

| Katarzyna Szara

Cooperation of Enterprises as a Stimulus for the Development of Creative Capital

Abstract

Objective: The article evaluates cooperation in enterprises from the point of view of building creative capital.

Research Design & Methods: Research was conducted among companies from Poland's Podkarpackie Province: 100 entities from the creative sector and 430 entities operating in various sections of the national job-type classification.

Findings: There is a need to create mechanisms conducive to establishing and strengthening cooperation in creativity. The survey on cooperation done among respondents in enterprises revealed that their average assessment was of "a medium impact".

Implications/Recommendations: The dimension of cooperation does not differentiate enterprises conducting different economic activities in terms of how they build creative capital.

Contribution: the novel aspect of this research was its combination of issues of cooperation and creative capital. Cooperation was accepted as a component of creative capital and assessed according to the author's formula. The comparative assessment made among creative sector enterprises and other sections of the national job-type classification can be considered as input.

| Katarzyna Szara, The University of Rzeszów, College of Social Sciences, Institute of Economics and Finance, Department of Economics and Management, M. Ćwiklińskiej 2, 35-601 Rzeszów, e-mail: kszara@ur.edu.pl, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1687-0505>.

| This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0); <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Keywords: creative capital, cooperation, enterprise, dimensions, creative sector.

JEL Classification: D24 L14, L23, L26.

1. Introduction

Creative capital is a resource appropriate for people who cooperate and function in all conditions, including new ones, and use their creativity (Szara 2017, p. 66). Human creativity is the foundation of this capital, and is derived from human capital (Florida 2010). Creative capital is most often employed by representatives of the creative sector. In the case of artistic creativity, when artists create in the comfort of their studio, they do not always emphasise the effects of their work. Cooperation with another person, however, allows them to present their work. For artists and creators, this illustrates the need to take up issues related to cooperation and creativity. Numerous other authors in Poland (*Rola kultury...* 2010, Rogowska 2011, Kasprzak 2013) have also looked at the creative sector.

A common analysis of creativity and cooperation is important for those who declare creativity in their CVs or use creativity at work and work in teams. The team nature of work, which is preferred in enterprises, often requires a search for creative solutions to problems. Creativity is defined as an ability to solve problems (see Nęcka 2001).

In the literature, creative activities are incorporated into the effects of an innovation, as innovations are the effect of creativity. Engagement in activities transforming ideas into products, or a common search for solutions require cooperation. Features of creativity and cooperation exist not only in enterprises of the creative sector, but also in other industries. Thus, the question how compatible they are with each other arises. Are creativity and cooperation compatible with each other in case of enterprises which do not belong to the creative sector?

The subject literature shows that a lack of research has been carried out on the impact of cooperation on human creativity. That paucity was the main motivation for undertaking this research. These issues are particularly important in relation to entrepreneurs as decisions taken in the course of running business activities have a significant impact on financial results. The research gap also concerned the lack of documented empirical knowledge about the phenomenon of creative capital in enterprise.

The subject matter is important for managers, who can use the conclusions of research in the decision-making process. An approach to creative capital and cooperation is innovative from the point of view of changes which take place in enterprises, and the promotion of activities that result in innovation. No studies dealing with the structure of creative capital have been done. The lack of empirical

research on creative capital in enterprises was another motivating factor for the research.

The paper evaluates cooperation in enterprises in terms of building creative capital. The assessment will be conducted in the context of human resources. The paper offers an analysis of the subject literature before moving on to present the results of empirical research done in enterprises in Poland's Podkarpackie Province are applied. The paper seeks to answer this question: does cooperation in internal and external areas of enterprises building creative capital depend on the type of business activity the enterprises engage?

The article focuses on one element of creative capital – cooperation. The first part, the literature review, looks at the essence of creative capital and cooperation. This is followed by a presentation of the research methodology. In the third part, the author places her own research in the context of other research that has been done.

2. A Review of the Literature: Cooperation in Enterprise as a Potential Source of Creative Capital Resources

In the literature on the subject one can find descriptions of both cooperation and creativity, though they are most often presented separately. In the context of the assessment of cooperation in building creative capital, the main categories of the description are indicated.

According to the literature, business cooperation is currently one of the most important factors in enterprises' success. The benefits of cooperation depend on the form of cooperation and the technical level of the entities working together. At present, as Porter has emphasised, cooperation of enterprises provides an enterprise an additional advantage over competitors (Poznańska 2016, p. 143).

In the Polish literature on management, much has been written about cooperation both within an enterprise (see Wasiluk 2018, pp. 30–34; Kamińska 2017, pp. 70–85; Olesiński 2016, pp. 18–30; Karbowski 2016, pp. 119–135; Spodarczyk & Szelągowska-Rudzka 2015, pp. 437–444; Lipka 2004), and with elements beyond it (Czakon 2007, Kaczmarek 2000). Collaboration is a broader concept than cooperation and refers to deeper and stronger forms of inter-organisational ties (*Sieci międzyorganizacyjne...* 2012, *Relacje międzyorganizacyjne...* 2014, Nowak 2012, Strzyżewska 2011).

These subjects are likewise widely discussed in international publications, including works: (Mattessich, Murray-Close & Monesy 2001, Thomson & Perry 2006, Axelrod 2006, Martinez-Sanchez *et al.* 2019, Kraus *et al.* 2018, Sward 2016, Gnyawall *et al.* 2016, Favre-Bonte, Gardet & Thevenard-Puthod 2016). The authors

present different approaches to analysing cooperation, a complex concept with complex methodological criteria involved.

Creative capital is the second concept presented in the paper. Knowledge about this capital is diverse and often addressed with a wide range of terminology different, making interpretation and a comparison of research results difficult.

In the literature on the subject one can find the following main categories describing creative capital:

1. As a feature of a creative class. Creative capital is derived from the concept of a creative class that originated in the American economy as a result of promoting the importance of creativity in development. The “class” was understood as people who, from a professional perspective, were appointed as those who used creativity (Florida 2010, pp. 338–339). Its development is favoured by talent, technology and tolerance, or the 3T model. The creative class is a narrowly described definition of creative capital, which is treated as a deeper concept of a human factor. In its narrow dimension, the creative class was considered as the basic form of creative capital. A wider definition of creative capital was proposed: it is a resource appropriate for people who cooperate and function in all conditions, including new ones, and use their creativity. Within this definition there are the creative class and all people who, to any extent in their life or work, use creativity. This means that a person who does not use creativity after discovering it or identifying the need to use it, or uses it unconsciously, becomes a representative of creative capital (see Szara 2017, pp. 66–67).

What have other authors written about creative capital? In Polish publications, the research of the creative class can be distinguished where the authors (Podogrodzka 2013, pp. 417–440; *Klasa kreatywna...* 2012, Montgomery 2005, Rese 2012, Corriera & da Silva Costa 2014) present a number of professions that have developed or are developing a creative class usually at the national level, and assess its importance, most often using the measure of correlation in relation to talent, technology or tolerance.

2. Creative cities in which there are opportunities for the development of creative capital. The second area of the research concerns the use of creative potential, especially in urban areas (Pięta-Kanurska 2013, pp. 155–166) predestined for the development of the creative class. The subject of cities where the creative class is developing is more and more frequently being taken up in the foreign literature (see *Rola kultury...* 2010). In the majority of studies on creative capital, the analyses concern a spatial (regional or national) approach based on indexes proposed in the Florida methodology (Florida 2010, Hui, Chung-Hung & Mok 2004, Landry & Bianchini 1995).

3. Creative industries. Since the end of the 20th century, numerous researchers have focused on the creative sector (Gwóźdź 2010, Creative 2008, Stryjakiewicz

& Stachowiak 2010). The creative sector encompasses broadly understood creative enterprises that are particularly market-oriented and deal with the creation, production, distribution and/or spreading of creative goods and services through the media (*Creative Economy Report...* 2008, Flew 2002, Caves 2000, Stachowiak 2015). This has been presented in the study on the measurement of creative capital (Szara 2018c).

4. Creative economy. The role and significance of the creative economy was established in the 20th century. It grew out of the abundant free time and wealth people had, and increased demand for cultural goods (Howkins 2001, Stachowiak 2017, Towse 2011).

In this paper creativity is treated as the lowest form of art, and considered in terms of how people use it individually. In this context, creativity has variously been defined as an ability to think creatively, broadly understood ingenuity and adaptive flexibility resulting in an ability to find creative, original solutions that go beyond accepted schemes (Drozdowski *et al.* 2010, p. 20).

Analyses of creativity are presented in the literature on the pedagogy of creativity (Szmidt 2013, Karwowski 2009, Kaufman 2011), as well as in other disciplines relating creativity to human capital (Shaping 2012, Amirbekuly & Aimukhanbetova 2018, Nikolaichuk & Matukova 2016) and organisations (Amabile 1988, Bratnicka 2017, Wojtczuk-Turek 2010, Dyduch 2013, Baer 2012, Moultrie & Young 2009). Creativity in the context of innovation or entrepreneurship has also been widely analysed (Acar, Turakci & Knippenberg 2019, Amabile & Pratt 2016, Anderson, Potočnik & Zhou 2014, Perry-Smith & Mannucci 2017).

Cooperation is seen as an ability to create relationships, to work in a team, and as a means of solving problems. The last definition dovetails with the creativity described by some authors as an ability to solve problems (see Nęcka 2001, Proctor 2002).

Cooperation with respect to creativity as a human feature prompts the assumption that through cooperation human creativity can be developed or blocked. In the definition of creative capital, it can be assumed that cooperation is one component of creative capital. In the following research process, cooperation was assessed from the perspective of internal stakeholders (employees) and external stakeholders (clients and other entities). The approach to internal stakeholders – that is, to the employee constituting potential creative capital – will consider the promotion of ideas, solutions and their implementation, ultimately yielding innovation.

In this context, creativity will involve a common search for ideas and new solutions so that the effect of the activities can be presented to the client. This cooperation is based on mutual trust, loyalty and compliance with the goal duly realised by all individuals or groups (Okoń 1987, p. 346).

The effect of cooperation associated in this analysis with creativity can be perceived as beneficial to all or some of participants, neutral or unfavourable to entities, or neutral or unfavourable even to all entities (Peña & Fernández de Arroyabe 2002, pp. 37–39). Recipients of creative solutions do not always accept a new, unknown ways of solving problems. They can be difficult to see or comprehend due to the intangible nature of a construct (a product/a service). Including creativity in cooperation will involve looking anew through the prism of novel elements.

The common understanding of cooperation and creativity in the assessment of creative capital allows:

- for these two features to occur together and to be analysed together,
- that both cooperation and creativity are defined in a wide variety of ways, so settling on a single definition is impossible,
- that both features can be applied to individual, group of people and organisations alike,
- that both cooperation and creativity can generate benefits,
- that these features can be analysed at various levels of an enterprise's operations, as well as in relation to the work,
- that the value of cooperation lies in the potential of people and creativity, and it results from various possibilities and personality traits that combine in action promoting creativity.

3. Methodology

The Podkarpackie Province was chosen for the study because the share of its overall population that lives in rural areas is extremely high, as are the disproportions in the growth across the entire region. This choice made it possible to verify research assumptions in diverse conditions. This fits in with the trend in research into the economics of diversity.

Previous methods of measuring creative capital mainly used the professional structure of overall employment in the sphere of R & D. This is a one-sided measurement method, the shortcomings of statistical data are an obstacle to its use. In the literature, we will also try to measure creative capital indirectly. It was assumed for this analysis that creative capital could be measured differently than just as the key to carrying out one's "professions". This is important as creative capital does not only exist in the creative spheres, but in all spheres of socio-economic activity.

Because creativity is related to human behaviour, a behavioural approach was adopted for the study. It allows a broader view of the problem being examined

than is accepted in traditional economics. Behavioural economics draws on the achievements of other sciences. A behavioural approach also makes it possible to compare the results obtained.

People's creativity can be examined by means of tests or questionnaires, and the interview method can be also applied. Other options are psychological tests, bibliographic or experimental method. Research has also been carried out based on case studies and an integrated approach (for descriptions of the measurement of creativity, see Szmidt 2013, pp. 23–55).

The proposed assessment tools can analyse the level of creative abilities, the style of creation that characterises them, and the intensification of personality traits. In the creative pedagogy literature, the 4P model is the most commonly used theory. The 4P model was applied in further analysis as it was impossible to transfer the assumptions of creative capital theory in spatial terms in relation to the enterprise.

Creative capital is a resource appropriate for people who cooperate and function in all conditions, including new ones, and use their creativity. Creative capital is a derivative of human capital, for which the trait of creativity is a determinant, and it is most often employed by representatives of the creative sector. Measuring creativity as a trait is not easy; psychological tests, interviews and observations are the most frequently applied tools. The four-faceted 4Ps creativity paradigm (person, process, product, press) (Szmidt 2013) integrates different approaches to creativity.

Kreatywność can be considered the lowest form of creativity. The above model was modified in relation to this assumption (in the subject literature it is written with a small “c”, creativity). This modification (see Szara 2018c) was intended to find answers on how to measure creative capital. It was assumed that creativity was the basis of creative capital, a derivative of human capital. The possibilities of developing creative capital were assessed using the formula:

$$CC = P1 + R + P2 + E1 + E2,$$

where:

CC – creative capital,

P1 – sum of points obtained for the dimension “people”,

R – sum of points obtained for the dimension “cooperation (relations)”,

P2 – sum of points obtained for the dimension “a process”,

E1 – sum of points obtained for the dimension “a product/service (effect)”,

E2 – sum of points obtained for the dimension “enterprise environment”.

Given the practical goal of the research – to compare the possibilities of creative capital development in the arrangement of the job classification code in Poland – the focus was maintained on selected areas of data analysis.

Creative capital was assessed in enterprises in the dimensions of the human factor (see Szara 2018b) as the main element. Without it, creative capital could not exist. Work environments (covering the general characteristics of an enterprise (see Szara 2018a) support or hinder the development of human creativity, the cooperation relationship resulting from the definition of own creative capital, the process understood as actions leading to the achievement of the effect and a product/a service. Individual areas were characterised by features of creative capital, as well as human determinants and predispositions (see Szara 2018c). Each category contained 10 questions rated on a scale from 0 (no impact) to 5 (very high impact). From each area, a maximum of 50 points can be obtained, which can yield 250 points with 5 levels of analysis. An assessment can be made separately for each dimension by comparing against the scale: 40–50 very good development of the element (describing creative capital), 30–39 good, 20–29 average, 10–19 low, 0–9 very low.

The individual criteria reflect the image of the company's development in the cross-section of the occurrence and the use of creative capital as measured by proprietary dimensions. They do not include all variables affecting creative capital, but those the author believes are the most important. This does not preclude the possibility of extending the catalog of questions describing creative capital. This study presents the results of research related to the dimension of "cooperation".

The selection of a subgroup of representative enterprises proceeded according to the sampling procedure, which was set at 380. In the course of conducting surveys, they were carried out among randomly selected entities located in the Podkarpackie Province in 2016. The complete research material was collected among 430 enterprises (which accounted for 0.25% of enterprises in Podkarpackie Province). Questionnaires were conducted using the PAPI method, and filled out by randomly selected employees.

Because the creative capital at work in enterprises operating in various industries has been poorly identified, the study was conducted in companies outside of the creative sector, where creative capital is normally found (Lipka 2017). Using the data on associations, foundations and a group of enterprises included in the sector, requests for the implementation of the CAWI method were submitted three times. Due to the very low return of surveys in targeted selection in 2016, the studies were commissioned among 100 entities operating in the creative sector from Poland's Podkarpackie Province. They constituted a comparative group for other enterprises.

Questionnaires for enterprises from the creative sector and other industries were prepared analogously in case of the questions regarding conditions for the development of creative capital. The differences concerned the benefits of using creativity techniques and the analysis of working time formulated in the case of

enterprises in the creative sector. Creative capital was used as a dependent variable, and cooperation an independent one.

The subject matter is a new issue in the field of creativity and behavioural economics. The results of research on cooperation and creativity in the literature on the subject are presented separately, and most often based on case studies. These two premises and difficulties in collecting data from enterprises during the pilot project made it necessary to randomly assign an employee in the companies to fill out the questionnaires. This may raise objections concerning the overall picture of the company's functioning. Nonetheless, at the initial stage of the analysis, the applied quantitative research solution made it possible to verify not only the questionnaire, but also to indicate further directions of research. Comparative analysis methods, synthesis and simple statistical methods were used to analyse the data.

4. Research Results and Discussion

Cooperation in enterprises refers to the behaviour of people who want to create a new product, a service either individually or in a group, as well as from the point of view of a company as an organisation. The research includes selected topics on cooperation most frequently discussed in the subject literature, including the construction of creative capital in the context of various determinants.

Table 1. Assessment of Cooperation by Section and Number of Subjects Analysed (Average Points)

Symbol and Name of Section	Enterprises Examined	The Cooperation Dimension
A – agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing	20	32.35
B – mining and quarrying	13	29.08
D – generation and supply of electricity, gas, steam, hot water and air for air conditioning systems		
E – supply of water, wastewater and waste management and reclamation activities		
C – industrial processing	62	32.45
F – construction	56	32.55
G – wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles, including motorcycles	64	30.77
H – transport and warehouse management	28	32.36

Table 1 cont'd

Symbol and Name of Section	Enterprises Examined	The Cooperation Dimension
I – accommodation and food services activities	34	33.26
J – information and communication		
K – financial and insurance activities	19	33.26
L – real estate-related activities		
M – professional, scientific and technical activities	10	29.80
N – administrative services and support activities	20	29.40
O – public administration and defence, compulsory social security	22	31.55
P – education	22	34.68
Q – health care and social assistance	22	35.86
R – activities related to culture, entertainment and recreation	14	32.07
S – other service activities	24	31.79
T – households employing workers, households producing products and providing services for their own needs		
U – organisations and enclaves teams	0	0
Total sections	430	32.19
Enterprises of creative industries	100	32.30

Source: the author.

Due to the small numbers of entities in sections B, D, E, I, J, K and L, they were combined. The summary in Table 1 shows that in the dimension of cooperation, the assessments obtained do not differentiate enterprises according to the section from those included in the creative sector. The results came in between 29.08 to 32.05 points, which meant the assessments of cooperation in building creative capital in enterprises were from average to good. Differences between results for the sections and the companies from the creative sector are of about 6.79 points. The dimension of cooperation is diversified to the greatest extent among sections Q – health care and social assistance, P – education, IJ – activity related to accommodation, information and communication, and KL – financial and insurance activities. The lowest result was obtained for the BDE sections: mining, generation and supply of electricity, and water supply.

Responses describing the cooperation were within the range of the average impact of the independent variable (the predominance of assessments in note 3). This means that they most often have the average impact on cooperation in the enterprise related to the development of creative capital. Respondents gave two dimensions the highest values: company activity in respect of the recognition of

the local community, and relations of employees with clients, describing them as good. Risk-taking was assigned the lowest scores (Table 2).

Table 2. Average Assessments Describing the Dimension of Cooperation in Relation to the Construction of Creative Capital

Cooperation	Creative Industries	Other Companies
1. The company bases its activities on cooperation with others in the industry	3.13	3.06
2. The relationship between employees will be cooperative (it will create bonds)	3.43	3.53
3. The relationship between employees and management will be cooperative	3.07	3.46
4. The relationship of employees offering a product/service to customers is good	3.64	3.73
5. The company's activities are recognised by the local community	3.81	3.78
6. The company's activities are recognised by local institutions	3.50	3.02
7. The company's cooperation with the client is influenced by common cultural values	3.35	3.02
8. Employees can work above divisions	3.43	3.04
9. Employees identify themselves with the team	2.86	3.26
10. Employees are not afraid to take risks	2.08	2.38

Source: the author.

Relations among employees, management, team work, taking risk – in other words, features referring to internal cooperation – are associated with creative attitudes. The subject literature indicates that creative people do not like to be controlled, which is why the question about taking risks was included. In the case of enterprises in the creative sector, the sentence: “work in a creative economy can enable this, because – at least in some professions – control of work progress is very difficult and expensive” (Jemielniak 2008, pp. 76–77) is apt. In the creative sector, the assessment may be lower. This may result from the difficulty in assessing the idea or the finished effect, due to the uncertainty of the benefits it brings to the company. Hence, the work of a creative person with superiors and collaborators in a team does not always follow the assumptions of the theory. This is also confirmed by the higher average assessment of team-work for the group of other enterprises. Group tasks evaluating group creativity in the context of cooperation may even discourage individuals from developing innovative ideas, and may prevent the expression of very original ideas. However, these expectations

may change if intra-group competition is induced and team members strive to achieve better results (see Beersma & De Dreu 2005).

The features mentioned in the study can be found in the componential theory of creativity, which presents the process of creation, as well as factors affecting this process and its results. The theory is built around two basic assumptions: First, creativity takes various forms – from everyday creative activities to important scientific inventions shaping the development of entire civilisations; and, second, the level of creativity of individuals demonstrate, even within the same tasks, changes, and is the result of the impact of different components of variables over time, concerning both the person and their environment. Factors that stimulate creativity include: positive challenges posed at work, team collaboration, diversity, team skills, freedom in conducting one's work, being encouraged to submit new ideas, having one's creative results appreciated, as well as social norms aimed at sharing ideas with others (Kozarkiewicz 2015, p. 84).

Research on the relationship between cooperation and creativity is described in the subject literature. In the individual approach, the authors draw attention to the use of creativity in competitive activities. Analyses describing the relationship between cooperation and competition in the organisation concern the emergence and spread of new ideas, or creativity. The terms “cooperation” and “competition” are a dichotomy (see Bittner & Heidemeier 2013, Shah, Brazy & Higgins 2004, Förster & Higgins 2005, Webb 2016).

A lot of research has been devoted to the consequences of cooperative and competitive orders of productivity and creativity. While one line of research has found that cooperation has a positive effect on achievement (see Johnson *et al.* 1981), another has focused on creativity, reporting both positive and negative effects of cooperation on creativity. In some situations, it is possible that cooperation or competition are activated at the same time and can be changed through creative activities (Carsten *et al.* 2008).

Analysis of Schulz's work shows that at various stages in the development of civilisation, human creative activity has taken on a different character and has been done with varying levels of intensity. There is a basic difference between the creative activity in traditional and modern societies. Today, there is a need for cooperation in creative activities.

Supporting creativity can be done through cooperation, especially given that a person's approach to creativity is associated with acceptance by society, or the lack thereof. Mutual connections and interdependencies must be the goal for creative capital to exist. Development of the right conditions for creativity and for the creator depends to a great extent on those he or she cooperates with – even if it is often thought of as more self-realisation and self-creation. If both the subject and the observer recognise that a behaviour or products are new and valuable, one can

talk about creative activities. Creative people also have to deal with the lack of interest in their work on the part of relatives or colleagues. West (2000) indicates that cooperation is a condition that is conducive to creativity.

We are currently witnessing the growing role of cooperation in many areas of human activities: business, culture, society, administration and science. In these overlapping areas social relations, as well as common norms and ethical values are consolidating factors (Knop & Olko 2017, p. 5).

This is confirmed those in business. Patrick McKenna, the founder and the president of Ingenious Media, one of the world's largest media investing companies, believes that "we need to find new ways to encourage people with business and creative talents to work together to build the creative companies of the future". Although such cooperation will be largely promoted by the market, public policy can also help creative people (Newbigin 2010, p. 46).

5. Conclusions

One of the important conclusions resulting from the analysis is that there is a need to create mechanisms conducive to establishing and strengthening cooperation in the area of creativity. This means building a foundation for the development of creative capital. For creativity to flourish, ties must be created not only with employees but also with management, while the question of how to establish cooperation with clients in with the values they represent must also be answered.

This dimension does not differentiate enterprises conducting various economic activities in terms of building creative capital. Across multiple sectors, people in enterprises cooperate to build creative capital, and there are more opportunities to act. Improving enterprise cooperation in the area of creative activities thanks to the implementation of innovations is and will be an important challenge both for the enterprises themselves, external entities, and especially for their employees.

Integrating creative activities and building cooperation are not easy tasks. Research shows that creativity can lead to cooperation or competition. A condition for building cooperation will be the acceptance of creative behaviour, individual attitudes, and communication based on the exchange of employee views. The cooperation assessed by the respondents of the survey done for the present research is also based on other elements characterised in other dimensions. These include the creation of customer databases that provide information flow, meetings, and conversations with supervisors.

An issue that constitutes a new area of research – possibility of establishing cooperation between the creative sector and other sectors – is other worth noting.

Cooperation in building creative capital can contribute to:

- deepening knowledge about creative activities,
- team integration, building dialogue, reducing risk,
- strengthening mutual tolerance, improving social relations,
- skillful use of information, which reveals new ways of solving the problem,
- an ability to treat contradictions resulting from cooperation with other people as a stimulus to action.

Knowledge about cooperation in building creative capital can be useful for both employees and employers. It can help employers better and more widely use their employees' potential. It is not easy to do research on creative capital that takes cooperation into account. There are not only difficulties in identifying the subject of the study (what we want to study, properly defining cooperation and creative capital) but also in identifying the level of analysis of the entity in which this cooperation is carried out. In future analyses, attention should be paid to extensive research in the field of creativity at specific jobs and identifying their relevance to the financial results of enterprises.

Bibliography

- Acar O. A., Turakci M., Knippenberg D. (2019), *Creativity and Innovation under Constraints: A Cross-Disciplinary Integrative Review*, "Journal of Management", vol. 45, no 1, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318805832>.
- Amabile T. M. (1988), *A Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations*, "Research in Organizational Behavior", no 10.
- Amabile T. M., Pratt M. G. (2016), *The Dynamic Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations: Making Progress, Making Meaning*, "Research in Organizational Behavior", vol. 36, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>.
- Amirbekuly Ye, Aimukhanbetova G. (2018), *Features of Intellectual Capital Management at the Enterprise*, "Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Economy Series", no 4.
- Anderson N., Potočník K., Zhou J. (2014), *Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review and Prospective Commentary*, "Journal of Management", no 40, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>.
- Axelrod R. (2006), *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Revised Edition, Basic Book.
- Baer M. (2012), *Putting Creativity to Work: The Implementation of Creative Ideas in Organizations*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 55, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0470>.
- Beersma B., De Dreu C. K. (2005), *Conflict's Consequences: Effects of Social Motives on Post-negotiation Creative and Convergent Group Functioning and Performance*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", vol. 89, no 3, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.358>.
- Bittner J. V., Heidemeier H. (2013), *Competitive Mindsets, Creativity, and the Role of Regulatory Focus*, "Thinking Skills and Creativity", vol. 9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2013.03.003>.

- Bratnicka K. (2017), *Twórczość w przedsiębiorstwie. Perspektywa obustronności organizacyjnej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach, Katowice.
- Brzeziński M. (2009), *Organizacja kreatywna*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Carsten K. W., De Dreu C. K., Nijstad B. A., van Knippenberg D. (2008), *Motivated Information Processing in Group Judgment and Decision Making*, "Personality and Social Psychology Review", vol. 12, no 1, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307304092>.
- Caves R. E. (2000), *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Corriera C. M., da Silva Costa J. (2014), *Measuring Creativity in the EU Member States*, "Investigaciones Regionales", vol. 30, www.aecr.org/images/ImatgesArticles/.../01Correia.p... (accessed: 10.05.2016).
- Creative Economy Report. The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy: Towards Informed Policy-making* (2008), UNCTAD, Geneva.
- Czakon W. (2007), *Dynamika więzi organizacyjnych przedsiębiorstwa*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Katowicach, Katowice.
- Drozdowski R., Zakrzewska A., Puchalska K., Morchat M., Mroczkowska D. (2010), *Wspieranie postaw proinnowacyjnych przez wzmacnianie kreatywności jednostki*, Polska Agencja Rozwoju Przedsiębiorczości, Warszawa, <https://www.parp.gov.pl> (accessed: 5.03.2017).
- Dyduch W. (2013), *Twórcza strategia organizacji*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach, Katowice.
- Favre-Bonte V., Gardet E., Thevenard-Puthod C. (2016), *Inter-organizational Network Configurations for Ski Areas Innovations*, "European Journal of Innovation Management", vol. 19, no 1, <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejim-04-2014-0039>.
- Flew T. (2002), *Beyond ad hocery: Defining Creative Industries*, The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Te Papa, Wellington, New Zealand, 23–26 January 2002, https://eprints.qut.edu.au/256/1/Flew_beyond.pdf (accessed: 5.03.2017).
- Florida R. (2010), *Narodziny klasy kreatywnej*, Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warszawa.
- Förster J., Higgins E. T. (2005), *How Global versus Local Perception Fits Regulatory Focus*, "Psychological Science", vol. 16, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01586.x>.
- Gnyawall D., Madhayana R., He J. et al. (2016), *The Competition-cooperation Paradox in Inter-firm Relationships: A Conceptual Framework*, "Industrial Marketing Management", vol. 53, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.11.014>.
- Gwóźdź A. (2010), *Od przemysłów kultury do kreatywnej gospodarki*, Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warszawa.
- Howkins J. (2001), *The Creative Economy. How People Make Money from Ideas*, Penguin Books, London.
- Hui D., Chung-Hung N. G., Mok P. A. (2004), *Study on Creativity Index*, http://www.cnel.gov.pt/document/creativity_index_hong_kong.Pdf (accessed: 10.12.2014).
- Jemielnik D. (2008), *Praca oparta na wiedzy. Praca w przedsiębiorstwach wiedzy na przykładzie organizacji high-tech*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- Johnson D. W., Maruyama G., Johnson R., Skon L., Nelson D. (1981), *Effects of Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Goal Structures on Achievement: A Meta-analysis*, "Psychological Bulletin", vol. 89, no 1, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.89.1.47>.
- Kaczmarek B. (2000), *Współdziałanie przedsiębiorstw w gospodarce rynkowej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

- Kamińska A. (2017), *Współpraca przedsiębiorstw z pomiotami zewnętrznymi w realizacji procesów innowacyjnych*, "Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa", no 3.
- Karbowski A. (2016), *Współpraca badawczo-rozwojowa przedsiębiorstw: przegląd prac empirycznych*, Szkoła Główna Handlowa, "Studia i Prace Kolegium Zarządzania i Finansów", no 151.
- Karwowski M. (2009), *Klimat dla kreatywności*, Difin, Warszawa.
- Kasprzak R. (2013), *Przemysły kreatywne w Polsce. Uwarunkowania i perspektywy*, Kamon Consulting, Warszawa.
- Kaufman J. C. (2011), *Kreatywność*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej, Warszawa.
- Klasa kreatywna w Polsce. Technologia, talent i tolerancja jako źródła rozwoju regionalnego* (2012), K. Klincewicz (ed.), Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
- Knop L., Olko S. (2017), *Cooperation in Clusters and Networks – Creativity and Innovativeness Challenges: An Introduction*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej", no 109, <https://doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2017.109.1>.
- Kozarkiewicz A. (2015), *Teorie kreatywności jako podstawa zarządzania projektem kreatywnym*, "Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe UE w Katowicach", no 244.
- Kraus S., Meier F., Niemand T. et al. (2018), *I Search for the Ideal Coopetition Partner: An Experimental Study*, "Review of Managerial Science", vol. 12, no 4, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-017-0237-0>.
- Landry Ch., Bianchini F. (1995), *The Creative City*, Published by Comedia, www.demos.co.uk/files/thecreativecity.pdf (accessed: 12.09.2013).
- Lipka A. (2004), *Współdziałanie. Zmierzch rywalizacji pracowników*, Difin, Warszawa.
- Lipka A. (2017), *Luka kreatywności*, "Ekonomia XXI Wieku", vol. 2, no 14, <https://doi.org/10.15611/e21.2017.2.05>.
- Martinez-Sanchez A., Vela-Jimenez M. J., Abella-Garces S. et al. (2019), *Flexibility and Innovation: Moderator Effects of Cooperation and Dynamism*, "Personal Review", vol. 48, no 6, <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-12-2017-0397>.
- Mattessich P. W., Murray-Close M., Monsey B. R. (2001), *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, St. Paul, MN.
- Montgomery J. (2005), *Beware 'the Creative Class'. Creativity and Wealth Creation Revisited*, "Local Economy", vol. 20, no 4, <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-12-2017-0397>.
- Moultrie J., Young A. (2009), *Exploratory Study of Organizational Creativity in Creative Organizations*, "Creativity and Innovation Management", vol. 18, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00536.x>.
- Namyślak B. (2014), *Sektor kreatywny w gospodarce*, "Gospodarka Narodowa", vol. 270, no 2, <https://doi.org/10.33119/gn/100904>.
- Newbigin J. (2010), *Kreatywna gospodarka i przemysły kultury*, Part 1, British Council, London.
- Nęcka E. (2001), *Psychologia twórczości*, GWP, Gdańsk.
- Nikolaichuk O., Matukova G. (2016), *Enterprise Human Capital Management in the Conditions of Innovative Economy*, "Scientific Journal of Polonia University", vol. 18, no 3, <https://doi.org/10.23856/1815>.
- Nowak D. (2012), *Wpływ współpracy i współdziałania na wybrane obszary funkcjonowania przedsiębiorstwa – wyniki badań*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego", no 736, "Finanse, Rynki Finansowe, Ubezpieczenia", no 55.

- Okoń W. (1987), *Słownik pedagogiczny*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Olesiński Z. (2016), *Współpraca małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw jako sposób ich rozwoju*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uczelni Vistula", vol. 51, no 6.
- Peña N. A., Fernández de Arroyabe J. C. (2002), *Business Cooperation. From Theory to Practice*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Perry-Smith J. E., Mannucci P. V. (2017), *From Creativity to Innovation: The Social Network Drivers of the Four Phases of the Idea Journey*, "Academy of Management Review", vol. 42, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0462>.
- Pięta-Kanurska M., *Budowanie lokalnego kapitału kreatywności w metropolii (na przykładzie Wrocławia Nadodrze)* (2013), "Biblioteka Regionalisty", no 13, <https://doi.org/10.15611/br.2013.1.12>.
- Podogrodzka M. (2013), *Kapitał kreatywny a rozwój gospodarczy regionu w Polsce*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Nauk Ekonomicznych, "Studia Ekonomiczne", vol. 3, no 78.
- Poznańska K. (2016), *Współpraca małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw z podmiotami zewnętrznymi w zakresie innowacyjności*, "Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach", no 280.
- Proctor T. (2002), *Twórcze rozwiązywanie problemów*, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.
- Relacje międzyorganizacyjne w naukach o zarządzaniu* (2014), A. K. Koźmiński, D. Latusek-Jurczak (eds), Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
- Rogowska M. (2011), *Kreatywność i sektor kultury jako czynniki determinujące rozwój współczesnych miast*, "Zeszyty Naukowe WSB w Poznaniu", no 39.
- Rola kultury i przemysłów kreatywnych w rozwoju miast i aglomeracji* (2010), A. Klasik (ed.), Wydawnictwo UE w Katowicach, Katowice.
- Shah J. Y., Brazy P. C., Higgins E. T. (2004), *Promoting Us or Preventing Them: Regulatory Focus and Manifestations of Intergroup Bias*, "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", vol. 30, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203261888>.
- Sieci międzyorganizacyjne. Współczesne wyzwania dla teorii i praktyki zarządzania* (2012), J. Niemczyk, E. Stańczyk-Hugiet, B. Jasiński (eds), C.H. Beck, Warszawa.
- Spodarczyk E., Szelągowska-Rudzka K. (2015), *Is Social Responsibility Required in the Cooperation among Universities, Businesses and Local Government in the Local Environment?* Proceedings of The 11th European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance ECMLG 2015, Military Academy, Lisbon.
- Stachowiak K. (2015), *Problemy metodologiczne badania sektora kreatywnego*, "Rozwój Regionalny i Polityka Regionalna", no 30, <https://doi.org/10.14746/rrpr.2015.30.02>.
- Stachowiak K. (2017), *Gospodarka kreatywna i mechanizmy jej funkcjonowania. Perspektywa geograficzno-ekonomiczna*, Wydawnictwo UAM, Poznań.
- Strykiewicz T., Stachowiak K. (2010), *Sektor kreatywny w poznańskim obszarze metropolitalnym. Uwarunkowania, poziom i dynamika rozwoju sektora kreatywnego w poznańskim obszarze metropolitalnym*, Vol. I, Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznań.
- Strzyżewska M. (2011), *Współpraca między przedsiębiorstwami – odniesienie do polskiej praktyki*, Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH, Warszawa.
- Sward A. (2016), *Trust, Reciprocity, and Actions: The Development of Trust in Temporary Inter-organizational Relations*, "Organization Studies", vol. 37, no 12, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616655488>.

- Szara K. (2017), *Uwarunkowania i możliwości aktywizacji kapitału kreatywnego jako determinanty rozwoju lokalnego na przykładzie gmin województwa podkarpackiego*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszów.
- Szara K. (2018a), *Atrybut środowiska jako element budowy klimatu dla kapitału kreatywnego*, "Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa", no 2.
- Szara K. (2018b), *Człowiek jako podstawowy element kapitału kreatywnego przedsiębiorstw*, "Czasopismo Ekonomia i Zarządzanie", no 2.
- Szara K. (2018c), *Kapitał kreatywny w przedsiębiorstwie*, "Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa", no 1.
- Szmidt K. J. (2013), *Pedagogika twórczości*, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Sopot.
- Thomson A. M., Perry J. L. (2006), *Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box*, "Public Administration Review", Special Issue, no 66.
- Towse R. (2011), *Ekonomia kultury. Kompendium*, Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warszawa.
- Wasiluk A. (2018), *Zaufanie a współpraca przedsiębiorstw w perspektywie tworzenia powiązań sieciowych*, "Przegląd Organizacji", no 3, <https://doi.org/10.33141/po.2018.03.05>.
- Webb J. (2016), *How Does Cooperation and Competition Foster or Inhibit Creativity and Innovation?*, "Journal of Leadership Studies", vol. 10, no 2, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21448>.
- West M. (2000), *Rozwijanie kreatywności wewnątrz organizacji*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Wojtczuk-Turek A. (2010), *Rozwijanie kompetencji twórczych*, SGH, Warszawa.

Współpraca przedsiębiorstw jako stymulanta rozwoju kapitału kreatywnego (Streszczenie)

Cel: Celem artykułu jest ocena współpracy w przedsiębiorstwach w zakresie budowania kapitału kreatywnego.

Metodyka badań: Cel został zrealizowany na podstawie badań własnych przeprowadzonych wśród firm z Podkarpacia: 100 podmiotów sektora kreatywnego i 430 podmiotów należących do różnych sekcji PKD.

Wyniki badań: Jednym z istotnych wniosków wynikających z przeprowadzonej analizy jest potrzeba stworzenia mechanizmów sprzyjających nawiązywaniu i wzmacnianiu współpracy w obszarze kreatywności. Stwierdzono, że współpraca respondentów w przedsiębiorstwach z różnych sekcji była w większości przypadków oceniona jako współpraca na poziomie średnim.

Wnioski: Wymiar współpracy nie różnicuje przedsiębiorstw prowadzących różną działalność gospodarczą, jeżeli chodzi o budowanie kapitału kreatywnego.

Wkład w rozwój dyscypliny: Nowym aspektem badań było połączenie zagadnień współpracy i kapitału kreatywnego. Współpracę przyjęto za składową kapitału kreatywnego ocenianego według autorskiego wzoru. Za wkład można uznać ocenę porównawczą dokonaną wśród przedsiębiorstw sektora kreatywnego i innych sekcji PKD.

Słowa kluczowe: kapitał kreatywny, współpraca, przedsiębiorstwo, wymiary, sektor kreatywny.