fiol

1994 "Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation." *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 645–670.

Almeida, P.

1996 "Knowledge sourcing by foreign multinationals: Patent citation analysis in the U.S. semiconductor industry." *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 155–165.

Amabile, T. M.

1983 "The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45: 357–376.

Amabile, T. M.

1988 "A model of creativity and innovation in organizations." In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10: 123–167. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Amabile, T. M.

1996 *Creativity in Context: The Social Psychology of Creativity*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Arnett, J. J.

1995 "Broad and narrow socialization: The family in the context of a cultural theory." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57: 617–628.

Au, K. Y.

1999 "Intra-cultural variation: Evidence and implications for international business." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30: 799–812.

Baer, J.

1993 *Creativity and Divergent Thinking: A Task-specific Approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Baer, J.

1996 "The effects of task-specific divergent-thinking training." *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 30 (3): 183–187.

Barkema, H., J. Bell, and J. Pennings

1996 "Foreign entry, cultural barriers, and learning." *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 151–166.

Barkema, H., and F. Vermeulen

1997 "What differences in the cultural backgrounds of partners are detrimental for international joint ventures?" *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28: 845–864.

Bayus, B.

2013 "Crowdsourcing new product ideas over time: An analysis of the Dell IdeaStorm community." *Management Science*, 59: 226–244.

Bechtoldt, M. N., C. K. W. De Dreu, B. A. Nijstad, and H.-S. Choi

2010 "Motivated information processing, social tuning, and group creativity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99: 622–637.

Benito, G., and G. Gripsrud

1992 "The expansion of foreign direct investment: Discrete rational location choices or a cultural learning process?" *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23: 461–476.

Benjamin, L. T., Jr., and J. A. Simpson

2009 "The power of the situation: The impact of Milgram's obedience studies on personality and social psychology." *American Psychologist*, 64 (1): 12–19.

Berry, H., J. F. Guillen, and N. Zhou

2010 "An institutional approach to cross-national distance." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41: 1460–1480.

Bianchi, C.

2008 "Retail internationalization from emerging markets: Case study evidence from Chile." *International Marketing Review*, 26: 221–243.

Brabham, D. C.

2012 "Managing unexpected publics online: The challenge of targeting specific groups with the wide-reaching tool of the Internet." *International Journal of Communication*, 6: 1139–1158.

Brabham, D. C.

2013 *Crowdsourcing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Buck, T., and A. Shahrim

2005 "The translation of corporate governance changes across national cultures: The case of Germany." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36: 42–61.

Cassiman, B., and R. Veugelers

2006 "In search of complementarity in innovation strategy: Internal R&D and external knowledge acquisition." *Journal of Management Science*, 52 (1): 68–82.

Chatman, J. A., D. F. Caldwell, C. A. O'Reilly, and B. Doerr

2014 "Parsing organizational culture: How the norm for adaptability influences the relationship between culture consensus and financial performance in high-technology firms." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35: 785–808.

Cheng, C. Y., J. Sanchez-Burks, and F. Lee

2008 "Connecting the dots within: Creative performance and identity integration." *Psychological Science*, 19: 1177–1183.

Chiu, C.-y., and S. Y. Y. Cheng

2007 "Toward a social psychology of culture and globalization: Some social cognitive consequences of activating two cultures simultaneously." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1 (1): 84–100.

Chiu, C.-y., and Y. Hong

2005 "Cultural competence: Dynamic processes." In A. Elliot and C. S. Dweck (eds.), *Handbook of Motivation and Competence*: 489–505. New York: Guilford.

Chiu, C.-y., and Y. Hong

2006 *Social Psychology of Culture*. New York: Psychology Press.

Chiu, C.-y., and L. Y. Y. Kwan

2010 "Culture and creativity: A process model." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 447–461.

Chua, R. Y. J.

2013 "The costs of ambient cultural disharmony: Indirect intercultural conflicts in social environment undermine creativity." *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1545–1577.

Chua, R. Y. J., M. W. Morris, and S. Mor

2012 "Collaborating across cultures: Cultural metacognition and affect-based trust in creative collaboration." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118: 116–131.

Cialdini, R. B., R. R. Reno, and C. A. Kallgren

1990 "A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58: 1015–1026.

Cohen, W. M., and D. A. Levinthal

1990 "Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128–152.

Cropley, A.

2006 "In praise of convergent thinking." *Creativity Research Journal*, 18: 391–404.

Csikszentmihalyi, M.

1990 "The domain of creativity." In M. A. Runco and R. S. Albert (eds.), *Theories of Creativity*: 190–212. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M.

1999 "A systems perspective of creativity." In R. J. Sternberg (ed.), *Handbook of Creativity*: 313–335. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M.

2003 "Society, culture and person: A systems view of creativity." In R. J. Sternberg (ed.), *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives*: 325–339. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dachs, B., and A. Pyka

2010 "What drives the internationalisation of innovation? Evidence from European patent data." *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 19 (1): 71–86.

De Dreu, C. K. W.

2010 "Human creativity: Reflections on the role of culture." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 437–446.

Deloitte University Press

2014 "Tech trends 2014: Industrialized crowdsourcing." <http://dupress.com/articles/2014-tech-trends-crowdsourcing/>.

Drogendijk, R., and A. Slangen

2006 "Hofstede, Schwartz, or managerial perceptions? The effects of different cultural distance measures on establishment mode choices by multinational enterprises." *International Business Review*, 15 (4): 361–380.

Earley, P. C., and S. Ang

2003 *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Elsbach, K. D., and R. M. Kramer

2003 "Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments." *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 283–301.

Erez, M., and R. Nouri

2010 "Creativity: The influence of cultural, social, and work contexts." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 351–370.

Festinger, L.

1950 "Informal social communication." *Psychological Review*, 57: 271–282.

Finke, R. A., T. B. Ward, and S. M. Smith

1992 *Creative Cognition: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Florida, R.

2002 *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Ford, C. M.

1996 "A theory of individual action in multiple social domains." *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 1112–1142.

Foxall, G. R., and C. G. Haskins

1986 "Cognitive style and consumer innovativeness: An empirical test of Kirton's Adaption-Innovation theory in the context of food purchasing." *European Journal of Marketing*, 20 (3/4): 63–80.

Friedman, R. S., and J. Forster

2001 "The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81: 1001–1013.

Frost, T. S.

2001 "The geographic sources of foreign subsidiaries' innovations." *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 101–123

Fu, J. H.-y., M. W. Morris, S. Lee, M. Chao, C.-y. Chiu, and Y.-y. Hong

2007 "Epistemic motives and cultural conformity: Need for closure, culture, and context as determinants of conflict judgments" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92: 191–207.

Gandolfi, F., and P. Strach

2009 "Retail internationalization: Gaining insights from the Wal-Mart experience in South Korea." *Review of International Comparative Management*, 10: 187–199.

Gao, M. H.

2013 "Culture determines business models: Analyzing Home Depot's failure case in China for international retailers from a communication perspective." *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 55 (2): 173–191.

Gartner Inc.

2013 "Top predictions for IT organizations and users for 2014 and beyond." <http://www.gartner.com/newsroom/id/2603215>.

Gelfand, M. J., L. H. Nishii, and J. L. Raver

2006 "On the nature and importance of cultural tightness–looseness." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 1225–1244.

Gelfand, M. J., J. L. Raver, L. Nishii, L. M. Leslie, J. Lun, B. C. Lim, L. Duan, and al.

2011 "Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study." *Science*, 332: 1100–1104.

Gibson, C. B., and J. L. Gibbs

2006 "Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51: 451–495.

Gist, M. E., and T. R. Mitchell

1992 "Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability." *Academy of Management Review*, 17: 183–211.

Goncalo, J. A., and M. M. Duguid

2011 "Follow the crowd in a new direction: When conformity pressure facilitates group creativity (and when it does not)." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 18: 14–23.

Guilford, J. P.

1956 "Structure of intellect." *Psychological Bulletin*, 53: 267–293.

Hamilton, B. H., and J. A. Nickerson

2003 "Correcting for endogeneity in strategic management research." *Strategic Organization*, 1: 51–78.

Hardin, C. D., and E. T. Higgins

1996 "Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective objective." In R. M. Sorrentino and E. T. Higgins (eds.), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition*, 3: 28–84. New York: Guilford Press.

Harrington, J., and M. Gelfand

2014 "Tightness–looseness across the 50 United States." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1317937111.

Hempel, P. S., and C. Sue-Chan

2010 "Culture and the assessment of creativity." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 415–435.

Herbig, P. A., and F. A. Palumbo

1996 "Innovation—Japanese style." *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 96 (5): 11–20.

Higgins, E. T.

1996 "The 'self digest': Self knowledge serving self-regulatory functions." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71: 1062–1083.

Hofstede, G.

1980 *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G.

2001 *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., G. J. Hofstede, and M. Minkov

2010 *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill Professional.

Howe, J.

2008 *Crowdsourcing: Why the Power of the Crowd Is Driving the Future of Business*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

IBM Corporation

2010 "Capitalizing on complexity: Insights from the global chief executive." <http://www-935.ibm.com/services/us/ceo/ceostudy2010/>.

Janssen, O., T. De Vries, and A. J. Cozijnsen

2014 "Voicing by adapting and innovating employees: An empirical study on how personality and environment interact to affect voice behavior." *Human Relations*, 67: 945–967.

Jeppesen, L. B., and K. R. Lakhani

2010 "Marginality and problem solving effectiveness in broadcast search." *Organization Science*, 21: 1016–1033.

Katz, R., and T. J. Allen

1982 "Investigating the not invented here (NIH) syndrome: A look at the performance, tenure, and communication patterns of 50 R&D project groups." *R&D Management*, 12 (1): 7–19.

Khazanchi, S., M. W. Lewis, and K. K. Boyer

2007 "Innovation-supportive culture: The impact of organizational values on process innovation." *Journal of Operations Management*, 25: 871–884.

King, A., and K. R. Lakhani

2013 "Using open innovation to identify the best ideas." *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55 (1): 41–48.

Kirton, M.

1976 "Adaptors and innovators: A description and measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61: 622–629.

Kirton, M.

1994 *Adaptors and Innovators: Styles of Creativity and Problem Solving*. New York: Routledge.

Kogut, B., and H. Singh

1988 "The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19: 411–432.

Krauss, R. M., and C. Y. Chiu

1998 "Language and social psychology." In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 4th ed., 2: 232–267. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lau, I. Y. M., C.-y. Chiu, and S. L. Lee

2001 "Communication and shared reality: Implications for the psychological foundations of culture." *Social Cognition*, 19: 350–371.

Leung, A. K.-y., and C.-y. Chiu

2008 "Interactive effects of multicultural experiences and openness to experience on creativity." *Creativity Research Journal*, 20: 376–382.

Leung, A. K.-y., and C.-y. Chiu

2010 "Multicultural experience, idea receptiveness, and creativity." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41: 723–741.

- Leung, A. K.-y., W. W. Maddux, A. D. Galinsky, and C. Chiu**
2008 "Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how." *American Psychologist*, 63 (3): 169–181.
- Leung, K., and M. W. Morris**
2010 "Culture and creativity: A social psychological analysis." In D. D. Carner, J. K. Murnighan, and R. van Dick (eds.), *Social Psychology and Organizations*: 371–395. New York: Routledge.
- Lubart, T. I.**
1990 "Creativity and cross-cultural variation." *International Journal of Psychology*, 25: 39–59.
- Lubart, T. I.**
1999 "Creativity across cultures." In R. J. Sternberg (ed.), *Handbook of Creativity*: 339–350. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maddux, M. W., H. Adam, and A. D. Galinsky**
2010 "When in Rome . . . learn why the Romans do what they do: How multicultural learning experiences facilitate creativity." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36: 731–741.
- Maddux, M. W., and A. D. Galinsky**
2009 "Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96: 1047–1061.
- McCrae, R. R.**
1987 "Creativity, divergent thinking, and openness to experience." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52: 1258–1265.
- Mok, A., and M. W. Morris**
2010 "Asian-Americans' creative styles in Asian and American situations: Assimilative and contrastive responses as a function of bicultural identity integration." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 371–390.
- Moorman, C.**
1995 "Organizational market information processes: Cultural antecedents and new product outcomes." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32: 318–335.
- Morris, M. W., and K. Leung**
2010 "Creativity East and West: Perspectives and parallels." *Management and Organization Review*, 6: 313–327.
- Mueller, J. S., S. Melwani, and J. Goncalo**
2012 "The bias against creativity: Why people desire but reject creative ideas." *Psychological Science*, 23 (1): 13–17.
- Nagaoka, S., and J. P. Walsh**
2009 "The R&D process in the US and Japan: Major findings from the RIETI–Georgia Tech inventor survey." RIETI Discussion Paper Series 09-E-010. Tokyo: Research Institute on Economy, Trade, and Industry.
- Nelson, R. E., and S. Gopalan**
2003 "Do organizational cultures replicate national cultures? Isomorphism, rejection and reciprocal opposition in the corporate values of three countries." *Organization Studies*, 24: 1115–1151.
- Nelson, R. E., and S. Winter**
1982 *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Newman, K. L.**
2012 "Cross-national distance: Concepts, measures, and relationships." *Journal of International Business Economy*, 13 (2): 39–59.
- Ng, A. K.**
2000 *Why Asians Are Less Creative Than Westerners*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Niu, W., and R. J. Sternberg

2001 "Cultural influences on artistic creativity and its evaluation." *International Journal of Psychology*, 36: 225–241.

Niu, W., and R. J. Sternberg

2002 "Contemporary studies on the concept of creativity: The East and the West." *Contemporary Studies*, 36 (4): 269–288.

Niu, W., and R. J. Sternberg

2003 "Societal and school influences on student creativity: The case of China." *Psychology in the Schools*, 40 (1): 103–114.

Norenzayan, A., S. Atran, J. Faulkner, and M. Schaller

2006 "Memory and mystery: The cultural selection of minimally counterintuitive narratives." *Cognitive Science*, 30: 531–553.

Noriko, S., X. Fan, and L. Van Dusen

2001 "A comparative study of creative thinking of American and Japanese college students." *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 35 (1): 24–36.

Parvanta, C., Y. Roth, and H. Keller

2013 "Crowdsourcing 101: A few basics to make you the leader of the pack." *Health Promotion Practice*, 14 (2): 163–167.

Phene, A., K. Fladmoe-Lindquist, and L. Marsh

2006 "Breakthrough innovations in the U.S. biotechnology industry: The effects of technological space and geographic origin." *Strategic Management Journal*, 27: 369–388.

Plaut, V. C., H. R. Markus, J. R. Treadway, and A. S. Fu

2012 "The cultural construction of self and well-being: A tale of two cities." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28: 1644–1658.

Prpić, J., P. Shukla, Y. Roth, and J.-F. Lemoine

2014 "Is the world flat? Unpacking the geography of crowd capital." Paper presented at the 12th Annual Open and User Innovation Conference, Boston.

Rank, J., V. L. Pace, and M. Frese

2004 "Three avenues for future research on creativity, innovation, and initiative." *Applied Psychology*, 53: 518–528.

Rubin, D. B.

1987 *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: Wiley.

Schneider, S. C., and A. De Meyer

1991 "Interpreting and responding to strategic issues: The impact of national culture." *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 307–320.

Schwartz, S. H.

1994 "Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values." In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. Choi, and G. Yoon (eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications*: 85–119. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H.

1999 "A theory of cultural values and some implications for work." *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48: 23–47.

Shane, S.

1994 "The effect of national culture on the choice between licensing and direct foreign investment." *Strategic Management Journal*, 15: 627–642.

Shane, S.

1995 "Uncertainty avoidance and the preference for innovation championing roles." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26: 47–68.

Shane, S. A.

1992 "Why do some societies invent more than others?" *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7 (1): 29–46.

Shenkar, O.

2001 "Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32: 519–535.

Smith, S. M., and S. E. Blankenship

1991 "Incubation and the persistence of fixation in problem solving." *American Journal of Psychology*, 104: 61–87.

Taras, V., P. Steel, and B. L. Kirkman

2012 "Improving national cultural indices using a longitudinal meta-analysis of Hofstede's dimensions." *Journal of World Business*, 47: 329–341.

Tellis, G., J. Prabhu, and R. Chandy

2009 "Radical innovation in firms across nations: The preeminence of corporate culture." *Journal of Marketing*, 73: 3–23.

Tierney, P., and S. M. Farmer

2002 "Creative self-efficacy: Potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 1137–1148.

Tihanyi, L., D. A. Griffith, and C. J. Russell

2005 "The effect of cultural distance on entry mode choice, international diversification, and MNE performance: A meta-analysis." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36: 270–283.

Toh, S. M., and G. J. Leonardelli

2012 "Cultural constraints on the emergence of women as leaders." *Journal of World Business*, 47: 646–611.

Torrance, E. P.

1969 "What is honored: Comparative studies of creative achievement and motivation." *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 3 (3): 149–154.

Torrance, E. P.

1998 *The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking Norms—Technical Manual* Figural (Streamlined) Forms A & B. Bensenville, IL: Scholastic Testing Service.

Triandis, H. C.

1989 "The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts." *Psychological Review*, 96: 506–520.

Varsakelis, N. C.

2001 "The impact of patent protection, economy openness and national culture on R&D investment: A cross-country empirical investigation." *Research Policy*, 30: 1059–1068.

Wang, A. Y.

2011 "Contexts of creative thinking: A comparison on creative performance of student teachers in Taiwan and the United States." *Journal of International and Cross-Cultural Studies*, 2 (1): 1–14.

Ward, T. B.

2001 "Creative cognition, conceptual combination, and the creative writing of Stephen R. Donaldson." *American Psychologist*, 56: 350–354.

Warren, D. E.

2003 "Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations." *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 622–632.

Weisberg, R. W.

1999 "Creativity and knowledge: A challenge to theories." In R. J. Sternberg (ed.), *Handbook of Creativity*: 226–250. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zheng, H., D. Li, and W. Hou

2011 "Task design, motivation, and participation in crowdsourcing contests." *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 15 (4): 57–88.

Zou, X., K.-p. Tam, M. W. Morris, S. Lee, I. Y.-m. Lau, and C. Chiu

2009 "Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as

mechanisms of cultural influence.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97: 579–597.

Authors’ Biographies

Roy Y. J. Chua is an associate professor at the Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, 50 Stamford Road, Singapore 178899 (e-mail: royyj.chua@smu.edu.sg). His current research focuses on understanding how culture shapes creativity in the global business environment. He holds a Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Columbia Business School.

Yannig Roth is a Ph.D. candidate in marketing at the Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne–PRISM, 17 rue de la Sorbonne, 75005 Paris, France (e-mail: yannigroth@gmail.com). His research interests include online marketing, creative crowdsourcing, and consumer creativity.

Jean-François Lemoine is a university professor at the Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne–PRISM, 17 rue de la Sorbonne, 75005 Paris, France (e-mail: jflemoine30@hotmail.com) and the ESSCA School of Management. His research focuses on sensory and experiential marketing at the point of sale and digital marketing. He holds a Ph.D. in marketing from the University of Poitiers.