

**Creative bodies on the move:  
Exploring tensions of collaborative creativity in productional spaces of dance**

SUVI SATAMA

Turku School of Economics

University of Turku

Rehtorinpellonkatu 3, FI-20500 Turku, Finland

Tel: + 358 45 65 08 698

E-mail: stsata@utu.fi

and

ANNIKA BLOMBERG

Turku School of Economics

University of Turku

Pori University Consortium

Pohjoisranta 11A, FI-28101 Pori, Finland

Tel: +358 50 4368868

E-mail: anjoma@utu.fi

Full paper submitted to the Sub-Theme 12: Processes of Organizational Creativity: Collective  
Entrepreneurship, Co-Creation and Collaborative Innovation  
EGOS 2013 Colloquium, July 4–6, Montréal, Canada  
Version 3 June 2013

**ABSTRACT**

The focus of this paper is on the phenomenon of collaborative creativity emerging from shared, embodied experiences in the context of dance. Our aim is to explore *how collaborative creativity is shared and negotiated in productional spaces of dance*. We define collaborative creativity as an aesthetic experience emerging collaboratively in embodied and often unexpected ways. We argue that collaborative creativity actualizes in productional spaces, here understood as the frames settled for the current artistic production and within which dancers are able or unable to fulfill themselves as 'creative, embodied agents'. To

support our argument, we present observations from an ongoing study of dance in which sensuous, creatively embodied ways of moving are at the heart.

Based on our research material from two separate dance productions, we identified three tensions through which collaborative creativity is negotiated. The findings have significance firstly for how we understand the ambiguous phenomenon of collaborative creativity from an *embodied* point of view. Secondly, we show how collaborative creativity is not only a result of a collective social process (Sawyer 2000), but rather a multi-dimensional phenomenon in which shared meanings of emotional, intuitive and improvisational movements take the stage in day-to-day life of professional dancers.

*Key words: collaborative creativity, productional space, ethnography, professional dance*

## INTRODUCTION

*“If I could tell you what it meant, there would be no point in dancing it.” (Isadora Duncan)*

Let the quote of the legendary dancer Isadora Duncan, considered as a pioneer and the mother of modern dance (Duncan 2013), serve as a starting point for this paper. As Duncan sought in her work the creative connection between embodiment and creativity, so do we in this paper. Creativity, following Amabile’s (1997) definition, refers to *a human activity that produces novel and appropriate ideas*. Traditionally, creativity has been thought to arise in an individual’s mind, even if other individuals and the social context may influence it (Ekvall 1997). However, there are a few scholars who see creativity truly as a collaborative performance, even to the extent that they see collaborative creativity as a creating entity itself (e.g. Sawyer 2007; Sonnenburg 2004).

The purpose of this paper is to understand *how collaborative creativity takes place in dancers’ everyday-work* and to describe the central *elements that are present* as collaborative creativity emerges. We understand collaborative creativity as a collective social process that is fundamentally embodied and emotionally laden. We base the idea of this paper on the assumption that collaborative creativity emerges from embodied interaction and constant negotiation of meanings, ideas and interpretations of each other in an aesthetic way. We consider dance as an excellent context to explore the phenomenon of collaborative creativity, because creativity derives from embodied interactions between the dancers in their everyday life and therefore makes it perceptible in this specific context.

This paper has two main contributions. Firstly, it shows how collaborative creativity is negotiated and developed between dancers and other actors involved in the production, thus giving a better understanding of its emergence. Secondly, the paper explores the ways in which collaborative creativity is negotiated in productional spaces and, in this way, deepens our understanding of the intertwined relationship between collaborative creativity and the contexts within it is bounded.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### *Collaborative view on creativity*

Creativity has traditionally been studied mostly as an individual level phenomenon (Montuori & Purser 1995; Klijn & Tomic 2010) even if it is generally agreed that individual creativity is affected by social processes, and the group in which an individual functions, causes the most imminent influence on the individual behavior (Woodman et al. 1993). Several scholars have attempted to find different attributes that are believed to influence creativity in a group context (e.g. Björkman 2004). To certain extent, it can be said that all creativity is considered collaborative, since also in individual creation, the ‘raw material’ of creativity (i.e. ideas, products, tradition) has been produced by other people and additionally, creativity needs an audience to be recognized as such (see e.g. Csikszentmihalyi 1996) However, to emphasize the truly collective and collaborative nature of creativity and to differentiate it from the research of the individual, or group creativity scholars, the concept of collaborative creativity has been introduced (see e.g. Sawyer 2007; Sawyer & DeZutter 2009; Sonnenburg 2004).

Eisenhart and Borko (1991) make a distinction between ‘additive’ and ‘integrative’ approaches to collaboration. In additive view, the dancers work on separate parts of the production and each of them contribute their part to the collated final production. The integrative approach emphasizes working together to develop shared understandings. Accordingly, what divides collaborative creativity from group creativity, i.e. the creativity of several individuals working together, is that the creation is considered truly collaborative (Sawyer 2000) or integrative if Eisenhart’s & Borko’s (1991) terminology is used. It is a result of a collective social process and emerges from the interactions of the group rather than from the minds of single individuals. Therefore, it is impossible to identify the creativity of a single individual from the whole performance. (Sawyer 2000.) Collaboration is fundamentally different from the interactions of work acquaintances in that it involves a complex *mélange* of

skills, temperaments, effort and personalities that aim to realize a shared vision of something new and useful (Moran & John-Steiner 2004).

In collaborative creativity, a shared understanding of the task and the goals is developed and constantly negotiated between the participants through intersubjectivity, which is a necessary aspect of successful collaborative creation (Sullivan 2011). Collaborative creativity is a process, where individuals are responsible for each other, trust each other and required to be fully present in the situation. They also have a common language, and something that might be called a group mind in a positive sense. (Sawyer 1999.) Collaborative creation is often both emotionally and cognitively charged and personally meaningful (John-Steiner 2000) and involves the construction of subjectivities and relationships in addition to constructing ideas and artifacts (Littleton & Miell 2004).

According to Storey and Joubert (2004) the aspects that turn simple cooperation into collaborative creativity include motivation, fear and risk-taking, relationship of trust, intimacy and mutual vulnerability. Moran and John-Steiner (2004) add yet three characteristics of collaboration, which are complementarity, tension and emergence. Motivation, especially intrinsic motivation, is considered crucial for creativity (Amabile 1997), while many studies have found that working alone produces higher motivation than working in groups (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). Group's motivation tends to be as high as the motivation of the least motivated member of the group (Purser & Montuori 1999). However, in a truly collaborative encounter, motivation can rise higher than the combined motivations of the individuals. Firstly, the motivational energy resources are multiplied and secondly, through collaboration a joint intrinsic motivation can develop. A joint intrinsic motivation can be developed as the collaboration means giving and receiving constant feedback and even difficult criticism from your partners, which, at least in a successful collaboration and in a trustful relationship, results in a stronger motivation and engagement with the task at hand. (Moran & John-Steiner 2004.)

Mutual trust is another important element of collaborative creativity (Sawyer 1999; Seddon 2004; Storey & Joubert 2004). When the partners trust each other, they are able to give their best for the collaboration, since they know the others do the same. Trust is also connected to the next aspect, which is intimacy and mutual vulnerability. That means that in order to collaborate creatively, the partners need a certain amount of intimacy and especially that the intimacy and vulnerability related to it needs to be mutual. (Storey & Joubert 2004.) A very

intensive, concentrated collaborative working requires a high level of intimacy and makes individuals exhausted and vulnerable, but also may lead to radically creative insights (John-Steiner 2000).

Complementarity refers to the heterogeneity of the collaborators, regarding their perspectives, expertise, conceptualizations, working methods, temperaments, and talents (John-Steiner 2000; Moran & John-Steiner 2004). This complementarity causes different dynamics and even conflicts to emerge, creating a foundation for creative collaboration. That leads us to tension, which is also considered an important element of collaboration (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). There can be tension between staying in the comfort zone and experimenting and risk-taking, tension between different ideas and views, maybe even tension between different working styles but the idea of collaboration is not avoiding tension, but cultivating tension (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). The last aspect, emergence, refers to the fact that the result of a successful collaboration can lead to outcomes that could not have been predicted from the additive power of the individuals (Sawyer 1999).

The critical factors in the success of collaboration are sharing and trust. By sharing, one can refer to the division of labor where each participant knows s/he does not have to carry the whole burden. Sharing, in the case of collaboration, can also have another meaning. It can be understood as a shared liability, in which case each partner is fully responsible for the whole if the other partner fails to participate. Trust refers to respect for another person's differences and views, and confidence in the other partner's ability to contribute to the task at hand. (Moran & John-Steiner 2004.)

In addition, collaborative creativity seems to be enhanced by a development of a sort of a collective consciousness (Kenny 2008) Glaveanu (2011, 483) presents an idea of collaborative creativity taking place in a *representational space*, which is a sort of space where inner reality and external life interact with each other and which is shaped by social and collective systems of thought. He defines collaborative creativity in the following way: *“In a collaborative situation individuals use symbolic resources intrinsic to their particular system of knowledge and, through communication, generate new and useful artefacts (the creative outcome) within a representational space of the group.”* This representational space comes close to the concept of collective consciousness, which is often illustrated as being able to anticipate each other's minds, reading other's minds, feeling another's feelings and share intuitive wisdom and a deep sense of knowing and connection (Kenny 2008). We, however,

want to emphasize that the communication is not only limited to verbal communication, but it also includes bodily expression and non-verbal communication as well as experiencing through the body. In producing a dance performance, bodily presence becomes as important as cognitive presence (c.f. Sauer 2005).

### *Embodied work surrounded by productional spaces*

The “corporeal turn” (Sheets-Johnstone 2009) in the sociology of the body has turned the attention from a fleshy *materiality* towards more-than-fleshy *sociality* (Witz 2000), to which we attach this paper. Alongside with the “corporeal turn”, a “turn to embodiment” in organization studies (e.g. Hassard et al. 2000; Dale 2001; Dale & Burrell 2000) has raised an ever-growing interest to the role of the body at work (e.g. Hindmarch & Pilnick 2007; Patriotta & Spedale 2009) and to the research of embodiment (e.g. Moreira 2004; Wainwright, Williams & Turner 2007; Brown, Cromby, Harper, Johnson & Reavey 2011; Tarr & Thomas 2011). Still, relatively little attention has been paid to the embodied founding of collaborative creativity in organization studies. In this paper, we face this challenge by defining embodiment as a process whereby collective behaviours and beliefs, acquired through acculturation, are rendered individual and ‘lived’ at the level of the body (see Noland 2009). We view the bodies of dancers as fully enabled, culturally idealized representations of the human body (Douglas 1966), in a sense that they are physically trained throughout their careers and fully enabled to both express their individual creativity and “*the specific cultural meanings embedded in the roles they embody*” (Schechner 2006, 233) on the everyday stages they are performing.

The body and its relationship with the space are through which our spatial existence materializes itself. The concept of space refers to structures and environments but also spatial relations and meanings related to them. (Sauer 2005.) According to Merleau-Ponty (1989), an individual experiences the space with all the senses and with the body instead of actively or passively observing it. A space forms through the interpretations of the people experiencing it (Sauer 2005). An embodied space, on the other hand, is “the location where human experience and consciousness takes on material and spatial form” (Low 2003, 9). In this paper, we use the concept of productional space to define the variety of possibilities a dancer has in using his or her creativity while working on the present production. In our understanding, the productional space represents a framework for collaborative creativity, giving both the limits but also the resources for it.

## METHODOLOGY

This paper takes an aesthetic approach (Strati 2000) to capture sensuous ways of knowing, feeling and interacting. In other words, the methodology of our study is aesthetically sensitive, where the sensual experiences of researchers in gathering the empirical material are important, but mutually important are the aesthetic experiences of the researched subjects. In addition, the collaborative working, creation and communication in the context of dance is for a large part embodied and sensual, and thus requires taking an aesthetic approach.

The methodological approach of this paper is ethnographic. In general, ethnography is a way of thinking, analyzing and writing about social life (Watson 2011). Thus, it is more a research approach than a concrete, pre-defined set of methodological tools to be used on the field (Van Maanen 2011). Ethnography has been widely adopted as a way in which understanding of the micro processes of organizational life can be reached (Kellogg 2009; Michel 2011). In line with this view, we underline the nature of ethnography as a process of experiencing, interpreting and representing knowledge about culture, organization or individuals based on ethnographers' own experiences (see Crotty 1998, 7; Pink 2011, 22; Watson 2011).

The empirical material of this paper derives from two separate dance productions in which one of the authors of this paper conducted ethnographic fieldwork. The first of these is a production of two retired ballet dancers, a male and a female, who moved from the culture of ballet world to the freelance field and though, are supposed to have more personal space and freedom to decide of their own bodily practices and ways of moving. Both dancers worked for the Finnish National Ballet for over 20 years and retired at the same time, in June 2012. Especially interesting in these dancers is their life-long background in the world of classical ballet and the ways in which they now struggle between the traditions of classical ballet and creating their own personal style and space. The new turn in their career can be seen as a fruitful ground for collaborative creativity between them; on the other hand the tradition of classical ballet provides a common language for the two dancers, while on the other hand the rules of classical ballet do no longer apply and they are free, and even required, to create their own movements and style.

The second dance production is an on-going freelance production in which the choreographer works with five dancers and with several musicians and other actors, such as the composer, the make-up artist and the technicians, involved in the production. The premiere of this

production is planned to be in autumn 2014, thus the working period is longer than usually in the freelance field of dance.

The empirical material of both productions described above includes participant observation, photographs, video clips and numerous informal conversations with dancers and other participants. We decided to concentrate on these two settings because we believe the material collected from these is suitable to illustrate the ways in which creativity is collaborative in kind and the ways in which it is negotiated and created in two different kinds of productional spaces.

## NEGOTIATING COLLABORATIVE CREATIVITY THROUGH TENSIONS IN PRODUCTIONAL SPACES OF DANCE

Based on the extensive empirical material collected for an on-going study of dancers' embodied agency, that was now analyzed from the perspective of collaborative creativity for the purpose of this paper, we were able to recognize three central tensions that seem relevant in the emergence of collaborative creativity in the two productional spaces of dance, one of the two retired ballet dancers and the other one with more participants. These tensions are discussed in the following subsections below.

### *Emotional tensions of collaborative creativity*

The work of professional dancers has a strong emotional basis on which the dancers build their embodied existence and moving. Expressing themselves through motions is fundamentally embodied, though the emotional experiences of the profession become often so intense that the dancers give up many other options, such as having children, for its sake. The professional dancers are able to use bodily processes in refined ways to feel the body in flow while working (see Csikszentmihalyi 2008). Emotions are embedded in dancers' day-to-day work and firmly shaped by the cultural values of the production and its actors. In line with Fineman (2008) we view emotions as important social products, shared and negotiated collaboratively in the creative work of professional dancers.

The dancers' work is emotional-laden for many reasons. Firstly, the purpose of a dance performance is to wake emotions both in the audience's and in the actors' minds onstage. Therefore a part of dancers' work is about getting tuned in an appropriate emotional state to be able to express the story through their body. Secondly, intensive collaborative work is



always emotionally charged, as the dancers need to be fully present both offstage and onstage and sensitive towards the thoughts, feelings, movements and actions of their colleagues (John-Steiner 2000; Kenny 2008).

In addition to these viewpoints, the actors involved in a dance production are often confronted with the challenge of mixing up their personal characteristics and intimate emotions with the working life and the emotional aspects of it. Based on the empirical material used in this paper, it, however, seems that the emotional-laden working is rather a source of collaborative creativity than its hindrance. The episode below renders the emotionally laden foundation of dancers' collaborative work and tries to capture the multi-level emotions of a dance production. John-Steiner (2000, 124) argues that collaboration is charged not only cognitively, but also emotionally. Collaboration requires the simultaneous use of embodied reflexivity, emotions, and technical skill, which is gained through repetitive practices offstage. The creation of the productional material derives from emotional states that the choreographer has in her mind:

*The choreographer stands in the middle of the rehearsal hall, surrounded by five dancers who listen to her with deep concentration. She seems to be excited about the production and tries to create a relaxed atmosphere and starts the rehearsal by describing her ideas behind the current production. "So, originally this supposed to be a solo, but let's make it a duet now. The production is called 'Nordic Roots'. This scene is about a Viking woman who has lost her all. The story attaches easily to the partnership problematic of postmodern times. This is the background of the story." The dancers nod and seemingly try to catch the world the choreographer is explaining.*

*The choreographer continues: "Let's try it now!" She advises a female dancer: "You can grab him functionally, but the woman should not embrace the man, that's the idea. Let's divide you in pairs now!" The dancers start joking about how to divide the pairs. One of them suggests: "Let's do it like it was Argentinean tango. No eye contact, just the feeling." He grabs the female dancer and they take steps of tango. The other dancers are doubled up with laughter. The group makes constantly inside jokes that I am unable to catch. They come quickly to a mutual understanding about the division of the pairs, sober down, and wait for the choreographer to give them the next step to follow. "Is it like my world in which I am moving, or our joint world?" a dancer asks. "Let it be your world of imagination although it will be expressed collaboratively", the choreographer replies.*

*The choreographer puts the music on and the dancers start moving in pairs, sensing the music and impulses it wakes in their bodies. They listen to each other and seem to catch the thought from the point where the other leaves it. They communicate through their bodies, by feeling and sensing the impulses that the partner transmits. The choreographer follows the dancers by walking quietly on the sides of the rehearsal studio and expresses her satisfaction with a soft smile (see video clips from the first rehearsals, <http://vimeo.com/47918051>).*

*The music ends, and the choreographer asks whether the dancers want to change pairs to try the same scene with a different partner. I am surprised by the meaning of the various combinations of the pair dynamics for the overall appearance of the scene. The choreographer encourages by short expressions, such as “yes, yes” and “yes, just like that” all the pairs equally and avoids commenting negatively any movements the dancers make in the starting phase of the production.*

In the empirical episode above, the emotionally charged movements emerge through the mutual interpretation of the given emotional state and the music (see Montuouri 2003). The dancers interpret the choreographer’s ideas and the emotional states she has tried to verbally describe, and share it with each other. The choreographer watches it, and expresses her view on the dancers’ interpretation. In fact, collaborative mutuality is a central aspect upon partners who share both their personal and working lives (John-Steiner 2000, 132). In the work of the collaborative dance piece illustrated in the episode above, the collaborative mutuality comes to existence through embodied work. As the dancers work close to each other both emotionally and physically in their daily life, they easily share their whole life with their colleagues and the boundaries between work and home are difficult to draw: “*We share everything with each other, one would notice if someone had some worries. In this work it is impossible to hide. You have to be fully who you are.*”

The emotional state visualized by the choreographer is the starting point for collaboration and collective interpretation and creation of the scene. Intimacy and instinctivity are required both from the dancers and the choreographer in order to be able to accomplish the task (Storey & Joubert 2004) and to get into a right kind of emotional state.

John-Steiner (2000) discusses the supportive and destructive aspects of emotional themes of collaboration. *Confidence* or *trust* in a partner’s capabilities is central in collaborative work, as marginality, and self-doubt often characterize creative people. For example, in the freelance production of the choreographer and five dancers, the choreographer sometimes

spoke in loud to me while I was writing my field notes in the corner of the rehearsal studio: *“I really wonder why I’m actually doing this, am I good enough? Only a few performances and such a huge job. This work is just crazy.”* In the episode described above, despite the self-doubt and challenge, the choreographer trusts herself as well as the interpretational capability of the dancers. Also the dancers have to rely on the choreographer and her vision, and on the other dancers to be able to immerse themselves fully in the emotional state created in a shared understanding during the first rehearsal of the production.

An effective partnership of creative work builds on the solidarity as well as the differences between the workers (John-Steiner 2000). While the freelance production is assembled recently and the dancers have not worked together before, the two retired ballet dancers have a joint, life-long background in the opera house. Thus, the emotional atmosphere of the production depends on the actors’ previous collaboration and familiarity with each other. The patterns of partnerships are present in various emotional dynamics of the retired ballet dancers’ work, such as caring, respectful companionship to the passionate connections within relationships (John-Steiner 2000). As Minna comments: *“I know Kare’s temperament very well and we complement each other perfectly. We have a common sense of humor and he’s ideas stimulate my working when I’m stuck with my thoughts.”* This thought also relates to John-Steiner’s (2000, 127–128) argument on complementarity in knowledge and expansion of one’s efforts by absorbing of the partner’s belief in one’s capabilities. The dancers complement each other’s embodied knowledge by combining their ideas into a coherent whole.

Also collaborative mutuality (John-Steiner 2000) is an important aspect in dealing with various emotions that the embodied work raises in daily work of the two ex-ballerinas. The synergy of the partnership builds on the similar conceptual framework of ballet and helps to develop collaborative mutuality.

Collaborative mutuality is also central as their work gets often blurred with private life and both the dancers tend to work at home without counting the hours they use for the forthcoming production. Collaborative mutuality is often needed also when the dancers deal with the problematic of practical matters, such as the lack of set pieces before moving to the theatre, as the following episode renders:

*“We don’t have the bed in the rehearsal studio, so we have to manage without it. Maybe we have to go to my home, to my bedroom, to practice the “bed scene”. She laughs and continues: “What will my husband say if I take Kare there?”*

The bed scene (see picture 1) is one of the most emotional sections of the whole piece. The lack of a ‘real’ bed doesn’t bother the dancers and they are amazingly able to do without them. As the picture below renders, the empathy and the losing oneself in the emotional state is possible without the ready set pieces that the dancers do not have until few days before the premiere. Even though the onstage performance is more refined and visually richer, the emotional ‘chargedness’ is present and easily rendered also in the everyday-life of the dancers offstage.



Picture 1 The dancers are able to fully immerse themselves in the various emotional states without the set pieces offstage.

During the production of the retired ballerinas, the dancers often worked on the scenes at home. When I asked the male-dancer whether it bothers his wife, he replied: *“Not at all, she understands it fully. She is a dancer-choreographer as well so we often discuss the work issues at home.”* Collaborative mutuality (John-Steiner 2000) is thus extended to the home

life of the dancers. In a way, it is an emotional tool for working towards shared understandings of the production.

The empirical episode below illustrates how collaborative creativity is about balancing between the opinions of people from various backgrounds, mixed with a blend of emotions of both the people of the production and those of the 'outsiders':

*The weeks go by and eight weeks later we sit in the audience of the theatre and discuss the details of the piece. The premiere is in few days.*

*Various people come and go during the stage rehearsal, which makes the multiple relations involved in the dance production more visible. They advise Minna and Kare. I wonder how they are able to internalize all the comments as it is only one week to the premiere. It seems they absorb all the comments but regard only a part of them. They continue by practicing the piece from the beginning again and videotape it. Then they move to the audience and look the taped section from the small screen of a video camera.*

Minna: *"Yes! Our movement is finally filled with natural nuances. We need to give this video to the light designer. I think our working has developed more subtle."*

Kare's wife: *"I agree but still you should make differences between the first and the final parts of the piece. I didn't notice the differences between them."*

Kare: *"Well, I think we need to think about this during the weekend. Maybe the different emotions are not transmitted clear enough to the audience."*



Picture 2 Two days before the premiere the piece onstage is polished but working offstage still chaotic.

*The various opinions of several people from different backgrounds have an effect on dancers' visions of the dance piece they have constructed now for two months. It is surprising how the piece is developed until the last day before the first night. Still, it is never considered as ready and perfect. As they have now moved to the theatre they continue to test the video projection, the dresses and try different placing of the bed, the pendant crystal lamp and the mirror (see picture 2). The entirety is still scattered and in a sense a 'creative mess', even though the illusion of the working onstage makes the piece to seem as more ready than never before.*

As all the empirical episodes above illustrate, creativity is a result of a series of actions and events bound with each other (Sundgren & Styhre 2007). It is thus not an individual ability, but a collaboratively shared process during which the actors need good listening skills, respect for each other's thoughts and open-minded attitude to cope with the various emotional laden moments and to transform it into a dance performance.

In sum, as all the empirical episodes above have rendered, collaborative creativity builds on a sphere filled with a blend of emotions, including those of the actors and of the production itself. The emotionally charged nature of dancer's work makes it challenging, while also is a

resource of their collaboration and creativity. The various emotions shared and negotiated between the actors are an essential platform for the emergence of collaborative creativity.

### *Intuition as a solitary and a shared experience*

Intuition and the unconscious are important elements of creativity (see e.g. Barron 1988; Feldman 1988; Andersen 2000; Styhre 2011; Sundgren & Styhre 2004). Especially in collaborative work the ability to *sense* the situations and other actors' thoughts and mental states is crucial, and helps to integrate the different ideas together creatively (Kenny 2008). In the successful process of collaborative creativity, a collective consciousness emerges (Barron 1988; Kenny 1998).

The collaboration between a choreographer and dancers employs concentrated attentiveness in which both of them feel each other's sentiments intuitively. Through the collaborative listening they end up with a mutual, creative outcome. The collective consciousness may also lead to a stronger intuitive capacity between partners, meaning a direct physical, emotional and mental sensing and interaction between the collaborators (Kenny 2008). We call this phenomenon *shared intuition* of the artistic production.

In dancers' everyday-work, intuition plays an important role in the handling of the various emotional states on the basis of the production. Intuition leads the work towards a creative outcome. It becomes observable through the embodied work of dancers in which detailed, nuanced variations of the movements are created collaboratively. A successful collaboration requires both elements of addition and integration (Eisenhart & Borko 1991) in which the dancers work is guided by both solitary and shared intuition. In other words, the additive aspect materializes as the dancers use their solitary intuition to work on separate parts on the dance piece by themselves, whereas the integrative aspect actualizes as they work together towards a goal guided by the collaboratively created shared intuition. This integrative capacity is essential for collaborative creativity as it allows individuals to combine different ideas in a new way because they are able to perceive a synthesis underlying the ideas with the help of solitary and shared intuition (Kenny 2008).

Dancers' personal background and experiences, i.e. the *solitary* intuition forms the basis for the *shared* intuition in their collaborative work. In other words, the intuition shapes towards a shared experience through the embodied work. In the empirical episode below, the tension between solitary and shared aspects of intuition are rendered visible.

*The atmosphere in the rehearsal studio is devoted, peaceful and sensitive as I step in. It is Saturday morning, and I am observing the first rehearsal of the scene called "Roe deer". There are two dancers, a male and a female, and the choreographer present. The choreographer seems to be focused and a bit absent in the same time. Both the choreographer and the dancers warm up, chatting freely together for a while. Jonna, one of the dancers, tells she had a terrible nightmare last night. "My former ballet master came to twist my ankle, and wondered how come my ankle can be naturally so flexible". The other dancer, Pekka, sighs: "I wish I got into that kind of mode some day, without a need to try".*

*Pekka moves to the back side of the studio and starts to play with a big gymnastics ball. The choreographer puts the music on and starts to explain to Jonna: "I am not sure whether I have the heart to use you in this solo. You are needed in the other sections at the same time. I need to think about it." They start moving by sensing the music and taking impulses from the sound world. "Use proud shapes, you can take some bourré in between the postures. Try to stay up and curled in the same time", the choreographer verbalizes her ideas to the dancer.*

*The music stops but Jonna continues moving without the music, empathizing into the role of the fragile roe deer. The choreographer follows and encourages her: " Yes, yes! Just like that, that's what I meant!" Jonna seems to follow the choreographer and easily catch her verbal advice and turn them into embodied forms of creative movements (see picture 3).*





Picture 3 The collaboration between the choreographer (on the left) and the dancer is intuitive in a sense that the collective ideas are shared and developed into a mutual understanding based on listening to each other's body language and slightly varying gestures.

As described in the episode above, by concentrating on the *bodily* presence and on the ideas the choreographer and the dancer generate together, the actors shift their focus little by little from routinized practicing and scripted behavior towards a sensuous, aesthetic working style in which more space for intuitivism is allowed (see Styhre 2011).

Collaborative creativity is thus a result of collective social process, emerging from intuitive interactions between the actors both offstage, as seen in the episode above, and onstage and thus cannot be identified to a single individual (see Sawyer 2000). In this respect, intuition, considered here as a 'generator' of collaborative creativity, is *shared* between the actors. It is not only an individual ability, judgment, experience or thinking process, as recent organizational scholars have suggested (see e.g. Dane & Pratt 2007; Betsch 2008; Salas, Rosen & DiazGranados 2010) but a shared yet unspoken, aesthetically born and partly subconscious knowledge or understanding of what to do and how. It is based on what is known while it also goes beyond it to enable something new to be created (Sundgren & Styhre 2004).

Another episode from the same rehearsal described above renders the development of solitary intuitions of the choreographer and the dancer into a shared intuition:

*After a short break the choreographer asks the dancer to move in the flow of the music by giving her certain frames for working. Now they focus on the use of her hands. The choreographer asks the dancer to use her hands as if she were a graceful roe deer and to use sudden accents while moving (see picture 4 below).*



Picture 4 The intuitive moving is fundamentally embodied as the dancer senses every single motion through her body, ending at her fingertips.



Picture 5 The choreographer encourages the dancer to try different possibilities of moving and in this respect, the intuition becomes shared.

*After giving certain frames for how to move, the choreographer gives space for the dancer to create her own interpretation of the scene. The dancer reflects and carries the story of the roe deer, and the choreographer follows intensively every move she makes. While the dancer moves the choreographer comments and gives more and more detailed ideas of the scene: “Try to get some ethereal softness to your hands. Your body sends impulses to your hands, it brings a sense of bestiality to the movement, let’s try it together!”*

*The choreographer starts moving beside the dancer, and together they produce movement material that is not planned or choreographed in advance, only the background-thoughts of the choreographer she has explained guide the actions of their collaboration. Suddenly the choreographer starts to explain her vision about the scenography: “Here I see 30 meters of straight passage, with columns in straight rows. My vision is to create depth and abilities to ride along causeway here. And we could put the audience in the middle of all the action.”*

*The choreographer glances at the dancer and continues: “I guess you have the discretion to choose whom you dare to draw near in the audience?” The dancer looks enthusiastic and answers: “Definitely yes!” They continue by trying the scene with a diverse music in which*

*only an accordion is played without any accompanying instrument. The atmosphere in the rehearsal studio changes even more devout than before.*

In the episode above, intuition is developed from the dancer's and the choreographer's solitary intuitions towards the shared intuition between them in an iterative, non-linear manner (see Sundgren & Styhre 2004). The tension between these aspects is not negative in any means. Instead, it is a powerful resource of collaborative creativity. The intuitive dialogue is engaged in a positive spirit, arising from direct experience through "*an intuitive felt-sense of one's union with the interconnected wholeness of life*" (Kenny 2008, 595). The momentary, embodied ideas that the choreographer and the dancer share with each other without words, by using their agency (see Noland 2009, 9), become intuitive manifestations of collaborative, artistic work.

Another episode from the production of the retired ballet dancers renders the meaning of intuition in an artistic production. Although the working is chaotic, *shared* intuition is dancers' tool for overcoming difficult moments, execute ideas as conceived and combine them into coherent wholes, as Sundgren and Styhre (2004; 2007) suggest:

*It is Wednesday afternoon. The room is small, 10 by 7 meters and two of the walls are covered by mirrors. I sit on the floor in front of the mirror, in the left side of the room trying to capture the dynamics between the two retired ballet dancers who are constantly on the move, talk simultaneously, and amazingly seem to understand each other from only half a word. They know the piece so well that they do not need to go through the technical details anymore. They have internalized the movements totally and now it is time to concentrate on the expressions and on the emotional side of the piece.*



Picture 6 The collaboration between the dancers is solid as they work close to each other both mentally and physically, and combine their intuitive resources.

*None of them dominates the other. When the other gets stuck with an idea, the other one helps to get over it. As it is eight weeks to the first night, there are still many unfinished scenes and for me as an observer the overall impression of the production looks fragmented and chaotic. Although Kare has done the choreography mainly and he has the overall vision of the performance, the various possibilities are often decided collectively:*

*Minna: "Should the space start to divide as the end approaches?"*

*Kare: "Maybe yes. But I have another idea. What if the lights just turned off and you walked away at the end?"*

*Minna: "Good idea! We need to put it on the back burner."*

The empirical episode above illustrates how dancers' collaborative working style plays a vital role in everyday situations, in which different kinds of ideas constantly emerge and their meanings and interpretation are continuously negotiated. The dancers have a strong confidence in each other's intuitive capabilities (John-Steiner 2000) and abilities to find



solutions to the difficult sections of the production as the time goes by. The solutions are not resolved immediately but as the process proceeds.

The collaboration between the two ex-ballerinas has evolved to a solid companionship in which space is given to each other's opinions and insights. Even if Kare has the overall vision of the piece, the actual performance emerges from the intuitive interactions, visions and experiences of both of the dancers, thus making the working truly collaborative (Sawyer 2000). They have developed something like a collective consciousness, as they seem to anticipate each other's thoughts and feelings from small, almost unnoticeable hints (see Kenny 2008).

### *The tension between 'serious' and 'playful' improvisation*

Formal content is always present in dance, interfering with dramatic or emotional content (Salosaari 2001). As formal content is about technical, virtuous skills (Salosaari 2001), the dramatic or emotional content brings forward improvisational ideas and allows the aesthetic, sensuously driven creativity to emerge. In the creation process of a dance piece, the dancers and the choreographer have their own visions of what the final version of the performance onstage is going to be (see Moran & John-Steiner 2004). No one of them, however, can say in advance exactly how the different parts of the piece are combined into a coherent whole during the various stages of the process and what the process brings along; the collaboration is thus largely improvisational in nature. The actions and reactions of the people involved influence the actions and reactions of the others, and therefore the outcome of the process is always unpredictable (see Sawyer & DeZutter 2009). Regardless of the unpredictable nature of improvisation, it also relies on rehearsed routines and, based on them, can be prepared or practiced (Vera & Crossan 2005). In the spirit of Crossan and Sorrenti (1997, 156), we consider improvisation as an intuitive experience emerging collaboratively in a spontaneous, unexpected way.

As the following episode from the production of retired ballet dancers illustrates, improvisation is characterized by a tension between 'serious' and 'playful' aspects, by which we mean a serious, concentrated and totally immersed improvisation on the one hand, and the playful, childlike improvisation on the other hand. Collaborative creativity actualizes through the variation of these improvisational moments in day-to-day work of professional dancers:

*It is Thursday afternoon and the rehearsal is about to start. Minna enters the room chuffing and says that she is very warm already as she has been teaching for one and a half hours downstairs. She asks Kare how he is feeling today and explains me how the body feels different every day. They discuss together before every rehearsal what to practice today, depending on the feelings of the body.*

*They agree to work on with something peaceful and start going through one section of the piece which is serene (see picture 7 below). They let the music lead their moving, and it seems the world around them is totally shut out. The dancers close their eyes and improvise in a mutual connection by gently touching each other and sensing each other's bodies. The piece is still an incoherent mess. As the dancers go through the peaceful section, concentrating fully only on the present moment, new movements are created as a result of the serious immersion into the music, movement and each other.*



Picture 7 The dancers concentrate on being fully present when improvising a serene scene of the piece.

*Suddenly they jump to a total other section; it is still messy and includes many unsolved movements. It doesn't seem to bother them as they concentrate on being fully present when improvising the series of unfinished movements. The dancers laugh and play with the movements as they are stuck with how to proceed (see picture 8). Laugh is often heard in the*

*rehearsal studio, and as an observer it looks like similar sense of humor is a necessity at their work. The playful attitude towards the work is constantly present and the atmosphere in the rehearsal studio is relaxed. Kare plays a wit by fooling with the movements, while Minna catches his jokes wit by continuing to improvise in the same spirit.*



Picture 8 Dancers' playfulness derives from spontaneous moments offstage.

In the empirical episode above, improvisation is achieved through playful interactions (compare Hanley and Fenton 2007) between the dancers. The bodily sensations have a big role in the decisions of what and how the dancers practice. As described in the episode above, the dancers get impulses from each other's expressions and develop the piece further in a playful, improvisational way combined with serious, fully present and concentrated working sections. Both the seriousness and the playfulness are for a large part embodied; the humor is presented by bodily movements and in fact, the movements are a source of humor. Also the seriousness and concentration are fully embodied, as the outside world ceases to exist and the dancers focus solely on the music and on each other's embodied language. As Hanley and



Fenton (2007, 126) suggest, improvisation is “an expression of expertise”. In the work of retired ballet dancers improvisation, considered as they suggest, is gained through balancing between serious and playful solutions, and based on shared understanding of a vision or the goals that is constantly negotiated between them (compare Sullivan 2011).

According to several studies (see e.g. Barrett 1998; Mirvis 1998; Chelariu, Johnston & Young 2002; Vera & Crossan 2005) improvisation can be learned and developed. Looking at the retired ballet dancers’ work the improvisation seems to be displayed with ease. The ‘playful’ aspect serves as a platform for learning and developing the courage to improvise and, in this way, to overcome the knots of the piece.

The theoretical literature of improvisation is often connected to the jazz metaphor (for a review, see e.g. Cunha et al. 1999 or Organization Science Special Issue on Jazz Improvisation 1998). An essential element of jazz improvisation is the balance and tension between structure and creativity (Sawyer 1996), meaning that improvisation pursues to generate something unusual and unforeseen within the pre-existing structures and tradition (Montuori 2003). Although it is especially salient in jazz improvisation, the same tension is present in all improvisational genres (Sawyer 1996), also in dance improvisation. In the case of retired ballet dancers, the structure is partly created through their classical background and partly set by the current productional space, whereas they pursue to create something new. In their working, the tension between the serious and playful aspects of improvisation actually materialize in the form of the previous career in the highly controlled and idealized ballet world (Aalten 2007) and the possibility to combine the ballet background to modern movements freely in the current freelance production (compare Moran & John-Steiner 2004).

The picture below renders the confidence between the dancers as they try out risky movements in which partner’s role is crucial. Also the sense of creativity they use through the piece by combining their lifelong background as ballet dancers with strong support and straight lines to a modern twist by improvising with different possibilities of moving is made visible in their everyday-work.



Picture 9 The ballet dancers build their work on high trust in each other's capabilities.

An episode from the other freelance production illustrates the collaboration between the choreographer, the dancers and other actors involved in the production, and the importance of imagination for letting the collaborative improvisation to flourish in a shared understanding. It shows how creativity emerges from the interactions and improvisational moments, both from the serious and playful ones, of several people working together towards a shared goal (Sullivan 2011). As the following episode illustrates, all the actors involved in the production leave their own traces to it:

*We have gathered to an old and abandoned dockyard. The space is huge, rough and impressive, and it gives a total contrast to the cozy and safe rehearsal studio. There are all the five dancers of the production, three male and two women, the choreographer (Niina), the composer, the light designer and both of us researchers present. The choreographer and the composer discuss the preliminary ideas of the sound world of the forthcoming production.*



Picture 10 The choreographer leads the rehearsal at the funky dockyard and the composer (on the right corner of the picture) listens carefully.

*The choreographer illustrates her acoustic impressions and objectives behind the piece by describing verbally and richly her thoughts and aims towards the music of the piece. “In this section, the sound world could be something like a mixture of an owl and Emil i Lönneberga, you know?” says the choreographer, and the composer complements her: “Yes, yes! Something dark and deep”. Both the choreographer and the composer seem very enthusiastic and empowered by each other’s thoughts that follow each another in a smooth but accelerating way.*

*The composer follows concentratedly and intensively the rehearsal. She catches some words, such as ‘hazy’, ‘strong’, ‘individuality versus collectivity’ and ‘peculiar’, and writes them down on her laptop immediately. I assume she buries herself in the creative work at home to be able to concentrate more after having the initial and inspirational ideas from the choreographer at the beginning of the rehearsal. The choreographer leads the rehearsal by instructing the dancers and moving in between the composer and the light designer. “Here the spines of the dancers should be get displayed somehow”, she says to the light designer who nods pensive.*

The episode above illustrates how the collaborators build on each other's excitement and ideas in a multiplicative way. The playful improvisation is used to develop the picture of the forthcoming performance by brainstorming ideas collectively in a frisky spirit. The choreographer trusts in the other actors' ability to improvise on the basis of the her ideas expressed verbally to them. Collaboration does not only put together the involved people's energy resources but multiply them by creating a reserve of energy (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). The excitement, creativity and wild ideas are contagious; the other people's energy makes the others feel energetic as well. In this way, the courage to improvise playfully is developed through the collaborative work.

In addition, the playful aspect of improvisation is rendered in the episode below in which the rehearsal continues by a frisky 'slide scene':

*All the dancers are onstage, sliding with each other along a steep set piece. The dancers build the slide from wooden pieces and start moving along the comments of the choreographer: "The contacts may be funny, sympathetic, warm. Feel free to try and explore them!" Both the choreographer and the dancers are in stitches as the dancers improvise playfully by trying different kinds of slides in contact with each other. "What are you actually seeking after this?" a dancer asks the choreographer, and she answers: "I am looking for sleeping slides that start varying little by little."*

*The slide differs from the actual, broader one. The dancers need to adapt themselves to the circumstances of the different places in which the rehearsals are held. "We just need to pass this through with the material, both in an abstract and a practical sense, that we do already have", the choreographer explains, and continues: "This slide scene should be the climax of the story, and after that it calms down. Yes! That looks great, good insights! Use each other's bodies and different kinds of contacts while sliding down together."*





Picture 11 The dancers feel free to try different ways of moving on the slide.

As the playfully improvisational episode above renders, the collaborative creative process allows both trials and errors to occur and proceeds through many tiny experiments (Storey & Joubert 2004) such as the ones of the dancers sliding down in various ways in the episode above. These explorations lead to unidentified destinations which are improvisational and truly collaborative.

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The purpose of this paper was to explore the aspects through which collaborative creativity is negotiated in the context of dance. By collaborative creativity, we mean creativity emerging from interactions that are fundamentally different from the interactions of work acquaintances as they involve a complex blend of skills, efforts and personalities aiming at realizing a shared vision of something new and useful (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). However, while creativity can be seen to be included in the very definition of dance as an art form, we find it necessary to criticize usefulness as a defining aspect of creativity (see e.g. Mostafa & El-Masry 2008; Pandey & Sharma 2009; Rego et al. 2007) in the context of dance. Based on our empirical work of two dance productions, usefulness is not considered as a necessary aspect of

collaborative creativity. Rather than talking about usefulness, the core issue in the negotiation of collaborative creativity is expressing and conveying the embodied and emotionally laden thoughts through shared intuition both offstage and onstage. Also an important notion is that the final result of the onstage performance is not the goal towards the actors work. Instead, the fine-grained, aesthetic day-to-day work offstage is essential for the sharing and negotiation of collaborative creativity. Usefulness as a precursor of creativity in the context of dance might be better expressed by the concept of value or dignity, which according to some views could replace the notion of usefulness in defining creativity (see e.g. Napier & Nilsson 2006). Based on the empirical material of this study, working towards a shared understanding of the creative performance was considered valuable as such, without any instrumental value.

In the everyday work of professional dancers, collaborative creativity is about negotiating a joint perspective and a shared meaning (Glaveanu 2011) in a spirit of concentrated attentiveness and involvement with others (Hanley & Fenton 2007; Sawyer 2009). Based on the research material gathered from two distinct dance productions, we found three tensions: emotional tension, a tension between solitary and shared intuition and a tension between playful and serious improvisation. We claim that these tensions are essential for the existence and negotiation of collaborative creativity. In all of these tensions the collaborative, shared ways of moving and creating are present. The tensions materialize in productional spaces, tied with certain time, space and actors of the production. In other words, the tensions are emphasized differently, depending on the present productional space.

*The emotional tension* includes various emotional aspects, such as those occurring both offstage and onstage, those of the individual collaborators and those awakening during the intensive collaboration between the actors. The various emotions between the people and things create constant tensions, thus making the collaboration both cognitively and emotionally charged (John-Steiner 2000). Confidence and self-doubt, mutual intimacy and even dependency and the role of the actors in interpreting and transmitting the emotional states of the piece performed or practiced all create tensions, which need to be developed further collaboratively.

*The tension between solitary and shared intuition* materializes in dancers' everyday work as they work on the basis of their own emotional, embodied experiences one the hand, and towards a joint, bodily shared experience, on the other hand. Even if a shared intuition makes collective actions more harmonious, it requires constant efforts to accommodate tensions

emerging from the various solitary intuitions being shared, challenged and negotiated (compare Glaveanu 2011). Therefore, the constantly on-going and changing tension between the solitary and shared intuition appears to be a relevant aspect of collaborative creativity.

Turning the spotlight on the third *tension between playful and serious improvisation*, we found that both of the two variations of improvisational work are required to produce a creative performance. The playful aspect of improvisation helps to negotiate collaborative creativity in an open-minded spirit, while the serious aspect is needed when the actors immerse themselves in the multiple layers of creative work. Thus, the tension between the two styles of improvising is at the heart in finding a creative solution to overcome the unsolved issues of the production and to create something new.

The tensions summarized above are connected with each other in multiple ways. Only when emotional tensions are productively dealt with, a solid and safe basis for intuitive working and the development of a shared intuition can be formed. On the other hand, the embodied forms of improvisation can take the stage only through constant negotiation between the solitary and shared intuition. What is important in a successful creative collaboration is that the three tensions summarized above are productive seeds of collaborative creativity, rather than something to be avoided (Moran & John-Steiner 2004). The tensions are meaningful for collaborative creativity as they require mutual respect and understanding, learning and questioning the old ways. They also require tolerance of ambiguity and allowing both trials and errors (Storey & Joubert 2004), which are essential elements of creativity.

We conclude that collaborative creativity is fundamentally embodied. It is intimate and sensuous form of working in a sense the actors are in close contact with each other both mentally and physically in their day-to-day work. In addition, many of the elements found to be essential for the emergence of collaborative creativity in our study are embodied, at least to a certain extent. Emotions are embodied by their nature, as they are both experienced in and through the body and expressed with it (see Chandler 2012; Sauer 2005). Intuition can be referred to as the ‘gut feeling’ (see e.g. Sundgren & Styhre 2004), which includes a direct reference to the body. It is considered as the knowledge prior to or beyond of explicit knowledge and it escapes the words (see e.g. Sundgren & Styhre 2004). Thus, it is more of knowledge of the body and senses than knowledge of the brain. Improvisation, and the playful and serious aspects of it, are experienced and expressed in and through the body, as well. The tensions in between all these aspects – emotions, intuition and improvisation, are powerful

spheres of opening up new, creative ways of exploring and understanding the embodied nature of collaborative creativity. Methodologically, we argue that ethnography is a dynamic and deep tool for engaging with this challenge and gives voices to the research participants, which we consider to be essential when studying the collaborative nature of creative, embodied work.

We argue that by illustrating the embodied and sensuous nature of collaborative creativity in the context of dance we are able to contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon and to give an interesting platform for the future studies on collaborative creativity, also in contexts which are by their nature less physical than professional dance by their nature. By describing detailed stories from the fundamentally embodied field of dance, we highlight the aesthetically sensitive aspect of collaborative creativity. Above all, we hope that our study gives new insights and raises challenging questions to other scholars interested in the embodied side of collaborative creativity.

## REFERENCES

- Aalten, A. (2007) Listening to the dancer's body. *Sociological Review*, Vol. 55(1), 109–125.
- Amabile, T. M. (1997) Motivating creativity in organizations: on doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review*, Vol. 1(40), 39–58.
- Andersen, J. A. (2000) Intuition in managers: Are intuitive managers more effective? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 46–63.
- Barrett, F (1998) Creativity and improvisation in jazz and organizations: Implications for organizational learning. *Organization Science*, Vol. 9(5), 543–555.
- Barron, F. (1988) Putting creativity to work. In Ed. R. Sternberg, *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*, 76–98. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Betsch, C. (2008) Chronic preferences for intuition and deliberation in decision making: Lessons learned about intuition from an individual differences approach. In: H. Plessner, C. Betsch and T. Betsch (eds.) *Intuition in judgement and decision making*, 231–248. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.
- Björkman, H. (2004) Design Dialogue Groups as a Source of Innovation: Factors behind Group Creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 13(2), 97–109.
- Brown, S. D. – Cromby, J. – Harper, D. J. – Johnson, K. – Reavey, P. (2011) Researching “experience”: Embodiment, methodology, process. *Theory & Psychology*, Vol. 21(4), 493–515.
- Chandler, A. (2012) Self-injury as Embodied Emotion Work: Managing Rationality, Emotions and Bodies. *Sociology*, Vol. 4(3), 442–457.
- Chelariu, C. – Johnston, W. J. – Young, L. (2002) Learning to improvise, improvising to learn: A process of responding to complex environments. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 55, 141–147.
- Crossan, M. – Sorrenti, M. (1997) Making sense of improvisation. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol. 14, 155–180.



- Crotty, M. (1998) *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. Sage Publications, London.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996) *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. Harper Collins Publishers, New York.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2008) *Flow. The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Cunha, M., Cunha, J. & Kamoche, K. (1999) Organizational improvisation: What, when, how, and why. *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 1(3), 299–341.
- Dale, K. (2001) *Anatomising Embodiment and Organization Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Dale, K. & Burrell, G (2000) What shape are we in? Organization theory and the organized body. In: Hassard, J. – Holliday, R. – Willmott, H. (2000) *Body and Organization*. Sage, London
- Dane, E. – Pratt, M. G. (2007) Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, 33–64.
- Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and Danger*. Routledge, New York.
- Duncan, I. (2013) *Isadora Duncan: My Life*. The restored edition. Liveright Publishing Corporation, USA.
- Eisenhart, M. A. – Borko, H. (1991) In Search of an Interdisciplinary Collaborative Design for Studying Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 7(2), 137–157.
- Ekvall, G. (1997) Organizational conditions and levels of creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 6(4), 195–205.
- Feldman, D. H. (1988) Creativity: Dreams, insights, and transformations. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*, 271–297. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Fineman, S. (2008) *The Emotional Organization: Passions and Power*. Blackwell Publishing, USA.
- Glaveanu, V.-P. (2011) How are we creative together? Comparing sociocognitive and sociocultural answers. *Theory & Psychology*, Vol. 21(4), 473–492.
- Hanley, M. A. – Fenton, M. V. (2007) Exploring Improvisation on Nursing. *Journal of Holistic Nursing*, Vol. 25(2), 126–133.
- Hassard, J. – Holliday, R. – Willmott, H. (2000) *Body and Organization*. Sage, London.
- Hindmarsh, J. – Pilnick, A. (2007) Knowing Bodies at Work: Embodiment and Ephemeral Teamwork in Anaesthesia. *Organization Studies*, Vol. 28(9), 1395–1416.
- John-Steiner, V. (2000) *Creative collaboration*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2009) Operating Room: Relational Spaces and Microinstitutional Change in Surgery. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 115 (3), 657–711.
- Kenny, R. M. (1998) *Creative collaboration: The untapped resource of team synergy*. Unpublished doctoral candidacy essay. Saybrook Graduate School and Research Institute, San Francisco, CA.
- Kenny, R. M. (2008) The Whole is Greater: Reflective Practice, Human Development and Fields of Consciousness and Collaborative Creativity. *Journal of Global Education*, 64(8), 590–630.
- Klijin, M. – Tomic, W. (2010) A review of creativity within organizations from a psychological perspective. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 29(4), 322–343.
- Littleton, K. – Miell, D. (2004) Collaborative creativity: contemporary perspectives. In: D. Miell and K. Littleton (eds.) *Collaborative creativity: contemporary perspectives*, 1–8. Free Association Books, London.
- Low, S. M. (2003) Embodied Space(s): Anthropological Theories of Body, Space, and Culture. *Space and Culture*, Vol. 6(1), 9–18.

- Marleau-Ponty, M. (1989). *The phenomenology of perception*. Translated by Colin Smith. Routledge, London.
- Michel, A. (2011) Transcending socialization: A nine-year ethnography of the body's role in organizational control and knowledge workers' transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(3), 325–368.
- Mirvis, P. H. (1998) Practice improvisation. *Organization Science*, Vol. 9, 586–592.
- Moran, S. – John-Steiner, V. (2004) How collaboration in creative work impacts identity and motivation. In: D. Miell and K. Littleton (eds.) *Collaborative creativity: contemporary perspectives*, 11–25. Free Association Books, London.
- Montuori, A. (2003) The complexity of improvisation and the improvisation of complexity: Social science, art and creativity. *Human Relations*, Vol. 56(2) 237–255.
- Montuori, A. – Purser, R. E. (1995) Deconstructing the Lone Genius Myth: Toward a Contextual View of Creativity. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 35(3), 69–112.
- Moreira, T. (2004) Coordination and Embodiment in the Operating Room. *Body & Society*, Vol. 10(1), 109–129.
- Mostafa, M. M., & El-Masry, A. (2008). Perceived barriers to organizational creativity: A cross-cultural study of British and Egyptian future marketing managers. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15(1), 81–93.
- Napier, N. K., & Nilsson, M. (2006). The Development of Creative Capabilities in and out of Creative Organizations: Three Case Studies. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(3), 268–278.
- Noland, C. (2009) *Agency and embodiment: performing gestures/producing culture*. Harvard University Press, London.
- Organization Science Special Issue on Jazz Improvisation and Organizing. Vol. 9(5), 1998.
- Pandey, S., & Sharma, R. R. K. (2009). Organizational Factors for Exploration and Exploitation: A Conceptual Review. *Global Business & Management Research*, 1(2), 1–18.
- Patriotta, G. – Spedale, S. (2009) Making Sense Through Face: Identity and Social Interaction in a Consultancy Force. *Organization Studies*, Vol. 30(11), 1227–1248.
- Pink, S. (2011) *Doing Visual Ethnography*. 2nd edition. Sage, London.
- Purser, R. and Montuori, A. (1999), *Social Creativity (Vol. 2)*, Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ.
- Rego, A., Sousa, F., Pina e Cunha, M., Correia, A., & Saur-Amaral, I. (2007). Leader Self-Reported Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Employee Creativity: An Exploratory Study. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 16(3), 250–264.
- Salas, E. – Rosen, M. A. – DiazGranados, D. (2010) Expertise-Based Intuition and Decision Making in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36(4), 941–973.
- Salosaari, P. (2001) *Multiple Embodiment in Classical Ballet. Educating the Dancer as an Agent of Change in the Cultural Evolution of Ballet*. Doctoral dissertation. Theatre Academy, Department of Dance and Theatre Pedagogy. Yliopistopaino, Helsinki.
- Sauer, E. (2005) *Emotions in Leadership: Leading a Dramatic Ensemble*. Academic Dissertation. University of Tampere.
- Sawyer, K.R. (1996) The semiotics of improvisation: The pragmatics of musical and verbal performance, *Semiotica*, 108, 269–306.
- Sawyer, K.R. (1999) The emergence of creativity. *Philosophical Psychology*, 12, 447–469.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2000). Improvisational Cultures: Collaborative Emergence and Creativity in Improvisation. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 7(3), 180–185.
- Sawyer, K. R. (2007) *Group genius: the creative power of collaboration*. Basic Books, New York.
- Sawyer, K. – DeZutter, S. (2009) Distributed creativity: how collective creations emerge from collaboration. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, Vol. 3(2), 81–92.

- Schechner, (2006) *Performance Studies. An introduction*. Second edition. Routledge, New York.
- Seddon, F. (2004). Empathic creativity: The product of empathic attunement. In D. Miell & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Collaborative creativity: Contemporary perspectives*, 65–78. Free Association Books, London.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (2009) *The corporeal turn: an interdisciplinary reader*. Imprint Academic, UK.
- Sonnenburg, S. (2004) Creativity in Communication: A Theoretical Framework for Collaborative Product Creation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 13(4), 254–262.
- Storey, H. – Joubert, M.M. (2004) The emotional dance of creative collaboration. In: D. Miell and K. Littleton (eds.) *Collaborative creativity: contemporary perspectives*, 40–51. Free Association Books, London.
- Strati, A. (2000) The aesthetic approach in organization studies. In Linstead, S.A. Höpfl, H.J. (Eds.) *The aesthetics of organization*. Sage Publications, London.
- Styhre, A. (2011) Practice and intuitive thinking: the situated nature of practical work. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 19(2), 109–126.
- Sullivan, F. R. (2011). Serious and Playful Inquiry: Epistemological Aspects of Collaborative Creativity. *Educational technology and society*, 14(1), 55–65.
- Sundgren, M. – Styhre, A. (2004) Intuition and pharmaceutical research: the case of AstraZeneca. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(4), 267–279.
- Sundgren, M. – Styhre, A. (2007) Creativity and the fallacy of misplaced concreteness in new drug development. A Whiteheadian perspective. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 10(2), 215–235.
- Tarr, J. – Thomas, H. (2011) Mapping embodiment: methodologies for representing pain and injury. *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 11(2), 141–157.
- Van Maanen, J. (2011) Ethnography as Work: Some Rules of Engagement. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 48(1), 218–234.
- Vera, D. – Crossan, M. (2005) Improvisation and innovative performance in teams. *Organization Science*, Vol. 16(3), 203–224.
- Wainwright, S. P. – Williams, C. – Turner, B. S. (2007) Globalization, Habitus, and the Balletic Body. *Cultural Studies & Critical Methodologies*, Vol. 7(3), 308–325.
- Watson, T. J. (2011) Ethnography, Reality, and Truth: The Vital Need for Studies of "How Things Work" in Organizations and Management. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 4(1), 202–217.
- Witz, A. (2000) Whose Body Matters? Feminist Sociology and the Corporeal Turn in Sociology and Feminism. *Body & Society*, Vol. 6(2), 1–24.
- Woodman, R. W. – Sawyer, J. E. – Griffin, R. W. (1993) Toward a Theory of Organizational Creativity. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18(2), 293–321.