The article by Teresa M. Amabile is dedicated to the problem of organizations unintentionally “killing” one of their main assets over and over every day. The author states that the real “murderer” is the work environment itself established due to various factors, that the Teresa M. Amabile came with after many years of working experience and researches made.

Before actually getting into describing the murderer’s motivation and making suggestions about how to avoid this unfortunate tragedy in an organization, the article refers to the definition of creativity that is made up of originality along with usefulness and actionability that make a good idea valuable.

Creative thinking refers to how people approach problems and solutions - their capacity to put existing ideas together in new combinations. Thinking imaginatively is one part of creativity, but two others according to the author, are also essential: *expertise* and *motivation*.

Expertise encompasses everything that a person knows and can do in the broad domain of his or her work. Expertise and creative thinking are an individual's raw materials-his or her natural resources, if you will. But a third factor – motivation - determines what people will actually do.

Extrinsic motivation comes from outside a person - whether the motivation is a carrot or a stick. This sort of motivation "makes" the worker do his or her job in order to get something desirable or avoid something painful.

But passion and interest-a person's internal desire to do something-are what *intrinsic* motivation is all about (interest, satisfaction, and challenge of the work itself-and not by external pressures).

After we are given the full picture of how the “victim” looks like, the article concludes the six factors that could’ve been the reasons of creativity gets undermined and the practices which could’ve saved and make it flourish. The author adds that managers can influence motivation most effectively.

1. **Lack of challenge or overloading with goals.**

Managers can match people with jobs that play to their expertise and their skills in creative thinking, *and* ignite intrinsic motivation. Perfect matches stretch employees' abilities. The amount of stretch, however, is crucial: not so little that they feel bored but not so much that they feel overwhelmed and threatened by a loss of control.

2. **Little freedom or unclear goals.**

When it comes to granting freedom, the key to creativity is giving people autonomy concerning the means-that is, concerning process - but not necessarily the ends. People will be more creative, in other words, if you give them freedom to decide how to climb a particular mountain.
You needn't let them choose which mountain to climb. In fact, clearly specified strategic goals often enhance people's creativity.

But it is very important that whoever sets the goals also makes them clear to the organization and that these goals remain stable for a meaningful period of time. It is difficult, if not impossible, to work creatively toward a target if it keeps moving.

3. **Few or too many resources**

The two main resources that affect creativity, according to the article, are *time and money*.

Under some circumstances, time pressure can heighten creativity but organizations routinely kill creativity with fake deadlines or impossibly tight ones. On the other hand, creativity often takes time. It can be slow going to explore new concepts, put together unique solutions. Managers who do not allow time for exploration or do not schedule in incubation periods are unwittingly standing in the way of the creative process.

Interestingly, adding more resources above a "threshold of sufficiency" does not boost creativity. Below that threshold, however, a restriction of resources can dampen creativity. Some managers keep resources tight, which pushes people to channel their creativity into finding additional resources, not in actually developing new products or services.

The author also mentions another resource that often gets misunderstood when it comes to creativity - physical space. It is almost conventional wisdom that creative teams need open, comfortable offices. Such an atmosphere won't hurt creativity, and it may even help, but it is not nearly as important as other managerial initiatives that influence creativity.

4. **Work-group homogeneity and poor cooperation.**

A manager must create mutually supportive groups with a diversity of perspectives and backgrounds because when teams comprise people with various intellectual foundations and approaches to work - that is, different expertise and creative thinking styles-ideas often combine and combust in exciting and useful ways.

According to Teresa M. Amabile, managers must also make sure that the teams they put together have three other features:

1) Members must share excitement over the team's goal.
2) They must display a willingness to help their teammates through difficult periods.
3) And third, every member must recognize the unique knowledge and perspective that other members bring to the table.

5. **Overpraising or overcriticism new ideas and wrong attitudes towards failures.**

Managers may freely and generously recognize creative work by individuals and teams - often before the ultimate commercial impact of those efforts is known. Not every new idea is worthy of consideration, of course, but in many organizations, managers habitually demonstrate a reaction
that damages creativity. They look for reasons to not use a new idea instead of searching for reasons to explore it further.

By contrast, managers who kill creativity do so either by failing to acknowledge innovative efforts or by greeting them with skepticism. Unfortunately, this sort of negativity bias can have severe consequences for the creativity of those being evaluated. A culture of evaluation leads people to focus on the external rewards and punishments associated with their output, thus increasing the presence of extrinsic motivation and its potentially negative effects on intrinsic motivation. And such a culture creates a climate of fear, which again undermines intrinsic motivation.

In many business situations, knowing what doesn't work can be as useful as knowing what does. But if people do not perceive any "failure value" for projects that ultimately do not achieve commercial success, they'll become less and less likely to experiment, explore, and connect with their work on a personal level. Their intrinsic motivation will evaporate.

Supervisory encouragement comes in other forms besides rewards and punishment. Another way managers can support creativity is to serve as role models, persevering through tough problems as well as encouraging collaboration and communication within the team. Such behavior enhances all three components of the creative process, and it has the added virtue of being a high-impact practice that a single manager can take on his or her own.

6. **Obstacles for information sharing and collaboration**

Infighting, politicking, and gossip are particularly damaging to creativity because they take peoples' attention away from work. Researcher suggests that intrinsic motivation increases when people are aware that those around them are excited by their jobs. When political problems abound, people feel that their work is threatened by others' agendas.

Politics also get in the way of open communication, obstructing the flow of information from point A to point B. Knowledge stays put and expertise suffers.

Organization's leaders must put in place appropriate systems or procedures and emphasize values that make it clear that creative efforts are a top priority. They can support creativity by mandating information sharing and collaboration and by ensuring that political problems do not fester.

Information sharing and collaboration support all three components of creativity. Take expertise. The more often people exchange ideas and data by working together, the more knowledge they will have. The same dynamic can be said for creative thinking. In fact, one way to enhance the creative thinking of employees is to expose them to various approaches to problem solving. With the exception of hardened misanthropes, information sharing and collaboration heighten peoples' enjoyment of work and thus their intrinsic motivation.
The author of the article provides the overwhelming survey of the factors that influence the creativity within the team. We come to a better understanding of what an impact on creativity could be and what are the main procedures concerning the selection, the supervision of the team-members. Especially valuable is the distinguishing of extrinsic motivation from the intrinsic one that gives great opportunities for the analysis of the impact of different factors on it.

It’s of great importance, that we know where to find and how to identify the creativity killers existing within the organization. But another challenge comes: how to fight such a situation. It’s management that possesses the only authority to influence the process. And according to the Teresa M. Amabile approach it is also the main source of such creativity killers. That makes several points appear.

The first point is that in such a case it becomes hardly possible to change the situation drastically. It seems that the only effective measure could be the replacement of the management that undermines the creativity of the team. The author mentions that creativity often requires “that managers radically change the ways in which they build and interact with work groups”. But it is hardly likely to achieve.

Moreover, sometimes it is really a great challenge for the management to recognize the negative impact of their supervision and leadership. It concerns the personal style of management, the main views on how to make the work effective and how to build the relationship with the team-members.

On the other hand, it seems according to the article that the problems occur connected with the team-members do not include the human factor that could be sometimes really difficult to identify. And such a factor can sometimes undermine the creative work of the team formed according to all of the not-to-kill-the-creativity standards.

It also seems that there is no better recipe to form a creative team than to include completely different people with completely different background. It would probably lead to some really extraordinary projects or products that would distinguish the company from others. But it is not useful to all of the companies in all the cases. If there’s lack of time for instance, there’s no possibility to waste time onto building strong relationships within the team or to settle some conflicts that would probably occur in case when people have diverse views on one issue. In case of tough time resources it would be more useful to build up a team consisting of people of similar views and culture to achieve some goal in a short period of time.

Another idea concerning the creation of the positive atmosphere within the company touches upon the problem of the mistakes perception. That is really important that a team-member should not be shy in the expression of his ideas. But it is even more crucial that those ideas should be carefully analyzed before launching a new project. It is time and resource consuming to get those
new projects unfinished. It is vital for an efficient company operation that everyone is confident in the positive result of the work.

Creativity often requires that managers radically change the ways in which they build and interact with work groups. In many respects, it calls for a conscious culture change. But it can be done, and the rewards can be great.

The risks of not doing so may be even greater. When creativity is killed, an organization loses a potent competitive weapon: new ideas. It can also lose the energy and commitment of its people.