EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This exploratory study pioneers the investigation of: *The learning styles of creatives and suits*. By linking creative industries research with the theory of mental self-government, the thesis opens up a new analytical perspective on the assumed inevitable conflict between creatives and suits – creative artists and profit-oriented managers. Creatives are defined as people working within creative industries with creative job content, and suits are defined as people working within creative industries with humdrum job content.

In educational research, learning styles have been used as a tool to make teachers more understanding of and better at reaching students with different preferences for perceiving and processing information. Learning styles could potentially be used as a tool in creative industries to reduce interpersonal conflict between creatives and suits. However, given lack of prior research on the topic, the learning styles of creatives and suits must first be discerned.

21 employees at film production company Copenhagen Bombay and media company Wulffmorgenthaler responded to the Danish Self-Assessment Learning Styles Inventory (D-SA-LSI) and a background survey on demographic information. Given the small sample size, only one statistically significant finding was obtained. Creatives were found to favour the monarchic learning style (focus on single task) significantly more than suits. However, the creatives only displayed a mean medium strong preference for the style, indicating it is not a preferred learning style. Based on the analysis, 11 bold hypotheses were generated, and can function as starting points for future research. Comparing the learning styles of the creatives in the sample with results obtained in literature on the creative personality point to the existence of sub-categories of creatives, thus challenging the assumption of unitary creative and suits groups within creative industries theory. Lack of distinct differences between the learning styles of creatives and suits, and socialisation of styles can indicate that creatives’ and suits’ preferences for perceiving, and handling problems/tasks/situations are not as different as indicated by creative industries literature. Finally, it is concluded that according to learning styles conflict between creatives and suits is *not* inevitable, suggesting artistic and managerial processes can be complementary rather than antagonistic.

Given the inconclusiveness of the pilot study, future research with larger samples is necessary if the learning styles of creatives and suits are to be discerned. In this endeavour, the methodology developed in the present study can be utilised and replicated.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................. 4  
1.1 The great divide between “creatives” and “suits” .............................................................. 4  
1.2 The limitations of current approaches to the conflict between creatives & suits .................. 6  
1.3 Learning styles as a tool to accommodate to people different than oneself ............................ 6  
1.4 The learning styles of creatives and suits ........................................................................... 7  
1.5 Research question .............................................................................................................. 7  
1.6 Sub questions ..................................................................................................................... 7  
1.7 Purpose of the thesis ......................................................................................................... 8  
1.8 Relevance ......................................................................................................................... 8  
1.9 Definitions and delimitations ............................................................................................. 9  
1.10 Structure .......................................................................................................................... 12  

INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW CHAPTERS 2-4 .................................................. 13  

2. EXPLORING THE CREATIVE AND SUIT CONCEPTS ......................................................... 13  
2.1 Who are creatives and suits? ..........................................................  ........................................ 13  
2.2 The tensions between creatives and suits .............................................................. 16  
  2.2.1 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on an ideological level .......... 16  
  2.2.2 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on an organisational level .......... 18  
  2.2.3 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on a group level ................. 19  
2.3 Conclusion on creatives and suits .................................................................................. 21  

3. LEARNING STYLES THEORY ............................................................................................ 22  
3.1 What are learning styles? ......................................................................................... 22  
3.2 The theory of mental self-government .................................................................... 25  
  3.2.1 The functions of mental self-government ......................................................... 26  
  3.2.2 The forms of mental self-government ............................................................. 27  
  3.2.3 The levels of mental self-government ............................................................. 29  
  3.2.4 The scopes of mental self-government ........................................................... 30  
  3.2.5 The leanings of mental self-government......................................................... 30  
3.3 The potential benefits from utilising learning styles theory ........................................ 31  
3.4 Learning styles in a non-academic setting ......................................................................... 33  
3.5 Conclusion on learning styles ..................................................................................... 34  

4. THEORETICAL DISCUSSION: WHAT ARE THE LEARNING STYLES OF CREATIVES AND SUITS? ...................................................................................................................... 34  

5. METHODOLOGY .................................................................................................................. 38  
5.1 Research design ........................................................................................................... 38  
5.2 Methodological considerations ................................................................................. 39  
5.3 Type of study, research approach and theory of science .................................................. 39  
5.4 Theory ............................................................................................................................ 40  
5.5 Case population identification and case selection ........................................................ 42  
5.6 Participants ...................................................................................................................... 43  
5.7 Instruments ........................................................................................................................ 43  
5.8 Data collection ................................................................................................................ 44  
  5.8.1 Primary data ........................................................................................................ 44  
  5.8.2 Secondary data .................................................................................................... 45  
5.9 Data analysis ................................................................................................................... 45  
5.10 Validity and reliability ................................................................................................ 45
6. COMPANY DESCRIPTIONS ........................................................................................................48
6.1 Copenhagen Bombay ........................................................................................................48
6.2 Wulffmorgenthaler ........................................................................................................49

7. FINDINGS ..................................................................................................................................51

8. ANALYSIS .................................................................................................................................53
8.1 Differences between creatives and suits: Significant findings ........................................53
8.2 Differences between creatives and suits: Noteworthy non-significant findings ..............54
8.3 Interesting similarities between creatives and suits ............................................................57
8.4 Style grouping according to creativity and conformity .........................................................60
8.5 The learning styles of creatives .........................................................................................61
8.6 Inconclusive learning styles ...............................................................................................63
8.7 Conclusion on analysis .........................................................................................................63

9. CONCLUSION ...........................................................................................................................65

REFERENCES................................................................................................................................73

APPENDICES.................................................................................................................................73
Appendix 1 – List of abbreviations ............................................................................................73
Appendix 2 – Glossary .................................................................................................................74
Appendix 3 – The creative industries .........................................................................................80
Appendix 4 – Examples of how actors act in accordance with economic logic of practice .......84
Appendix 5 – The problem with creative people .......................................................................85
Appendix 6 – Overview of the dichotomous differences between creatives and suits ............86
Appendix 7 – Example of a learning styles profile ....................................................................87
Appendix 8 – Teaching style focus and favouritism of participants with certain learning styles 88
Appendix 9 – D-SA-LSI survey and background information survey in English ......................89
Appendix 10 – Organisational structure for Copenhagen Bombay ...........................................90
APPENDIX 11 – Copenhagen Bombay’s value chain for production of a typical feature film......92
APPENDIX 12 – Example of how decision-making in Wulffmorgenthaler is based on the artistic quality of products ........................................................................................................92
APPENDIX 13 – Example of how artistic logic dominates Wulffmorgenthaler .............................92
APPENDIX 14 – D-SA-LSI average mean scores ......................................................................93
APPENDIX 15 – D-SA-LSI sum mean scores .............................................................................94
APPENDIX 16 – T-test for equality of means tested on sum scores for each learning scale .......95
APPENDIX 17 – Legislative learning style – categorical distribution ..........................................97
APPENDIX 18 – Progressive learning style – categorical distribution .........................................97
APPENDIX 19 – Oligarchic learning style – categorical distribution .........................................97
APPENDIX 20 – Learning styles of independent artists versus the sample creatives .................97
1. INTRODUCTION

“For there is an inevitable conflict between art and business in enterprises which must use artists in order to make profit; the beautiful is not necessarily the popular; the profitable is generally not beautiful, and popular art is as much despised by artists as "intellectual art" is despised by businessmen.”


1.1 The great divide between “creatives” and “suits”

The inherent conflict between art & business is a not a phenomenon unique to Los Angeles´ filmmaking suburb Hollywood in the 1940s (Rosten, 1941). In creative industries, “the eternal battle” (Thompson, Jones & Warhurst, 2007) between business managers and highly specialised, creative employees repeats itself every day, as they in unison try to cooperate and turn creativity into appropriate commercial commodities (Movitz & Sandberg, 2009).

The rub is that both “suits” - profit-oriented managers - and visionary “creatives” contribute vitally to economisation of creativity, business innovation and the overall creation of value (Austin & Nolan, 2007). Creatives and artists “create objects, emotional reactions, expressions, and thoughts through books, paintings, recordings, music, film, performances and programs” (Vogel, 2008: 143). Suits, on the other hand, are responsible for careful allocation of the organisation’s resources to achieve optimal return on investment (Austin & Nolan, 2007). Their combined unique abilities, knowledge and skill sets enable the creation of new and original ideas and the conversion of these into economic capital and saleable products (Howkins, 2002). Both sides are indispensable and need each other (Vogel, 2008): The painter needs an art dealer and the publisher a novelist.

However, this “marriage of necessity” between art and business is most often a troubled one, given the inherent contradiction between creative work and “humdrum” commerce (Caves, 2000). The creative and business fields have different knowledge and practices, styles of living, languages (Austin & Hjorth, 2008), interests, priorities (Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000), underlying logics and measures of success (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2008). Business managers are judged by their results and abilities to exploit ideas by turning them into revenue streams (Bilton, 2007). Creative employees, on the other hand, are judged by how successfully they use their expertise and specialist knowledge to translate innovative ideas
into finished original and useful products (Ibid). As a result, suits frequently undermine creativity by maximising business imperatives such as coordination, productivity and control (Amabile, 1998). Creatives, on the other hand, regularly undermine management by maximising artistic imperatives such as perfectionism, art for art’s sake and creative freedom (Caves, 2000; Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000). Creatives favour to operate based on an artistic logic of practice with reference to aesthetics, whereas suits prefer an economic logic of practice with reference to economy as rationale (Austin & Hjorth, 2008). These logics constitute distinct and potentially contradictory points of reference for those involved in creative production (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 525). Furthermore, “art as a sphere of aesthetic performance in its own right deliberately negates economic market orientation. It thrives not only on being art for art’s sake, but also on being non-economic” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006: 234). Thus, the process of business innovation resembles a series of battles between people with very different priorities, and conflict between creatives and suits is assumed to be inevitable (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

When confrontations between creatives and suits occur, creatives will prefer to argue based on artistic logic and aesthetics, while suits will favour economic logic and business imperatives (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). This mismatch in communication often leads to lost business opportunities, as can be seen in an example from a Copenhagen-based theatre:

*A scenographer tells a production manager that he can lift the theatre play from “great” to “world class”. The plan is all worked out. All that is needed is $1500. The reward for his trouble is a firm “no” and an hour-long lecture on the budget, financing, resource allocation and profit margins.*

In this situation, the scenographer cares vitally about “the originality displayed, the technical prowess demonstrated, the resolution and harmony achieved in the creative act” of stage presentation (Caves, 2000: 4). Driven by intrinsic motivation, deep interest, curiosity and challenge for the work itself (Amabile, 1998: 79) he argues based on a glittering artistic vision: Push Danish scenography to world-class heights. The scenographer wants to contribute to art as a greater good, and to him business concerns are secondary. In contrast, the production manager advocates a market-orientation and cost efficiency approach. He perceives his job duties to be responsible allocation of limited resources and will not risk failure or project unprofitability by “wasting money on grand artistic aspirations”. The creative and suit simply do not recognise or value what the other party is trying to say.

It is a repeat of what Hiltzik (2000: 263) observed at Xerox PARC in the 1970s: Managers and technology visionaries “communicated like creatures of different species.” And it is a repeat of thousands of other, similar situations occurring in the creative industries every
day: Clashes between intrinsically motivated, creative visionaries oblivious to business realities and unwilling to compromise, on the one hand, and market-oriented, efficiency-focused managers uninterested in glittering visions and unmanageable creatives who go off on wild tangents, on the other (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

In the short-run, miscommunication between creatives and suits simply means missed business opportunities and squandered resources. In the long run, however, the conflict between creatives and suits leads to the central paradox of creative production: “When the artistic logic of practice is economically utilized, economic logic tends to crowd out artistic logic and thus, erodes the very resources upon which creative production depends” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 524). Conflicts between creatives and suits threaten to put a company’s ability to innovate effectively at risk (Austin & Nolan, 2007: 31). It is therefore vital to address the continual mismatch in communication between creatives and suits - and the assumed inevitability of the conflict that exists between them.

1.2 The limitations of current approaches to the conflict between creatives & suits
Current theoretical approaches to solve conflicts between creatives and suits are largely based on bridge builder solutions – using people who have legitimacy in both camps to broker for peace (Austin & Nolan, 2007; Bilton & Leary, 2002). However, this is not a viable solution in the long run. The responsibility for functioning communication between two work groups is not a burden select individuals should bear alone. It only reinforces the categorical division between creatives and suits by legitimising the differences and gaps between the profession groups, and allows creatives and suits to retreat to their comfort zones (Bilton, 2007). Also, in times of organisational strife, it can put individuals straddling the gap between art and commerce under untenable pressure (Glynn, 2006). What is needed is greater group-wide dialogue and understanding of other people’s preferences, rather than a preoccupation with stereotypes. This can be achieved through a fresh analytical perspective on the stereotypical opposition between creatives and suits.

1.3 Learning styles as a tool to accommodate to people different than oneself
In educational research, knowledge of one’s learning style - preferences for information processing and problem solving - has been used to create conceptual change in experienced teachers by explicitating their implicit beliefs on learning and performance of their job (Nielsen, 2008). This enabled the teachers to consciously interchange between matching and mismatching to the styles of the students, use their non-preferred styles to engage more students, become more understanding of other learning styles, become more accommodating
to students who did not share their style, and achieve greater differentiation teaching practice (Nielsen, 2008). In short, understanding styles of thinking and learning can help people prevent misunderstandings and come to a better understanding of each other, and of themselves (Sternberg, 1995).

1.4 The learning styles of creatives and suits

Based on the above, I wonder if learning styles can be transferred to a creative industries context and used as a tool to reduce conflict between creatives and suits by creating conceptual change. This would be especially pertinent for managers, whose responsibility it is to effectively achieve work through others very different from themselves. However, no prior research has been conducted on the learning styles of creatives and suits. Therefore an exploratory study needs to be undertaken to investigate what the learning styles of creatives and suits are - and if they differ systematically.

1.5 Research question

Based on the above, the main research question in the thesis is:

What are the learning styles of creatives and suits?

1.6 Sub questions

To answer the main research question, I have devised the following research sub-questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Section to be answered in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creatives &amp; suits</td>
<td>- What are the characteristics of creatives and suits?</td>
<td>- Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles</td>
<td>- What are learning styles?</td>
<td>- Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Can the concept of learning styles be transferred from an academic context and to a creative industries context?</td>
<td>- Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles of creatives &amp; suits</td>
<td>- Do the learning styles of creatives and suits differ systematically?</td>
<td>- Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Sub questions

To answer the research question, I will first define the concepts of creatives and suits and their characteristics by focusing on the tensions between them. Furthermore, I will investigate the concept of learning styles, and the possibility of transferring it from an academic to a non-academic context, followed by a theoretical discussion on the learning styles of creatives and
suits. An empirical investigation and testing of creative labour is undertaken at film production company Copenhagen Bombay and media company Wulffmorgenthaler. Finally, the results obtained are analysed to determine what the learning styles of creatives and suits are and if they differ systematically.

1.7 Purpose of the thesis
The overall purpose of the thesis is to provide a new analytical perspective on the simple, yet powerful creative-suit dichotomy, by linking creative industries research with learning styles theory in an exploratory pilot study. This opens a new analytical perspective on management of creativity and commerce, and communication between creatives and suits. The contribution to existing theory is greater understanding of the creative and suit concepts and their characteristics, and an indication of whether learning styles theory supports or refutes inevitable conflict between them. Based on the research question, the thesis aims to:

- Compare and contrast the learning styles of creatives and suits to ascertain if they have systematically different learning styles, i.e. fundamentally different preferences for information processing and problem solving

If there are marked differences between the learning styles of creatives and suit, this can increase our understanding of why miscommunication, tension and conflict appear to be inevitable. If there are not marked differences between the learning styles of creatives and suits, this challenges 1) Current definitions of creatives and suits 2) The core assumption of creative industries: That creativity and business are natural opponents and conflict between creatives and suits inevitable. Few marked differences in learning styles will suggest that creative and managerial processes are complementary rather than antagonistic (Bilton, 2007).

1.8 Relevance
Research on how to communicate and manage in the cross-section between creativity and management by incorporating non-economic norms and values, is crucial for creative industries, knowledge-intensive industries (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007), other sectors dominated by strong professional enthuses, and project-based industries in general (Thompson et al, 2007). Knowledge-based societies have turned creativity into a source of competitive advantage (Florida, 2004: 4), by shifting from a Fordist economy dominated by manufactured goods and manual labour to a new, creative economy where ideas, intangible assets, services and relational skills predominate (Flew, 2005). In Denmark today, 50-75% of creative people work outside creative industries (Bille, 2008). Thompson, Jones & Warhurst
(2007: 514) report that the antagonism observable in creative industries between creatives’ professional ethos on the one hand, and organisational and corporate logics on the other, is “a symptomatic tension in the rapidly expanding field of professional services.” This makes research on communication between creatives and suits relevant for both traditional and new sectors increasingly characterised by innovation, risk, uncertainty, performativity and differentiation (Smith & McKinlay, 2009a: 4), as well as management of knowledge workers and professionals. Given that creative business are quintessentially project businesses; insights from the creative industries might be of relevance for other project-based industries in general (Thompson et al, 2007: 514).

Further research has the potential to develop Sternberg’s learning styles framework into a tool for proactively managing the conflict between creatives and suits. For a creative industries manager, learning styles as a tool could provide the following benefits:

- A shared and agreed conceptual framework and vocabulary
- A group neutral tool not biased towards creatives or suits
- Learning styles are not intrusively personal and can be disclosed in the work space
- Knowledge and awareness of own style in relation to others
- Improved communication with employees, colleagues and superiors (Zhang, 2005)
- Enhanced cooperation in cross-disciplinary project teams (Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard, 2008b)
- Improved management training and development programmes (Zhang, 2005)
- Learning styles can be used as a tool for self-development
- Cause top management to view employees as a diversified human resource portfolio (Zhang, 2005)

1.9 Definitions and delimitations
Demarcating topics and concepts in an explorative, multi-disciplinary thesis is a challenge. The following presents core definitions and what has deliberately been included and omitted from the thesis and why, based on research question, purpose and type of research study.

The thesis examines **learning styles on individual level in a creative industries context.** **Learning styles** are defined according to Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government and Nielsen’s adaptation of the theory to a Danish cultural context. Due to the complexity of integrating two seemingly disparate fields of knowledge, no other learning styles theories are utilised. In this thesis, the concept of style refers solely to learning styles.
The creative industries term is defined as (see Appendix 3 for further elaboration):

a) Encompassing specific sectors:

“Publishing and magazine publishing, visual arts (painting, sculpture), the performing arts (theatre, opera, concerts, dance), sound recordings, cinema and TV films, even fashion and toys and games” (Caves, 2000: 1).

b) Displaying unique characteristics:

Globally connected industries, tendency to agglomerate in clusters in big cities, can develop space-specific brands e.g. Danish design, often integral part of public authorities’ development strategies, durable product and durable rents, production of symbolic goods that serve an aesthetic or expressive rather than utilitarian function, uncertain demand for creative products due to the unpredictability of subjective experience, infinitely differentiated products allowing small firms to view the giants and possibly attain a monopolistic regime of competition, highly educated & technically skilled labour force with vertically differentiated skills in A list/ B list format, diversely skilled production crews, advanced use of technology in production, time pressure to produce and finalise creative products, and art for art’s sake motivation - creators care vitally about their products and derive non-economic psychological satisfaction from their work (Bille, 2007; Birch, 2008; Caves, 2000; Gibson & Kong; 2005; Power & Scott; 2004).

The thesis does not cover consumption of culture in the broader experience economy, the service industries in general, software or other content industries, sport and tourism, or purely publically funded creative activities. Political definitions of creative industries are not considered, as they are vague, oversimplified (Birch, 2008; Bilton, 2007), only compromise industry-specific definitions (Birch, 2008: 34), consider qualitative dimensions at a superfluous level (Birch, 2008: 38), vary highly depending on country and political system (Birch, 2008) and lack theoretical clarity (Galloway & Dunlop, 2006). Finally, creative industries should not be confused with its -precursor cultural industries.

The creative and suit concepts are defined according to current creative industries research. Creatives are defined as people working in creative industries with creative job content: Skilled, specialised and highly capable creative employees responsible for creation, development and design of experiential objects emotional reactions, expressions, and thoughts (Austin & Nolan, 2007; Caves, 2000; Vogel, 2008). Suits are defined as people working within creative industries with “humdrum” job content, performing administrative and support work for commercialisation of creative, experiential products. Suits are most often managers responsible for careful allocation of resources with the aim of achieving optimal return on investment (Austin & Nolan, 2007; Caves, 2000). I will not consider creative and suits outside their context, the creative or humdrum activities people perform in their spare time or at other jobs, or the historical development of the creative and suit concepts.
The concept of **creativity** is culturally dependent, profoundly rooted in time and space and not universal (Santagata, 2004), and is defined from a Western-European perspective:

- The *ability* to generate and execute original ideas that are useful, appropriate and actionable based on individual expertise, creative thinking skills and predominantly intrinsic motivation, all occurring in a domain (rules, procedures and instructions for action) with relation to a field (external evaluation of appropriate creative capability) (Amabile, 1998; Csikszentmihalyi).
- An incremental *activity* based on careful, concentrated effort (Bilton & Leary, 2002).
- A *result* of ordinary thought processes of ordinary individuals (Weisberg, 1986: 12).

The following topics are not considered in relation to creativity and creatives & suits:

- **Personality psychology and personality traits of creatives and suits**
  
  Creativity is not a personality trait and results from a complex combination of more basic mental capabilities (Sawyer, 2006: 74)

- **Biology and genetics: Different brain or biological characteristics of creatives and suits**
  
  Twin studies have found no evidence creativity is heritable, there is no creativity gene and no evidence creativity is located in any specific brain region (Sawyer, 2006). Split-brain research has shown that creativity is a complex systemic whole-brain function and it is thus too simplistic to associate creative activity with either hemisphere (Ibid).

The thesis takes a **managerial perspective** on interactions between creatives and suits in a creative industries context. It is assumed that suits are in managerial positions, i.e. business managers managing artists and not artists managing other artists, for two reasons: One, the latter scenario would defeat the purpose of the thesis, and two, artists managing artists give rise to different dynamics and an altered set of problems.

The intention of combining creative industries theory and learning styles theory is how the latter may be used to decrease disruptive conflict, not constructive and positive conflict between creatives and suits. The thesis is a **snapshot exploratory study** and will not generate causal, longitudinal or predictive research on the learning styles of creatives and suits.
1.10 Structure

The thesis follows a linear-analytic structure, see Fig. 1. Succeeding the Executive Summary and the Introduction, are chapters 2, 3 and 4 compromising the Literature Review, which lays the theoretical foundation of the thesis. In chapter 2 the concepts of creatives and suits are explored and in chapter 3 Sternberg’s theory of learning styles is presented. The Literature Review concludes with chapter 4 Theoretical Discussion, combining the two strands of theory. Chapter 5 Methodology, explains and discusses the choice of framework, theories and methods for data collection in relation to the inductive theory building approach. Chapter 6 Company descriptions, provides the necessary background information on film production company Copenhagen Bombay and media company Wulffmorgenthaler. Chapter 7 Findings, relays the results from administering the Danish Self-Assessment Learning Styles Inventory (D-SA-LSI) to the research participants. The results are analysed in chapter 8. Analysis. Chapter 9 Conclusion, succinctly summarises the research study and results obtained, as well as the future research needed to develop this interesting topic area.

Fig. 1 Structure of the thesis
INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW CHAPTERS 2-4

Chapter 2 to 4 constitute the theoretical foundation of the thesis. The aim of chapter 2 *Exploring the creative and suit concepts*, is to define and present the characteristics of creatives and suits according to creative industries research by focusing on the tensions between them. The aim of chapter 3 *Learning styles theory*, is to present Sternberg’s theory of learning styles, the potential benefits of utilising learning styles theory and to explore the previously limited usage of learning styles in non-academic settings. The aim of chapter 4 *Theoretical discussion – combining creative industries and learning styles theory*, is to link the two strands of theory and evaluate possibilities for integration, as the two theories have not previously been combined.

2. EXPLORING THE CREATIVE AND SUIT CONCEPTS

The nature of creative labour remains an understudied topic in creative industries theory, where focus has been on consumption of cultural artefacts rather than on the production side of the value chain (Birch, 2008; Smith & McKinlay, 2009a, 2009b). Furthermore, the creative-suit dichotomy as an overarching thought structure dominates creative industries research. The tendency is to portray suits as what creatives are not and vice versa, resulting in the either-or imagery of the archetypal creative genius versus the bureaucratic manager. Additionally, the “creative” and “suit” terminology remains stubbornly ingrained in the psyche of creative industries professionals and in the employment ads used to hire them (Bilton, 2007: 12). The strong reverberation with both creative industries theorists and practitioners serves to uphold and reproduce the notion that employees within creative industries are *either* creatives or suits, and that there exists “a great divide” (Bilton, 2007) and an inherent, inevitable conflict (Austin & Nolan, 2007) between them. In the following, the creative and suit concepts are defined and their characteristics explored by focusing on the conflict between them at ideological, organisational and group level.

2.1 Who are creatives and suits?

In his seminal work on creative industries, Caves (2000) defines creatives and suits according to job content. Creatives work with creative job content and engage in the creative process of inventing, designing and producing experiential goods and services (Caves, 2000). Suits, or “humdrum inputs” as Caves calls them, work with “humdrum job content” and perform the necessary administrative and support work that allows for commercialisation of creative,
experiential products and services (Caves, 2000). As such, suits are most commonly managers responsible for careful allocation of an organization’s resources with the aim of achieving optimal return on investment (Austin & Nolan, 2007). Creatives are normally skilled, specialised and highly capable creative employees (Austin & Nolan, 2007) responsible for the creation and development of experiential objects emotional reactions, expressions, and thoughts through books, paintings, recordings, music, films, performances and programs (Vogel, 2008: 143).

In his work on the Creative Class, Richard Florida (2004) specifies the occupations creatives and suits typically hold, though in his universe they are dubbed Bohemians and Creative Professionals. In Creative Class theory, people are clustered in groups according to common interests and the tendency to think, feel and behave similarly. According to Florida (2004: 8), these similarities are based on the economic function people perform, i.e. the work they are paid to do for a living. In contrast to the Working Class or Service Class, who are primarily paid to be physically present and execute according to plan, both Bohemians and Creative Professionals are primarily paid to be mentally present and think, create and innovate (Florida, 2004). The means of production are their brains, knowledge and talent (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007). The Bohemians constitute the artistically creative part of the Creative Class (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007) and their “economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/ or creative content” (Florida, 2004: 8). The Creative Professionals, on the other hand, are knowledge-based professionals not directly connected with artistic creation or technological development. Their economic function is to educate, manage, care-take and develop models and thoughts to facilitate economic development (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007). In between the Bohemians and the Creative Professionals lies the Super-Creative core, of which the Bohemians are in fact a sub-group, constituting the most creative part. The Super Creative Core consists of people who “invent, take out patents and thereby drive economic and technological development” (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007: 11) by producing new forms and designs that are readily transferable and broadly useful. As such, Florida extends the concept of creatives to include the entire Super-Creative Core. However, for this thesis’ intents and purposes, the concept of creatives is limited to Bohemians and the concept of suits is limited to Creative Professionals. The occupations Bohemians and Creative Professionals occupy are:
Other parameters have been launched as means to distinguish between creatives and suits. According to Bille (2008), creative workers can be demarcated from their business counterparts by either job content or education. However, the artistic education criterion falls short because formal education within the arts or other creative activities (e.g. architecture, movies, media, music) does not automatically result in a career as an artist. As Bille (2008: 3) states, “many people explore arts as an occupation but very few remain as artists for significant periods of time”. Furthermore, only 22 percent of the total Danish labour force working with creative job content have a creative education (Bille, 2008): Many artists are autodidact, performing creative work for which they have no formal qualifying education (Bille, 2008). Therefore, job content has emerged as the most easily operational criteria to distinguish creatives from suits in a given environment.

Job content as a functioning demarcation criterion between creatives and suits necessitates a systemic, social-economic definition of creativity as a non-extraordinary, non-genius-related, non-irrational, everyday form of thinking. It requires a democratised creativity definition like Weisberg’s (Goldenberg & Mazursky, 2002: 32): “Creativity is not an extraordinary form of thinking”, and the combined creativity definitions of Amabile (1998), Csikszentmihalyi (2001) and Movitz & Sandberg (2009): The ability to generate and execute original ideas that are useful, appropriate and actionable based on individual expertise, creative thinking skills and predominantly intrinsic motivation, all occurring in a domain (rules, procedures and instructions for action) with relation to a field (external evaluation of appropriate creative capability). In this perspective, creativity is an incremental activity based
on careful, concentrated effort, an individual’s accumulated memories and experience, and domain-specific expertise; knowledge of own and other’s ideas within a given domain (Bilton & Leary, 2002). Defining creativity as the outcome of ordinary, everyday thinking enables the “masses” to perform creative job content on a large scale and deserve the epithet “creative”.

2.2. The tensions between creatives and suits

Tensions between creative and suits result from the overall project in creative industries: Turning creativity into appropriate commercial commodities (Movitz & Sandberg, 2009). The tensions have to be bridged at ideological, organisational and group level, where they manifest as conflicts between art and business, creativity and control, and creatives and suits respectively (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006). Using this three-level structure as an analytic tool enables us to move from definitions of creatives and suits to examining their characteristics.

2.2.1 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on an ideological level

Although it represents a reduction, creatives and suits conflict on an ideological level because they subscribe to the opposing logics of art and business. However, in creative industries research, there is severe lack of empirical research and theoretical models explaining a) how art and business as reference points drive creative production, and b) the nature of the relationship between artistic and economic logic of practice (Austin & Hjorth, 2008; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). Eikhof & Haunschild (2007) seek to fill this gap in understanding by applying Bourdieu’s theoretical concept of ”logics of practice” to their qualitative research in German theatre. Their argumentation goes as follows:

Because the creative industries are a sphere of the economy where the business field and cultural field overlap, both artistic logic of practice and economic logic of practice drive individual production of creatives’ and suits’ work related practices (concrete decisions, everyday activities and habitual features) (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). The logics are “sets of norms, values and unwritten laws on which the actions of all the players in the field are based” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 526). The artistic logic of practice is characterised by a desire to produce art for art’s sake, and can be identified when the primary intention of social practices is to contribute to art as a greater good (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). Art is defined as an abstract quality that surfaces in “specific aesthetics or individual reactions by the recipient, and needs no external legitimisation” – it exists only in subjective interpretations (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 526). Economic logic, however, is characterised by an explicit market orientation – quantifiable market values stated by “the market” as an objective institution and comparability as a leading principle (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). It can be
identified when the primary intention is to exchange outputs on a market, be it product, capital or labour markets (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). Generally, creatives prefer artistic logic of practice with reference to aesthetics, whereas suits favour economic logic of practice with reference to economy as rationale (Austin & Hjorth, 2008). The problem is that the artistic logic of practice deliberately negates economic reasoning with its principles of non-comparability and non-measurability: Art “thrives not only on being art for art’s sake, but also on being non-economic” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006: 234). Cultural forms will not gain artistic recognition unless they can prove their creative makers are autonomous, producing works for their own sake (Regev, 1997). Creatives “do not (like to) think of themselves as involved with economic reasoning and certainly do not want to be perceived as economically driven” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 533). Consequently, creatives’ predilection for artistic logic of practice and suits’ predilection for economic logic of practice lead to regular clashes between the groups (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007).

However, Eikhof & Haunschild (2007) demonstrate that German actors can - and do - act in accordance with economic logic of practice. Tight internal and external labour markets for actors, temporary work contracts and idiosyncratic staffing decisions heavily influenced by personal contacts, make the actors consciously allocate their creative resources, control the outcome of their efforts and strategically invest in social capital to increase employability (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007, for examples see Appendix 4). The finding that people are capable of acting in accordance with both logics, despite a personal preference for one, is vital. It makes it possible to move beyond the general assumption of creative industries research - that art and business constitute distinct and contradictory points of reference for those involved in creative production (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007) - and instead assume that individual actors can – and do – act in accordance with the social practices of both the artistic and the economic field. This makes management in the creative industries and communication between creative and the economic field possible – even though it is challenge.

The challenge arises because economic logic dominates public discourse (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007) and in the world of business organisations, the relationship between art and management is structured hierarchically, with the latter dominant (Austin & Hjorth, 2008). Often, suits are awarded a sovereign status and the final word (Austin & Hjorth, 2008), controlling both the labour process and the output of creative labour (Movitz & Sandberg, 2009). Eikhof & Haunschild (2007: 536) argue that all attempts to manage and market artistic practices following economic logic crowds leads to the central paradox of creative production: “Economic logics tend to crowd out artistic logics, and thus endanger the
resources vital to creative production.” Austin & Hjorth (2008: 5), nuance this claim by pointing out that there are historical forces in play that “reproduce the dictating rather than conversing reality of the management-design” or creative-suit relationship. Through a case study at design firm E-Types, Austin & Hjorth (2008: 1) present a partial exception to the managerial tendencies of dominating artistic reasoning and logic, and show that economy and aesthetics can be made conversant by inducing them in frequent and familiar association:

“Business concerns do not always crow out aesthetic concerns, nor do business inclinations always lead to the best business outcomes; sometimes designers’ concerns for aesthetics align with the best business interests of the firm, from a strategic point of view, and can serve as a break on business inclinations to seize short-term economic gains at the expense of long-term economic success.”

Consequently, creatives and suits may have natural preferences for different ideologies or logics of practice, setting the stage for conflict and ideological battles. However, the tensions can also be utilised to create spaces for conversation, enabling creatives and suit to cooperate and jointly actualize new ideas, despite their different agendas and interests.

2.2.2 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on an organisational level

On an organisational level, the dual goals of commerce and art – exploitation of old certainties for profitability contrasted with exploration of new possibilities for uncertain returns (DeFilipi, Grabher & Jones, 2007; March 1991) – give rise to organisations with hybrid identities (Albert & Whetten, 2004). Hybrid identities are defined as identities consisting of two different identity elements not typically found together (Albert & Whetten, 2004). The typical hybrid consists of normative and utilitarian elements that are potentially conflictual because they give rise to “two logical systems of management” (Glynn, 2006): One espousing norms of artistic excellence and the other espousing norms of fiscal guardianship. The organisational actors that typify these dual identity elements are suits who balance budgets and creatives who create (Glynn, 2006: 58). Creatives and suits in their different organisational roles can emphasise and advance different aspects of the organisation’s identity (Albert & Whetten, 2004), either by “exacerbating latent tensions between artistic and utilitarian elements or dampening them to achieve synthesis and organisational synergy” (Glynn, 2006: 58). For persons occupying organisational roles that bridge and incorporate aspects of both identity elements, e.g. a music director in a symphony orchestra, this can be taxing and demanding, especially in times of organisational strife, retrenchment and tension (Glynn, 2006).

Hybrid organisations can be holographic or ideographic (Albert & Whetten, 2004). Holographic denotes that both identity elements are present in all units of the organisation and
not restricted to structural roles, e.g. a hospital (Albert & Whetten, 2004; Glynn, 2006). Ideographic denotes that each organisational unit is specialised in its identity with an attendant set of capabilities, expertise, professionalism and structural roles (Glynn, 2006), e.g. a theatre with an administrative unit and an artistic unit. The diffuse identity of holographic organisations is often problematic for its members to manage because each individual has to integrate or compartmentalise the latent conflict resulting from the dual identity elements (Glynn, 2006). Thus, conflicts within holographic organisations are resolved within units. For members of ideographic organisations, the problem during conflict is integration between the two disparate identity elements and their attendant employees (Glynn, 2006). However, as Glynn (2006), points out, organisational theorists still know little about managing hybrid and potentially conflictual identities, thus more research is needed in this area.

Most organisations within creative industries are ideographic organisations, including the ones in this study, and are based on functional division of artistic and economic labour in separate units. There are structural boundaries between creatives and suits, and their conflicting views, philosophies of education, rules of procedures, priorities, different systems of meaning and cultural values, so the incongruous artistic and economic identity elements do not contaminate each other, but can exist side by side (Albert & Whetten, 2004; Glynn, 2006). Thus, conflict in ideographic organisations can become a struggle over the very soul of the organisation (Albert & Whetten, 2004), where suits become labelled as “obstructive bureaucratic managers” in the eyes of the creatives, and creatives become labelled as “unmanageable prima donnas” in the eyes of the suits (for an example on what suits view to be “The Problem With Creative People”, see Appendix 5). Consequently, in hybrid creative industries firms, conflict between creativity and control is defined as the fundamental issue (Alvarez et al, 2005; Caves, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006).

2.2.3 Reasons for conflict between creatives and suits on a group level
Internally in creative industries firms, the collective nature of creative production necessitates co-operation between diversely skilled workers: A motley crew of creatives and suits (Caves, 2000). Interference with the market means diverse activities between them need to be closely managed, planned and coordinated in relatively short and finite time frames (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006; Flew, 2004) to achieve economic profitability and prompt realisation of revenues (Caves, 2000). However, artistic processes are, by their very nature, uncertain in outcome (Vogel, 2008): Creatives do not know the product and aesthetic choices in advance, and cannot pre-test if their visions will be equally persuasive to others (Musial, 2008). Thus,
the multiplicative production relationship and interdependence of production functions is often threatened by diverse interests, expectations, professional backgrounds, languages, priorities and preferences, making it a challenge to sustain cooperation between creatives and suits during production (Austin & Hjorth; Caves, 2000).

According to Caves (2000: 4), suits are just in it for the money: They demand a wage at least equal to what they earn outside the market for inputs of their type, and do not care who employs them or what task (within their competence) they are asked to undertake. Suits are extrinsically motivated, performing their jobs in order to “get something desirable or enjoy something pleasurable” (Amabile, 1998: 79): They respond to ordinary economic incentives (Caves, 2000; Vogel, 2008). Creatives, in contrast, have a “personal desire to engage with the affective, emotive, cathartic dimensions of creative pursuits” (Gibson & Kong, 2005: 544). They are driven by an art for art’s sake, inner motivation to engage in the creative work for its own sake, derive non-economic psychological satisfaction thereof and care vitally about their product (quality, originality, technical features, harmony in the creative act) (Amabile, 1998; Caves, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Flew, 2004; Vogel, 2008). Creatives are thus, willing to sacrifice to devote themselves to creative work, to the point where they will even proceed at adverse economic cost to themselves (Caves, 2000). For creative industries firms, the positive effect of this is, one, creative inputs can come cheap, and two, intrinsically motivated creatives generate more creative products than if they value the incomes they received (Caves, 2000). In fact, “art for art’s sake motivation outperforms all organisational schemes in terms of efficiency” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006: 240) and creativity (Amabile, 1998). However, creatives’ romantic notion of being an untainted, autonomous creative entity, producing works for its own sake (Regev, 1997), creating out of inner necessity (Caves, 2000), for self-realisation (Maslow, 1943), and perhaps to achieve a utopic, world-changing glittering vision (Austin & Nolan, 2007), directly clashes with suits’ business imperatives of profit-optimisation, productivity, control (Amabile, 1998), responsible allocation of investor resources (Austin & Nolan, 2007), return on invested capital, opportunity cost, risk and the time value of money (Vogel, 2008). Art for art’s sake entails that art claims a superior reality to humdrum commerce. To creatives, “imagination and passion carry their own warrant and should not compromise with reason and established practice” (Caves, 2000: 4), especially not when trying to achieve a vision (Austin & Nolan, 2007). So when suits see compromise as an inevitable part of practical business problems (Austin & Nolan, 2007), creatives will rebel at efforts to manage them systematically (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007) and “resist making commitments about future acts of artistic creation or
accepting limitations on them” (Caves, 2000: 4). The inherent problem is that resources are scarce and concessions most often unavoidable (Caves, 2000). Therefore, continual rejection on principle - by either party - will turn a potentially integrative, value-creating venture between creatives and suits into a competitive, value-claiming win-lose, distributive deal characterised by negative correlations between the parties’ goal attainment (Lewicki, Saunders & Barry, 2006). It will turn business innovation and creative production into battles between people with very different priorities, and put a company’s ability to innovate effectively at risk (Austin & Nolan, 2007). Therefore, it is vital to address the continual mismatch in communication between creatives and suits - and the assumed inevitability of the conflict. For an overview of the differences between creatives and suits, see Appendix 6.

2.3 Conclusion on creatives and suits
In this chapter, the creative and suit concepts have been defined using job content as a demarcation criterion. Further, it has been demonstrated that on an ideological level creatives and suits subscribe to artistic logic and economic logic respectively, although they are capable of acting in accordance with both. On an organisational level, creatives and suits can enact either the normative or the utilitarian hybrid identity of organisations, sometimes resulting in a struggle over the very soul of the organisation. In this process, suits can become labelled as bureaucratic managers and creatives as unmanageable creative geniuses. This portrayal reflects the classic presentation of creative and suits as an oppositional dichotomy, where the characteristics of the two groups are seen as mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive. Creatives are creative; suits are humdrum inputs and non-creative. Creatives are intrinsically motivated; suits extrinsically motivated.Creatives pursue an artistic vision; suits pursue the promise of profit. Creatives want to explore and create value; suits want to exploit and capture value. This opposition between creatives and suits is a simplistic, unproductive and inadequate perspective that inhibits further development of the field by fuelling and legitimising a dysfunctional inner “class struggle” within the creative industries.

The dichotomy as a thought structure permeates creative industries research. It is challenging to move away from or think outside this premise. But it can be done. At design firm Bruce Mau, the stipulation is that: ”The myth between ”creatives” and ”suits” is what Leonard Cohen calls ”a shining artefact of the past”” (Bruce Mau, 1998). In this thesis, the strategy is to provide a new analytical perspective on the simple, yet powerful creative-suit dichotomy by linking creative industries research with learning styles theory.
3. LEARNING STYLES THEORY

The overall goal of this chapter is to define the core concepts of Robert J. Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government. In section 1 What are styles? the aim is to define the concept of learning styles and present the 15 principles of learning styles. In section 2 The theory of mental self-government the aim is to place the definition of styles within Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government and describe the 14 different learning styles in the theory. In section 3 The potential benefits from utilising learning styles theory the aim is to describe the positive individual and collective outcomes from utilising learning styles. In section 4 Learning styles in a non-academic context the aim is to present and discuss the one study where learning styles have been utilised in a non-academic setting, thus providing evidence for Sternberg’s claim that the theory of mental self-government is a general theory of styles applicable both to academic and non-academic settings (Zhang, 2005; Zhang & Sternberg, 2006).

3.1 What are learning styles?

A style is a way of thinking (Sternberg, 1995). Learning styles are propensities for how to use one’s abilities (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) and can be described as modes of thought individuals find comfortable and suitable for themselves (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). Learning styles are presented in a profile of styles describing a person’s preferred ways of perceiving and handling problems and situations in a learning context (Nielsen, 2007). Overall, all styles have 15 distinct characteristics in common (Sternberg, 1999):

- Learning styles are preferences, not abilities
- Match in learning styles & abilities create synergy greater than sum of single parts
- Life choices must fit learning styles and abilities
- People have profiles of learning styles, not one style
- Learning styles vary across tasks and situations
- People differ in strengths of stylistic preferences
- People differ in stylistic flexibility
- Learning styles are learnt through socialisation
- Learning styles vary across the lifespan
- Learning styles are measurable
- Learning styles are modifiable and teachable
- Learning styles valued at one time may not be valued at another
- Learning styles valued at one place may not valued at another
- Learning styles are not good or bad – the question is fit with context
- We tend to confuse stylistic fit with levels of ability

![The 15 Principles of Learning Styles](image)

Figure 3 – The 15 principles of styles. Source: Sternberg (1999), Sternberg & Zhang (2005)
Learning styles are defined as the preferred ways of using one’s abilities (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005) and must not be confounded with the abilities themselves. The concept of ability refers to how well a person can do something, whereas the concept of style refers to how a person likes to do something (Sternberg, 1999: 8), e.g. how analytic a person is (ability) and how much the person enjoys performing analytic work (style). Thus, people’s learning styles may or may not match their abilities (Sternberg, 1999). Prolonged mismatch will unavoidably lead to frustration and discontent, as there will be a strong difference between what one likes to do and what one does well (Sternberg, 1999). A match between learning styles and abilities, however, will result in synergy greater than the sum of single parts (Sternberg, 1999: 80-81):

“People with exceptional creative but not analytical abilities who like to be creative, or people with exceptional analytical but not creative abilities who like to analyze, are obviously going to be at an advantage over people with creative abilities who prefer to analyse, or people with analytical abilities who like to create.”

Therefore, Sternberg (1999) recommends a fit between a person’s life choices, on the one hand, and styles and abilities, on the other. The rationale is that this will increase the quality of work and the enjoyment derived thereof.

In contrast to most previous style models yielding single styles (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005), the theory of mental self-government adapted to a Danish cultural context yields a profile of 14 learning styles for each individual (Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles 2007) with varying amounts of each style (Sternberg, 1994). All 14 learning styles are always present and represent a distinct continuum of preference, e.g. a high preference for working independently does not mean a person has low preference for collaborative work. They are two independent scales of preference (Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles 2007).

A person’s learning styles can vary across tasks and situations (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005): In the kitchen, Robert J. Sternberg (1999) prefers to follow recipes by the letter, but in his work as a psychologist he enjoys creating new theory. Additionally, people adapt and vary their learning styles, at least somewhat, to the task at hand or demands of the context (Sternberg, 1994). When doing your income tax, for instance, you are forced to be detail-oriented, whether you like it or not (Sternberg, 1995).

When comparing individuals, people differ in the strengths of their preferences, as well as their stylistic flexibility (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Some people have strong preferences for certain learning styles, whereas others have weak preferences (Ibid). Some people find stylistic adaptation easy, whereas others struggle. In general, the most successful people are those who can flexibly modify their learning styles as a situation requires and are not rigidly bound to one style (Sternberg, 1995).
Learning styles are socialised, at least partially, by the environment in which people live and work (Zhang, 2005). Given the fluidity of styles (Sternberg, 1994), they can change over a life span, with life demands (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005), and as a result of the various role models we emulate at different points in our lives (Sternberg, 1994). Learning styles are therefore dynamic rather than static entities, and socialisation of styles continues even at an adult level (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Consequently, “we need to be aware of the environment we enter, because we become like that environment” (Sternberg, 1995: 286).

Learning styles are measurable. They are measured through self-reports inventories, performance on thinking styles tasks or evaluations by other people (Sternberg, 1995), however, most commonly, a self-report inventory is utilised.

Learning styles are teachable. People are not “stuck” with certain styles, unless they want to (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005), and can be taught new strategies to cultivate and modify (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005) their preferences for information processing and problem-solving. Such conceptual change requires moving implicit knowledge and beliefs to the explicit sphere of thinking. The shift can be achieved through the activation of meta-cognitive processes, scientific cognitive processes, motivation, sense of control and efficacy, and the epistemological pieces of knowledge to be challenged (Nielsen, 2008). In short, transforming natural preferences into conscious choices, coupled with understanding of others’ stylistic preferences and their manifestations (Nielsen, 2007; Nielsen, 2008).

Learning styles are objectively, but not normatively value-free (Boysen & Nielsen, 2008). Within the theory of mental self-government specific learning styles are not better or worse than others (Sternberg, 1999). The core humanistic tenet of the theory is that everyone has potential that may be developed to lead to future success and usefulness. Objectively, learning styles are just different and differentially appropriate for different kinds of tasks (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). However, value placed on specific learning styles will vary in different sub-cultures and contexts (Nielsen, 2006a), so styles valued in one time or place may not be valued in another (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Through their study of teachers’ styles relative to grade taught, Sternberg and Grigorenko (1993) found that teachers at the lower grades displayed and valued a more self-structuring and inventive style, in contrast to teachers at the upper grades, who displayed and valued a more rule-abiding and pre-structured problem-solving style (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Thus, learning styles that lead to success in one school, job or milieu may lead to failure in another (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005).

Learning styles are often confounded with abilities or achievements (Sternberg, 1995), even though they are psychologically distinct from mental abilities or achievements.
(Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). In studies comparing students’ and teachers’ styles, Sternberg (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005) found that students received more favourable evaluations and performed better when they matched their teachers stylistically, independent of actual level of achievement. Stylistic mismatch is often equated with lack of ability due to the human tendency of sub-consciously rewarding thinking mirroring one’s own stylistic preferences (Nielsen, 2007). After all, it is easier to relate to and understand styles similar to one’s own (Nielsen, 2007), thus placing those stylistically different than oneself at a marked disadvantage (Sternberg, 1994).

In summary, a person with a specific learning style will have a marked tendency for preferring the mental processes matching his/her particular style, thus feeling drawn towards problems whose solutions call for the usage of the preferred style and mental processes (Nielsen, 2006a).

3.2 The theory of mental self-government

The basic assumption of Robert J. Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government is that the forms of governments in the world are not arbitrary or coincidental constructions (Sternberg, 1999: 148). Rather, they are externalised social manifestations of fundamental inner, individual psychological processes (Boysen & Nielsen, 2008). They reflect alternative ways in which people can govern and organise themselves (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005), and can thus be construed as mirrors of our minds on a grand scale (Sternberg, 1995). Both individuals and governments must manage their everyday activities, decide on priorities, allocate resources and be responsive to changes in the world (Sternberg, 1995; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). People are, therefore, assumed to govern their mental thinking in the same fundamental ways as can be observed in governmental structures (Nielsen, 2006a). In the theory of mental self-government adapted to a Danish cultural context by Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles (2007) there are five dimensions of learning styles, describing different aspects of governments: Function, form, level, scope and leaning. Within these dimensions are 14 different learning styles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of mental self-government</th>
<th>Legislative, Executive &amp; Judicial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms of mental self-government</td>
<td>Monarchic, Hierarchic, Oligarchic, Anarchic &amp; Democratic¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of mental self-government</td>
<td>Global &amp; Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopes of mental self-government</td>
<td>Internal &amp; External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanings of mental self-government</td>
<td>Progressive &amp; Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – The 14 styles of mental self-government.
Source: Sternberg (1999) and (Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles, 2007)

¹ The Democratic learning style is not a part of Sternberg’s (1999) 13 styles of mental self-government, but was added by Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles (2007) to adapt the theory to a Danish cultural context.
Each style describes how people organise, direct and manage their own thinking, and together they constitute the learning styles profile. In the following, the different learning styles are described in more detail.

3.2.1 The functions of mental self-government

Just like branches of government, the functions of an individual’s mental self-government are legislative, executive and judicial (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
<th>Preferred problems or situations (real or perceived)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Likes to create, invent, design, do things his/her own way, have little assigned structure</td>
<td>Self-structured or self-defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Define problem(s), set goals &amp; plan strategy</td>
<td>Ex.: Create original artwork or a new mathematical operation, write music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Likes to follow rules, procedures, prescribed methods, do what he/she is told,</td>
<td>Pre-structured and/or pre-fabricated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Execution of tasks with established guidelines</td>
<td>Ex.: Build from designs, memorise facts, learn assigned information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>Likes to judge and evaluate people, things, procedures, methods, structure and</td>
<td>Analytic, evaluative, compare-contrast,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>content ➔ Evaluate, analyse &amp; critique</td>
<td>Ex.: Give feedback, advice &amp; critique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – The functions of learning styles

The legislative person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations requiring creation, formulation and planning of ideas, procedures, structure and content (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005), preferring to choose the activity (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005) and how to perform it (Sternberg, & Grigorenko, 1993). The essence of the style is the desire to come up with new ideas (Sternberg, 1995). The legislative individual enjoys being a producer of knowledge (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993), and the style is thus, particularly conducive to creativity (Sternberg, 1995). To exercise the desire for self-instruction and self-direction (Sternberg & Zhang, 2002), legislative people often become creative writers, scientists, artists, sculptors, investment bankers, policy-makers and architects (Sternberg, 1995).

In contrast, the executive person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations where he/she can operate within a given structure (Sternberg, 1994), have clear rules and procedures serving as guidelines to measure success (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005) and be a consumer of knowledge (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). These implementers (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) are highly valued in business and school because they follow directions and orders, and may even do it cheerfully (Sternberg, 1995). To exercise their desire to fill in the gaps in existing structures, executive people often become certain types of lawyers, police
officers on patrol, builders of other people’s designs, soldiers, proselytizers of other people’s systems and administrative assistants (Sternberg, 1995).

The judicial person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that require evaluation, judgement and compare-contrast (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005) of existing things, ideas, methods, procedures (Sternberg, 1995), and the performance of other people (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). To exercise their desire to evaluate, judicial people often become judges, critics, programme evaluators, consultants, admissions officers, grand and contract monitors and systems analysts (Sternberg, 1995).

In each person, one of the functions of mental self-government – legislative, executive and judicial – tends to be dominant (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993).

3.2.2 The forms of mental self-government

The 5 forms of an individual’s mental-self government each constitute different ways of approaching the world and solving problems (Sternberg, 1995). Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles (2007) adapted the theory of mental self-government to a Danish cultural context by adding the democratic learning scale to Sternberg’s original 13, as there previously was no style describing the Scandinavian approach of joint goal attainment through dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
<th>Preferred problems or situations (real or perceived)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic</td>
<td>F fulfil one goal, do one thing at a time, devoting to it almost all energy and resources → Find the solution</td>
<td>Single solution Ex: Immerse oneself in a single project, e.g. art, science, business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>F fulfil a hierarchy of goals/ needs, a balanced, prioritised and systematic approach → Solve prioritised sub-problems</td>
<td>Different, prioritised (sub-) solutions Ex.: Budget more time &amp; energy to prioritised assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>F fulfil multiple goals/ needs of same importance, multi-systematic &amp; even competing approaches, trouble prioritising → Solve several problems simultaneously</td>
<td>Complex solutions with equally important parts Ex.: In a test, spend equal amounts of time on items weighted differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>F fulfil multiple goals/ needs of uncertain importance via an unsystematic approach → Solve individually chose/ random problem</td>
<td>Break with existing solutions/ procedures Ex.: Start, but not finish things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>F fulfil own &amp; others’ goals/ needs, both seen as equally important, dialogic approach → Find the best solution for the group</td>
<td>Problems/ situation requiring fulfilling own and others’ needs Ex.: Dialogic approach to problems²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – The forms of learning styles

² Due to lack of examples democratic learning styles in literature, the example is added by author.
The monarchic person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that require full concentration on one thing at a time (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002), staying with that until its completion (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). He/ she can, therefore, be single-mindedly driven, believe the means justify the ends, oversimplify problems, be relatively inflexible and self-unaware, and not let anything stand in the way of solving the problem, in his/ her eagerness to bring the task at hand to successful conclusion (Sternberg, 1995). Monarchic people can present a problem in business and school, as they usually want to be doing something other than what they are doing, and are likely to be thinking about that other thing when they should be concentrating on the task at hand (Sternberg, 1995). At the same time, they can be exceptionally efficient, by not allowing distractions to stand in the way of accomplishing their overriding priority (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993).

In contrast, the hierarchic person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations requiring allocation of attention, energy and time to several tasks, prioritised based on one’s valuation of the tasks (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005; Sternberg, 1994). Generally, hierarchic individuals fit well into organisations because they recognise the need for priorities (Sternberg, 1995) and are systematic in their problem-solving approach (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). However, when their priorities differ strongly from that of their organisation, they may find themselves unwelcome in their organisation, e.g. the company lawyer who spends excessive amounts of time on pro bono work (Sternberg, 1995).

Like the hierarchic person, the oligarchic person has a predilection for multiple tasks and projects. But unlike the hierarchic person, the oligarchic person cannot prioritise, and operates with multiple, equally important and even competing goals (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Consequently, oligarchic individuals often feel helpless, tense or conflicted when they have to assign priorities to tasks (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) competing for their time and resources, and may need help for this (Sternberg, 1995).

The anarchic person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that require a random approach to problems (Sternberg, 1994) and extreme flexibility on what, where, when and how a task is fulfilled (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002). He/ she is driven by such a potpourri of needs and goals that it is a challenge for the anarchic individual, let alone others, to identify and sort these out (Sternberg, 1995). The anarchic person eschews systems, guidelines and practically all constraints (Sternberg, 1994), is driven by a muddle of seemingly inexplicable forces and will fight back at whatever system the individual sees confining him or her (Sternberg, 1995). Thus, the anarchic stylist can show up as the “least successful of the various stylists on a variety of tasks and in a variety of situations” (Sternberg, 1995: 278).
However, despite their trouble adapting to work and school, anarchic people display massive potential for creativity, as they combine diverse pieces of information and ideas, have a wide-ranging scope and see solutions others do not (Sternberg, 1995). The challenge for an employer of an anarchic person is to harness his/her “potential for creativity and achieve the self-discipline and organisation that are necessary for any kind of creative contribution” (Sternberg, 1995: 278). If this is done, the anarchic individual may succeed in domains where others fail (Sternberg, 1995).

The democratic person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that through dialogue achieve the simultaneous fulfilment of the needs of others and oneself, as both are perceived as equally important (Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles 2007). The democratic person is therefore, conscious and reflective of themselves in regard to others, and tolerant and flexible to allow the goals of others to be put above their own (Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles, 2007).

3.2.3 The levels of mental self-government

Just like a government deals with societies, an individual’s self-government functions at different levels, namely global and local (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF MENTAL SELF-GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
<th>Preferred problems or situations (real or perceived)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Likes to deal with big picture, generalities, abstractions, operate in the world of ideas → Can see the forest, but not the trees</td>
<td>General problems on a high level of abstraction Ex.: Comprehend main ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Likes to deal with details, specifics, concrete examples → Can see the trees, but not the forest</td>
<td>Concrete problems involving details in perception or solution Ex.: Have great knowledge of facts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – The levels of learning styles

The global person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations, where focus is on relatively large and abstract ideas and issues (Sternberg, 1995). The preference to conceptualise and work in the world of ideas (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) may cause global people to lose touch with the details (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005) and become lost on cloud nine (Sternberg 1995). In contrast, the down-to-earth local person enjoys being engaged with concrete details, and has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations where focus is on many specifics. However, the pragmatic orientation of local people may cause them to lose sight of the forest and see only trees (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). Consequently, global and local people can work especially well together by attending to aspects of task completion the other would rather forget (Sternberg, 1995).
3.2.4 The scopes of mental self-government

Just like a government deals with domestic and foreign affairs, so does an individual’s self-government deal with internal or external issues (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISATION</th>
<th>PREFERRED PROBLEMS OR SITUATIONS (REAL OR PERCEIVED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Internal    | Likes to work alone, focus inward for answers, be reserved, be self-sufficient, less socially sensitive than externalists. Work alone | Task-oriented: World of objects and ideas essential part of problem
Ex.: Independent work |
| External    | Likes to work with others, focus outward, be interdependent, more socially sensitive than internalists. Work with others | People-oriented: Interaction and cooperation essential part of problem
Ex.: Team work |

Table 6 – scopes of learning styles

An internalist has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that allows for inward focus and work independently of others (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005), so they can “apply their intelligence to things or ideas in isolation from other people” (Sternberg, 1995: 279). Internalists tend to be introverted, task-oriented, less interpersonally aware than externalists, aloof and uncomfortable in groups (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). An externalist has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations requiring cooperation with other people (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002) and will seek out problems that involve working with other people or concern other people (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). Externalists tend to be extroverted, people-oriented, outgoing and socially sensitive (Sternberg, 1995).

3.2.5 The leanings of mental self-government

Just like a government, an individual’s mental self-government has different leanings, namely conservative and progressive (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISATION</th>
<th>PREFERRED PROBLEMS OR SITUATIONS (REAL OR PERCEIVED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Progressive  | Likes to do things in new ways, comfortable with ambiguity, defy conventions, maximise change. Seek out the new and unknown | Change or broaden existing principles or practice
Ex.: Seek alternative solutions |
| Conservative | Likes to do things in tried ways, avoid ambiguity, adhere to rules & procedures, minimise change. Seek out the known and familiar | Utilise existing principles or practice
Ex.: Take the lead from co-workers on how to complete a project |

Table 7 – The leanings of learning styles
A progressive person has a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that involve substantial novelty and ambiguity (Zhang and Sternberg, 2002) and will go beyond existing rules or procedures to maximise change (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). In contrast to the progressive person, who will become bored if things do not seem to change, the conservative person has a predilection for familiar tasks, projects and situations in work and professional life (Sternberg, 1995). Focus is on adherence to and observance of existing rules and procedures (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Consequently, the conservative person works best in a structured and relatively predictable environment (Sternberg, 1995).

Together, the 14 learning styles described above, compromise a profile of styles describing a person’s preferred ways to think in specific contexts (Boysen & Nielsen, 2008). For an example of a learning styles profile see Appendix 7.

3.3 The potential benefits from utilising learning styles theory

The theory of learning styles has its origin in an educational, academic context. Within this context, the goal of learning styles is to teach students to capitalise on their preferred styles, and to compensate for and explore their less preferred styles (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). The key principle is that for students to “maximally benefit from instruction and assessment, at least some of each of instruction and assessment should match their styles of thinking” (Sternberg, 1995: 286). The parts mismatching their learning styles function to teach them the important skills of stylistic flexibility and adaptation, as well as expanding their learning styles – to mutual benefit of student and teacher (Sternberg, 1994; Nielsen, 2006b). To ensure differentiation in teacher practice, teachers must expand and systematically³ vary the teaching and assessment methods to reach every student (Sternberg, 1994), thereby reaching students who both do and do not stylistically match them. For an overview of how differentiation of teacher practice affects participants with different styles, see Appendix 8.

Effectively reaching students stylistically different from oneself requires a teacher has knowledge of the theory of learning styles, awareness of personal styles, an understanding of their impact in relation to others, the ability to expand and systematically vary teaching and assessment methods, and the ability to consciously interchange between a matching and mismatching strategy to students’ styles (Nielsen, 2006b). All require the activation of deeper cognitive process, scientific thinking processes and meta-cognition processes (Nielsen, 2008).

Through her 2-day workshop study entitled Implementation of learning styles at the
teacher level in higher education, Nielsen (2008) demonstrated how such conceptual change could be facilitated in experienced teachers by explicitating their implicit beliefs on learning and teaching in terms of learning and teaching styles. This provided the teachers with opportunities for changing their practice of teaching (Nielsen, 2008). The 15 participating high school teachers reported the workshop made them more conscious of their implicit beliefs on knowledge and learning styles (Nielsen, 2008). A majority of participants reported the workshop enhanced their understanding of other learning styles, taught them the importance of using non-preferred styles to engage more students, made them more accommodating to students stylistically different from themselves, and resulted in greater differentiation in teacher practice (Nielsen, 2008). Based on a follow-up evaluation 14 months later, Nielsen (2008) concluded explicitation of the teachers’ implicit beliefs on learning and teaching appeared to be lasting, in some cases even further expanded into other areas of awareness, and to have resulted in greater degree of differentiation in teacher practice.

As the study demonstrates, the general benefits individuals can obtain from knowledge on learning styles theory is increased understanding and awareness of personal preferences: Why some activities fit and others do not, and even why some people fit and others do not (Sternberg, 1995: 268). This knowledge may allow individuals to achieve the important synergy between styles and abilities described above. Furthermore, learning styles can be used as a tool to consciously interchange between matching and mismatching to people with different preferences for perceiving and processing information, thereby reaching a greater number of people, including those stylistically different from oneself. Finally, learning styles and utilisation of non-preferred styles can be used as a tool for personal development.

On a collective level, the study demonstrates that awareness and understanding of own learning styles in relation to others can lead to increased accommodation and understanding of differences, thereby facilitating communication, preventing misunderstandings (Sternberg, 1995), leading to high-functioning (student) work teams (Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard) 2008) and maybe even increased organisational effectiveness (Zhang, 2005).

Finally, it is a perceptual human error to sub-consciously exaggerate recognition and reward thinking stylistically similar to one’s own. Knowledge of learning styles is therefore vital, so we do not unfairly penalise or overlook bright people who “just happen to have a style that is different from our own, or from the one we value” (Sternberg, 1995: 268).
3.4 Learning styles in a non-academic setting

The core assumption of this thesis is that Sternberg’s theory of learning styles is applicable outside education and academic contexts and to other, non-academic domains of personal and professional life, such as creative industries. Zhang and Sternberg (2005) support this assertion, basing their claims on Zhang’s (2005) article *Validating the theory of mental self-government in a non-academic setting*. This article describes the first exploratory and only study examining the applicability of Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government among personnel in a non-academic work setting (Zhang, 2005). Responses were obtained from 333 people in various business sectors in Guangzhou, PR China on the Thinking Styles Inventory-Revised, as well as questions on their actual and perceived work environments. Based on the results, Zhang (2005) reached three important conclusions. Firstly, the Thinking Styles Inventory Revised was determined to be a reliable and valid measure for assessing the thinking styles of the participants. Secondly, the results of the study confirmed Sternberg’s claim that the theory of mental self-government is a general theory of styles “applicable to people both within and outside academic settings” (2005: 1922). Finally, Zhang (2005) concluded that “the Thinking Styles Inventory-Revised has the potential to become an additional research tool for organisational psychologists apart from the one recent measure of styles in work settings: Riding’s (1991) Cognitive Style Analysis” (Zhang, 2005: 1924).

According to Zhang (2005), the latter finding has important implications for three groups. Human resource management personnel can benefit from awareness of employees’ learning styles, as this would make top management “more likely to view their employees as a diversified human resources portfolio” and manage them more wisely by taking their styles into account (Zhang, 2005: 1924). Providers of management training and development programmes can use the knowledge on learning styles to “create training and development programs that match training to the thinking styles of the trained personnel” (Zhang, 2005: 1924). Finally, members of the ordinary workforce can benefit from knowledge and awareness on their own and colleagues’ learning styles, thereby hopefully increasing the effectiveness of organisational behaviour (Zhang, 2005).

In conclusion, Zhang’s (2005) pioneer research on learning styles in a non-academic context provides vital support for transfer of the learning styles concept from an academic context to a creative industries context. In addition, her research indicates the positive benefits utilisation of styles can have in a work environment – an especially interesting finding given the severe lack of valid measures of styles in a work setting (Zhang, 2005).
3.5 Conclusion on learning styles
In this chapter, the concept of learning styles has been defined and the 15 general principles of styles explained. Further, the theory of mental self-government has been introduced, and the 14 different learning styles have been individually defined and explained. The humanistic theory of self-government and Nielsen’s (2008) workshop study have demonstrated that knowledge and understanding of learning styles can help people prevent misunderstandings and come to a better understanding of each other, and of themselves (Sternberg, 1995). The key is variety and flexibility, utilising strategies of stylistic match and mismatch, and the full range of styles available to you (Sternberg, 1994). Zhang’s (2005) study validated the theory of self-government in a non-academic setting, thus supporting 1) Sternberg’s claim that the theory of mental self-government is a general theory of styles applicable both to academic and non-academic settings and 2) the core idea of the thesis – transferring learning styles from an academic to a creative industries context.

4. THEORETICAL DISCUSSION:
WHAT ARE THE LEARNING STYLES OF CREATIVES AND SUITS?
The aims of the theoretical discussion are to link creative industries theory with Sternberg’s theory of learning styles, and evaluate the possibilities for integration of the two theories. This is vital because the two theories have not previously been combined. The questions in focus are: What are the learning styles of creatives and suits? Do they have systematically different learning styles?

There are no previous studies on the learning styles of creatives and suits. Naturally, most research on learning styles has occurred in educational research. However, there are several studies on the learning styles of creative artists, found in literature on the creative personality. In contrast to Zhang (2005), these do not take the context into account, but focus solely on measuring and comparing the learning styles of different occupational groups.

Lubart and Sternberg (1991) administered Sternberg’s Intellectual Styles Questionnaire (ISQ) to a convenience sample of 128 professional painters, collage artists and printmakers with the objective to learn more about how artists think. Their findings revealed the artists had a predilection for the legislative style (inventing and developing own ideas) over the executive style (implementing pre-existing ideas), and for the liberal style (preference for novelty, ambiguity and change) over the conservative style (adhere to existing rules and procedures) (Lubart & Sternberg, 1991). Further, the artists preferred the
hierarchical style (prioritise tasks) significantly to any other form of self-government when solving problems, and had low scores on the monarchic style (focus on single task) (Lubart & Sternberg, 1991). The high-legislative, low-executive preferences of the artists were found to be consistent with scores of laymen who generated the most creative sketches, stories and scientific problem solutions (Lubart & Sternberg, 1991). Within these and other studies, creativity is therefore associated with high legislative, liberal and hierarchic scores and low executive, conservative and monarchic scores (Gridley, 2006). However, the styles associated with specific creative work groups do vary. Kaufman (2002) administered the Mental Self-Government Thinking Styles Inventory to 81 undergraduate students, 41 creative writing students and 40 student journalists, and found the journalists were more executive than the creative writers, who in turn were more legislative than the journalists. Consequently, learning styles can be expected to differ according to the occupation of respondents (Gridley, 2006), both between creatives and suits and internally in the groups, depending on the type of creative or suit occupation.

Another study confirming the same findings, but not just including creatives and focusing merely on creative personality, is Gridley (2007), who administered the ISQ to 71 professional fine artists and 147 engineers. The study systematically documented that the vocational groups of artists and engineers differ in how they prefer to think (Gridley, 2007). The engineers – who on a day-to-day basis implement the ideas of others, accept input from outside sources and plan detailed projects – scored significantly higher than the artists on the executive, external and hierarchical learning styles (Gridley, 2007). The artists – who on a day-to-day basis create based on originality, work alone (taking input during the creation of art is often felt to accompany loss of integrity) and “follow their own muse” – scored significantly higher than the engineers on the legislative, internal and anarchic learning styles (Gridley, 2007). The main conclusion was that the “popular perceptions of artists and engineers are not entirely unfounded” (Gridley, 2007). In lack of previous research on the learning styles of creatives and suits, Gridley’s (2007) study is the one and only study close to answering this master thesis’ research question on the systematic differences in learning styles between the vocational groups of creatives and suits. Gridley’s findings therefore indicate that the popular perceptions of creatives and suits are most likely not entirely unfounded and do point to some substantial differences between the two groups. The question is only, what are more creative and more conforming, suit-like learning styles?

Zhang & Sternberg (2005) have grouped the 13 learning styles of Sternberg’s theory
of mental self-government\textsuperscript{4} into three main types: Type I styles – the creative styles (legislative, judicial, global, hierarchical and progressive), Type II styles – the norm-favouring styles (executive, local, conservative and monarchic) and Type III styles – the situational dependent styles (oligarchic, anarchic, external and internal). Type I styles prefer tasks with low degree of structure, that require higher levels of cognitive complexity, and allow for originality and high levels of freedom to do things in one’s own way (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Type II styles prefer tasks with high degree of structure, which require low levels of cognitive complexity and allow for conformity to traditional ways of doing things and high respect of authority (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Type III styles preferences are contingent upon the task and how one feels about it.

Applying heavy creative industries theory glasses to this, it may be tempting to couple Type I style with creatives, and consequently Type II styles with suits. This is of course assuming that suits and creatives are each other’s diametrical opposites, as is commonly directly or indirectly postulated in creative industries research. Thus, creatives achieve monopoly on creativity and suits are deemed to be non-creative, norm-conforming, conservative implementers. However, artist or “creative” is a known concept in learning styles theory. Artists may easily exhibit Type I learning styles, but the construct of suits is entirely foreign to the context. It is thus, vital to free oneself from the creative industries dogma that the suit is the anti-thesis of the creative. Further, given the internal diversity within the suit group – it compromises everything from intellectual property specialist to publicist to producer – we must avoid assuming false unity and communal identity for all suits.

Type III styles challenge the creative-suit dichotomy. The Type III styles are dependent on the stylistic demands of a task and an individual’s interest in the task, and can manifest the characteristics of both Type I and Type II styles (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). In other words, a creative task or a “humdrum” task can be carried out in a Type I way – a creative way, investing a great deal of complex thinking and trying to do a good job (Zhang, Sternberg, 2005). A creative task or “humdrum” task can also be carried out in a Type II way – a non-creative, established way, investing little deep or creative thinking in performing a job (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Thus, so-called creatives performing creative job content may be consistently traditional and uncreative, and so-called suits performing “humdrum” job content may be consistently creative. In this way, Type III styles challenge not only the creative-suit dichotomy, but also question the job-content-based definitions of creatives and suits because

\textsuperscript{4} The democratic learning style is not included in the original theory of mental self-government.
within learning styles theory the way a task is performed is as important as what is performed. This matches Weisberg’s (1986) democratized views on creativity, that creativity results from the ordinary thought processes of ordinary individuals, and is not a mysterious quality of creative geniuses (Weisberg, 1986: 12). However, in lack of other clear, robust and easily operational creative-suit definitions, the job-content based definition is utilised as a second-best alternative, with all its inherent weaknesses duly noted. Another important point is that the usage of terms such as “non-creative creatives” clearly exemplifies that “creatives” should have a different name. Shakespeare may contend that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. However, in this context the smell of the creative is far less important than how we think about the creative, and consequently also the suits. The term “creatives” serves to cloud and reinforce the creative-non-creative creative-suit dichotomy, as well as giving those deemed creatives monopoly on creativity.

So what have I got out of confronting creative industries theory with the theory of learning styles? Based on previous studies on the creative personality, creatives can be expected to have Type I learning styles – legislative, judicial, global, hierarchical, global and progressive, as well as anarchic and internal like the artists in Gridley’s study. Suits, however, are an unknown size within learning styles theory and need not be the diametrical opposites of creatives. Based on their general planned and effective approach, suits could be assumed to be executive, monarchic, hierarchic, external and conservative. However, there are no psychological arguments for the assertion that suits will have systematically similar profiles or that you can actually talk about a stylistically distinct group of suits.

In my literature research for this explorative master thesis, creatives and suits came across as dichotomously constructed groups. Unfortunately, creatives industry’s theory in its present state has little to offer in terms of deviation from or loosening-up of the strict dichotomous thinking. The above discussion has shown that learning styles theory can be a catalyst to shed light on the creative and suit concepts and lead to greater nuancing of the concepts.
5. METHODOLOGY
The aim of this chapter is to present the research design of the project and evaluate the
validity and reliability of the methodology. The chosen method enables collection of the
theoretical knowledge and empirical data necessary to investigate if creatives and suits have
systematically different learning styles. The research design of the project is:

5.1 Research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>The learning styles of creatives and suits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research question</td>
<td>What are the learning styles of creatives and suits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>New analytical perspective on the ‘great divide’ between creatives and suits. Increased understanding of concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Managerial and intra-organisational perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of research study</th>
<th>Exploratory pilot study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>Inductive theory-building approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of science</td>
<td>Critical rationalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Theory | Creative industries theory  
Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government |
| Case population identification and case selection | Initially theoretical sampling, then opportunity sampling |
| Participants | 14 creatives, 6 suits and 1 both-creative-and-suit from Copenhagen Bombay & Wulffmorgenthaler |
| Instruments | D-SA-LSI survey and background survey |
| Data collection – primary data | Quantitative data from D-SA-LSI and background survey  
Personal communication, documents, e-mails. |
| Data analysis | Heteroscedastic t-test unequal sample, unequal variance |
| Validity and reliability | Measuring and assessing the concepts of the thesis  
Assuring data collection techniques and analysis procedures yield consistent findings |

Figure 4 – Research design

Topic, research question, purpose and perspective have been covered in the introduction. In
the following, I will address key methodological considerations before covering the remaining
headings in the research design, from type of research study to validity and reliability, in the
order stated.
5.2 Methodological considerations

The thesis is built on a combination of knowledge from two seemingly disparate fields – creative industries theory and the theory of mental self-government – in the hope that their combination yields novel and valuable insight into the creative-suit conflict and concepts. This makes knowledge integration of the two theories and fit between them, as well as methodological fit internally in the thesis, essential to ensure quality research. To ensure knowledge integration between the two strands of theory, their key premises and assumptions and their implications have been attempted analysed, and are stated throughout the thesis. Methodological fit is defined as “internal consistency among elements in a research project – research question, prior work, research design and theoretical contribution” (Edmondson & McManus, 2007: 1155). Ankersborg’s (2007) model for Developing a Research Question has been used as a tool to maintain consistency and methodological fit between research question, the two fields of theory used, the empirical data and the elements of the research design.

5.3 Type of study, research approach and theory of science

Creative industries theory and the theory of mental self-government have not been combined before, nor is there prior research on the learning styles of creatives and suits. With no theory available, one must start with data. To gather preliminary data and gain further insight on the topic, define problems for later investigation and form specific hypotheses based on the empirical data, an exploratory research study was chosen (Andersen, 2008). The main advantage of the exploratory approach is that it enables uncovering of empirical patterns that can depict the limits of existing theories, in this case the creative-suit dichotomy. Furthermore, this exploratory study is a small pilot study, aimed at determining the potential of a larger and more in-depth study on the matter and detects problems in design or technique.

Lack of prior research and questioning of whether suits are a unitary group make it difficult to construct valid and reliable hypotheses from general principles for deductive testing. Thus, the thesis will follow an inductive theory-building approach, where collected data is developed into hypotheses and modest theory based on continuous iterations between theory and data to discover patterns and regularities. The goal is formulation of tentative hypotheses to be explored in further research, which may eventually lead to new theory.

The theory of science used in the thesis is critical rationalism, which states that the world exists independently of human minds and knowledge, although we can never be certain if our perception of it is correct (Andersen, 2008). However, not all knowledge is equally fallible. Rational judgement can be used to gain a preference for one explanation to another.
5.4 Theory

In this thesis, I have used theory to increase understanding of the problem field in question, and as the source of applicable analytical frameworks, methods and tools. The theory utilised is from the fields of creative industries research and theory of mental self-government, and was chosen based on precision and explanatory value.

Initially, I sought theory in the Management of Creative Processes curriculum, before undertaking a wider information search on creatives and suits. The theoretical territory of creative industries is heterogeneous, trans-disciplinary and highly fragmented, extending to a wide range of work from arenas such as organisational analysis, media and cultural studies, cultural policy, critical anthropology and consumer behaviour (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006; Jeffcutt, 2000: 124). The nature of creative labour remains little examined (Smith & McKinlay, 2009), thus information on creatives and suits is scarce, often limited to a few sentences or paragraphs per article. This necessitates many sources to accumulate sufficient and quality information on the concepts. Given the scarcity of research on creatives and suits, I also sought information in the neighbouring fields of creativity research (Amabile, 1996, 1998; Csikszentmihalyi, 2001; Sawyer, 2006; Weisberg, 1986) and cultural economics/cultural industries (Cherbo, 2008; Gibson & Kong, 2005; Power & Scott, 2004; Rantisi, 2004; Santagata, 2004; Vogel, 2008) to (a) gain comprehensive knowledge on the creative and suit concepts, and (b) gain deeper understanding and a more critical stance on core concepts such as creativity, the creative person and creation.

To define the creative and suit concepts, I employed Caves’ (2000) classic definitions, coupled with Florida’s (2004) occupational listing. Florida is one of few authors specifying the occupations creatives and suits can occupy, rather than providing general descriptions. I only utilised his definitions of Bohemians and Creative Professionals and none of his wider theory because it concerns orientations to work rather than of work (Thompson, Warhurst & Jones, 2007). Bille (2008) was included, as she is one of few authors discussing and researching multiple demarcation criteria for creatives and suits.

The three-level structure of ideology, organisation and group constituted an analytic tool for examination of creative and suit characteristics. Eikhof & Haunschild’s (2007) research on artistic and economic logics function to explain ideological tension, as it is one of the only articles explaining art and business as reference points for individual action in creative industries. Austin & Hjort’s (2008) theory on spaces for conversation provides important nuancing of Eikhof & Haunschild’s (2007) claims, as it proposes dialogue between the groups, rather than mere safeguarding of artistic logics. To describe the dual identity of
creative industries firms, I selected Albert & Whetten’s (2004) influential theory on organisational identity and hybrid organisations, coupled with Glynn (2006), one of few articles demonstrating the effect hybrid organisations can have on creatives and suits. On a group level I chose to use Caves (2000), again for his widely accepted definitions, and Austin & Nolan (2007) for their unique in-depth descriptions of the motivational and behavioural differences of creatives and suits. This was supplemented with Vogel (2008) to describe capital concepts and typical suit behaviour and Amabile (1998) to describe intrinsic motivation and creativity, both chosen due to their acclaim in their respective fields. Austin & Hjorth (2008), Eikhof & Haunschild (2007), Flew (2004), Gibson & Kong (2005), Maslow (1943), Musial (2008) and Regev (1997) were all employed to substantiate specific statements and aggregated definition sentences, due to the fragmentation of creative industries research.

Tine Nielsen recommended I read Sternberg (1999, 1995, 1994), Sternberg & Grigorenko (1993), Sternberg & Zhang (2005, 2000) and Zhang & Sternberg (2005, 2006) to achieve understanding and sufficient knowledge on Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government. This constitutes a small and well-drawn selection of Sternberg’s prolific writing on mental self-government, and was supplemented with Boysen & Nielsen (2008) and Nielsen (2006a) when specific points of theory needed referencing. I chose Nielsen, Kreiner & Styles’s (2007) article on the development of the democratic learning style to describe the addition of a 14th learning scale. Zhang (2005) is the only researcher who has investigated the usage of learning styles in a non-academic working context. I therefore used her article to provide vital support for transferring the concept of learning styles to a creative industries context, and for information on the positive benefits utilisation of styles can have in a work environment. Additionally, Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard (2008b) was used for their research on benefits from utilising learning styles when assembling high-functioning student teams. To demonstrate how facilitation of conceptual change using Sternberg’s learning styles, I chose Nielsen (2008), as it is one of the few articles on this newly emerging topic. Finally, Lubart & Sternberg (1991) and Kaufman (2002) describe two seminal research studies on creatives in the field, and were thus used to explore creatives/ artists’ and writers’ predilection for learning styles. Gridley (2006) offered background information on the preferred learning styles of professional artists, whereas Gridley (2007) was chosen because it constitutes the research study most similar to the current study, providing invaluable input to theory and analysis of data. Zhang & Sternberg’s (2005) grouping of learning styles was used, as it allowed for comparing and contrasting creatives and suits, and challenges the dichotomy.
5.5 Case population identification and case selection

To identify the case population, I developed nine theoretical sampling criteria, among them a size criterion of 50 employees. It was included as the aspiration was to conduct the research in the largest creative industries firm possible and contact with a large creative industries firm was obtained. Unfortunately, due to the financial crisis, the firm was unable to participate in research. Given the scarcity of large creative industries firms – most tend to be small and incorporated as modularized elements into wider production networks (Gibson & King, 2005) – the sampling strategy was altered to opportunity sampling. The goal was to obtain access to medium-sized creative industries firm(s) that fit the remaining eight sampling criteria:

1) **Operate in the specified creative industries sectors**  
   Ensures that the companies operate in the required sector of the economy

2) **Operate in the commercial sphere of the creative industries**  
   Market-orientation and the intent to generate profit increases tension between creatives and suits as they strive to commercialise creativity

3) **Display qualitative creative industries characteristics**  
   Ensures that the products of the companies are produced using both creative business processes and industrial making, and not exclusively the latter

4) **Employ creatives and suits**  
   Ensures the presence of the occupational groups to survey

5) **Employ creatives and suits in-house, preferably full-time**  
   Ensures creative outputs are produced internally in the companies, resulting from interaction between creatives and suits.

6) **Employ suits in managerial positions**  
   Ensures that the key management scenario of creative industries theory - suits managing creatives - is present in the companies.

7) **Location: Copenhagen**  
   Physical presence at the companies enables interaction with employees, effective promotion of the research project and increases response rate of surveys

8) **Operate in a context characterised by fast and escalating product lifecycles**  
   A preferred, but not essential criterion. Ensures increased pressure on creatives to deliver creative goods quickly and suits to adequately manage creatives and creative production.

Contact with the Copenhagen Bombay was obtained by arriving unannounced and pitching my research study to the managing director. Upon the impromptu meeting, I sent her an e-mail detailing my research and requirements, she was interested and a date was set for conducting the research both at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler.
5.6 Participants
Participants were 21 employees (14 creatives, six suits and one both-creative-and-suit) at film production company Copenhagen Bombay and media company Wulffmorgenthaler, totalling six women and 14 men. The creatives consisted of three women and 11 men. The suits consisted of three women and three men. Participants ranged from 24 to 48 years of age, with a median age of 32.9 years. 27 surveys were handed out, of which six were not answered due to overwhelming workload and imminent deadlines. In exchange for their participation the participants received personal learning styles profiles and a 6-page manual explaining the theory of mental self-government and how to interpret the learning style profile.

5.7 Instruments
The participants responded to two paper-based self-report surveys: 1) the D-SA-LSI, and 2) a survey on demographic background information. Both surveys were in Danish, but have been translated into English (Appendix 9).

The D-SA-LSI is an unpublished inventory developed by Nielsen (2005) and based on Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government (1997). It is used by Tine Nielsen in her research on learning styles at Copenhagen Business School’s (CBS) Learning Lab, and has shown a high degree of validity and reliability in use (Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard, 2008). The 98-item inventory contains 14 scales; the 13 scales in Sternberg’s theory of mental self-government plus the additional democratic scale added by Nielsen (2007) to adapt the inventory to a Danish cultural context. Each scale is composed of 7 statements, rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 to 7. 1 indicates no characteristics of the style and 7 almost all/ all characteristics of the style. The average score for each scale ranges from 1 to 7, corresponding to one of five categories: Very weak, weak, medium, strong, very strong (see Appendix 7). Completion time of the D-SA-LSI is approximately 30 minutes.

Permission to use the D-SA-LSI was obtained after approaching Nielsen and presenting my research idea. She was interested because it would be the first time the inventory was used outside an academic context.

Because the D-SA-LSI is a validated survey tool, the contents of the 98 statements were left unaltered. The descriptive sentence accompanying the rating scale was altered from “Rate each statement according to how well it describes you in learning situations in the context of your university study using the following scale” to “Rate each statement according to how well it describes you in learning situations in the context of your work using the following scale.” The front page and instructions preceding the survey were adapted for this specific
master thesis research, and altered to suit a working rather than educational context. Two sentences stating the survey was on learning in a work environment and describing how learning occurs in a work environment were included to avoid respondents assuming that learning does not occur at work and provide different or lower ratings based on this assumption. The name of each learning style was substituted with numbers 1-14, so the learning style title did not unduly influence the responding creatives and suits to rate themselves as more or less creative to uphold professional pride.

The background survey was developed to enable identification of creatives and suits based on job content. The questions were constructed to be clear and precise, as short as possible, one-dimensional, in an easy-to-understand language and to be similar to other demographic background surveys (Ringdal, 2001). The intention was to maximise clarity and minimise confusion on behalf of the respondent by asking precise factual questions on topics the respondent could clearly recognise and readily answer (Ringdal, 2001). This efficient and easy-to-complete strategy was chosen, as the background survey succeeds the extensive D-SA-LSI, which takes 30 minutes to complete. Thus, it was essential not to disrespect the effort of the respondents by asking unnecessary questions.

To minimise the risk of misunderstandings, both surveys were field tested on 8 people well known to the researcher in two rounds with four persons in each round, prior to the research study. My detailed knowledge of the test group enabled me to evaluate the accuracy of the answers obtained and adapt the questions for improved precision.

5.8 Data collection

5.8.1 Primary data
Primary data was collected on May 4 and May 7, 2009 at Copenhagen Bombay’s and Wulffmorgenthaler’s shared office space at Refshaleøen. 21 participants completed the D-SA-LSI and background survey. Participants had been informed of the research study in advance through an internal e-mail notification. The researcher handed out the surveys personally to the participants at their workstations, informing them that the surveys would constitute the primary data for my master thesis from CBS, and that the intent of the surveys was to measure the learning styles of employees in general within creative industries. The terms creatives and suits were not mentioned. The participants were asked to remember their survey number so they could receive their learning styles profile. The survey numbers enabled me to return to the respondents and have incomplete surveys completed, double-check illegible handwriting, and if in doubt, inquire on job content and work responsibilities to determine if the job
content of the respondent was that of a creative or a suit. Primary qualitative information on the companies was obtained through personal communication and documents on company profile and structure provided while on site, and later through company websites and follow-up e-mails to inquire on specific questions.

5.8.2 Secondary data
Secondary information on the companies, their products and founders was obtained through articles from the Danish Film Institute and movie magazine Ekkofilm, newspaper articles in Aftenposten and Information, and the websites of Danish Radio and Danish Agency of Libraries and Media. Additionally, I contacted Musial (2008) for her master thesis on collective culture and identity of Copenhagen Bombay, and Lind-Holm (2008) for her synopsis on the challenges of being a CBS student in the creative industries, utilising Wulffmorgenthaler as a case. Musial’s (2008) master thesis provided scientifically founded, empirical analyses of Copenhagen Bombay based on interviews and observation. As a former employee, Lind-Holm’s (2008) paper provided inside ethnographic information on Wulffmorgenthaler I would not have obtained otherwise.

5.9 Data analysis
The data obtained through the D-SA-LSI inventory and background survey was analysed using Gridley’s (2007) approach to comparing the learning styles of two vocational groups. The means and standard deviations were calculated. Due to small samples of unequal size and unequal variance, heteroscedastic t-tests were calculated for each learning scale to determine the probability the respective creative and suit samples are from the same population. As the both-creative-and-suit sample consisted of one person, only the sample of creatives (n=14) and suits (n=6) were compared.

5.10 Validity and reliability
In this section I will evaluate the validity and reliability of my secondary and primary data. Validity is the degree to which a study measures and assesses the concept the researcher sets out to measure (Ringdal, 2001). Reliability is the extent to which data collection techniques and analysis procedures will yield consistent findings (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2007).

Evaluation of validity and reliability of secondary data was done using Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill’s (2007) three stage process for evaluation of secondary sources: 1) Overall suitability – does the data meet the objectives of the section(s)? 2) Precise suitability – does the data originate from a reputable and trustworthy source? 3) Measurement bias – is
the data inaccurately distorted on purpose? Overall suitability was ensured by selecting sources providing information on the companies, their products and founders. Precise suitability was ensured by selecting information from trustworthy sources, e.g. the Danish Film Institute. Measurement bias from deliberate distortion is difficult to detect. To counter this effect, I crosschecked references used with Musial (2008) and Lind-Holm (2008), who have researched Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler respectively.

Primary qualitative data was collected with the intent to first obtain general and then specific information on the companies, their products and founders for use in the company description and analysis sections. Triangulating company internal information with external media sources and Musial’s (2008) and Lind-Holm’s (2008) research on the companies, helped ensure reliability and validity, and minimise potential impression management effects.

Primary quantitative data was obtained through the D-SA-LSI, which has shown high degree of validity and reliability (Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard, 2008), and a background survey. The 8 theoretical sampling criteria ensured the research occurred in companies with the needed characteristics, strengthening the validity of the thesis. The D-SA-LSI tests preferences for problem solving and information processing. It has previously been utilised in different academic contexts with teachers, students and supervisors, testing their teaching, learning and supervising styles respectively (Nielsen, 2005). Thus, the D-SA-LSI should be valid and reliable in a non-academic context by specifying that the respondents are to describe themselves in learning situations within the context of their work. Substituting learning styles titles in the survey with numbers ensured they did not unduly influence the respondents to rate themselves as more or less creative, thus upholding reliability. As did inclusion of two sentences in the introduction specifying that and how learning occurs at work. The intent was to avoid respondents assuming learning at work does not occur and rate themselves unnecessarily low. Finally, the number system increased both validity and reliability of the study, enabling me as a researcher to return to respondents who returned incomplete inventories. Some respondents had forgotten statements or background information, whereas others needed explanation of certain statements to complete the inventory. Additionally, the number system enabled me to return to respondents for further information on job content and responsibilities, thus ensuring I placed them in the correct group of creatives and suits. Had I not had the survey number system, 7 out of 21 surveys would have been unusable, making total sample size insufficient and further data collection necessary.

The creative and suit concepts were operationalised using job content as demarcation criterion, based on definitions from leading authors in the field (Austin & Nolan, 2007;
Caves, 2000; Florida, 2004). As demonstrated in the theoretical discussion, the concepts can be criticised for lacking validity and reducing complexity because creativity can be task and context contingent (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). In their current state, the creative and suit concepts are abstractions of what people do, not how they do it, for two reasons. One, there is a lack of studies operationalising the concepts, and a lack of valid procedures to emulate. Two, how do you easily operationalise how someone performs their job content (tasks, projects, process)? Thus, measuring those who have predominantly creative job content with artistic/aesthetic tasks to perform and those who have predominantly administrative, financial and support job content, is measuring and assessing what the researcher set out to measure – the differences between those deemed creatives and suits. Hence, operationalisation of the creative-suit concepts is assessed to be valid and reliable.

The validity of self-report data can be questioned, as it is one step distance from the phenomenon under investigation (Ringdal, 2001). The answers obtained are dependent on the respondents’ evaluations of themselves and interpretations of the questions. The self-report effect can be countered by converging operations, in this case by using multi-researcher observations and experimental testing of learning styles (Sternberg, 1995). Due to a lack of resources, time and access to test-subjects this was not an option. Thus, it is essential to remain critical to the self-report data.

To produce valid knowledge it is necessary to connect the theoretical perspective, the empirical object and the chosen method. By using an organised framework combining qualitative and quantitative data monitored by theory, a strong methodological profile is created, enabling the generation of a methodology and hypotheses to guide further research on the learning styles of creatives and suits.
6. COMPANY DESCRIPTIONS

6.1 Copenhagen Bombay

Copenhagen Bombay ApS is a 14-person production company that both initiates and produces features films, TV-series, animation films and documentaries, as well as crossmedia products, e.g. books, games, toys and web activities (Danish Film Institute, 2008). It was founded in 2006, when director Anders Morgenthaler and producer Sarita Christensen left Zentropa to form their own film production company (Bernsen, 2006, May 22). Their vision is to develop original stories for children and youth (Copenhagen Bombay, 2008) that nurture the offbeat and absurd, rather than conventional family entertainment (Danish Film Institute, 2008). The company’s most notable production to this effect is Carsten & Gitte’s Movie Madness (2008), which launched a new cinema format for preschoolers (3-6 years) based on compilation of several animated short films within a larger film framework (Monggaard, 2008, June 6).

The strategic apex of Copenhagen Bombay consists of Christensen, Managing Director and dedicated producer, and Morgenthaler, Creative Director and “prolific filmmaker-slash-idea-man” (Skotte, 2007, May). Through their stable, affect and trust-based producer-director partnership in their own company, Christensen and Morgenthaler have achieved creative control and optimal distinctiveness (Alvarez et al, 2005), or as Christensen says, the right conditions for us to produce exactly what we want (Musial, 2008: 59). Below the strategic apex are 5 departments (see organisational structure, Appendix 10). The Legal and Financial departments provide necessary administrative and support functions. The Animation and Film & TV departments produce short and feature films for TV and cinema. The Cross Media department creates a universe around the company’s films (Herdel, 2009, April 7) using a variety of media and multiple platforms to unfold the story. For these purposes, Christensen and Morgenthaler have acquired output deals with Nordisk Film International Sales (distribution, exhibition and marketing), Nordisk Film Special Marketing (toys, games etc.) and publishing house Aschehoug (books). The Board consists of Allan Hansen, CEO of Nordisk Film A/S, Sarita Christensen and Henrik Sanders. Ownership of the company is split between Nordisk Film/ Egmont Denmark (33%), Christensen (30%), Morgenthaler (30%) and Mor Sønner ApS (5%) (Navne & Numre Erhverv, 2009a).

Copenhagen Bombay uses a mixture of permanent staff and freelancers to meet variations in workflow and create capacity to undertake large projects. The number of
freelancers contracted varies from 20 to 50 or 60 depending on projects (P. Lindblad, personal communication, May 7, 2009). The majority of freelancers are hired through professional and social interconnected networks and have performed work for Copenhagen Bombay in the past (P. Lindblad, personal communication, May 7, 2009). It is thus known that they as people match the organisational culture, are enjoyable to work with, and possess the right skills and artistic style for a specific project (P. Lindblad, personal communication, May 7, 2009). The freelancers are encouraged to work at Copenhagen Bombay’s colourful open landscape offices at Refshaleøen, which they share with partly owned media company Wulffmorgenthaler. Co-location of full time employees and freelancers is intended to increase creative synergy and ensure work progress, as they in cooperation work to commercialise creative products (P. Lindblad, personal communication, May 7, 2009). For Copenhagen Bombay’s value chain for production of a typical feature, see Appendix 11.

Current projects at Copenhagen Bombay are Morgenthaler’s third feature, 2D-animated film *The Apple and the Worm*, presently in post-production, and development of a national library website for children that communicates Danish Children’s Libraries offerings and books in new and exciting ways, in cooperation with the Danish Agency of Libraries and Media (Styrelsen for bibliotek og medier, 2009).

### 6.2 Wulffmorgenthaler

Wulffmorgenthaler ApS is an entertainment and comic strip company founded in 2001 by Anders Morgenthaler and Mikael Wulff, who constitute the strategic apex of the company (Lind-Holm, 2008). The inception of Wulffmorgenthaler occurred when stand-up comedian and writer Wulff and director Morgenthaler spontaneously decided to enter Politiken’s comic strip competition a few hours before deadline (Dansk Radio, 2009). They won the competition. As a daily feature in Politiken, Wulffmorgenthaler has become a well-known Danish brand (Lind-Holm, 2008) famous for their crazy-satire content (Fossberg, 2008, October 8) ranging from sideways political statements to complete non-sequitur, relying on “both intelligent humour and bathroom humour, as well as an abundance of blood, sexual references and grotesque imagery, to get its point across” (Wulffmorgenthaler, 2009). The comic strip is distributed to newspapers and magazines in Austria, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Sweden and Switzerland, and features on the company website (Wulffmorgenthaler, 2009). In addition, the writer/ artist duo create presentations, television series, animated filmstrips, books, calendars, the Friday back page of
newspaper Urban, other merchandise (e.g. cups and t-shirts) and all creative, crazy ideas they can come up with (Lind-Holm, 2008; Wulffmorgenthaler, 2007).

Wulffmorgenthaler consists of five people: Managing Director Sarita Christensen, creative directors Wulff and Morgenthaler, graphic artist and web designer Martin Nielsen and Chairman of the Board Morten Wulff (M. Nielsen, personal communication, May 18, 2009). Freelancers are hired for specific tasks when needed. The remaining board members are Sarita Christensen, Wulff and Morgenthaler. Given frequent cooperation and overlap in employees, Wulffmorgenthaler is co-located at Refshaleøen with Copenhagen Bombay, which also owns 40% of the company (Navne & Numre Erhverv, 2009b). The remaining 60% are owned by Wulffmorgenthaler Holding ApS (Navne & Numre Erhverv, 2009b).

Wulffmorgenthaler is not a profitable company. It is the personal playground of Wulff and Morgenthaler where they can cultivate their crazy ideas and passion for comic strips, satire and absurd humour (Lind-Holm, 2008). Until 2009, Wulff and Morgenthaler did not receive salary for their work at Wulffmorgenthaler. Today, Wulff receives a salary from the company, whereas Morgenthaler continues to live off his work at Copenhagen Bombay (M. Nielsen, personal communication, May 18, 2009). Decision-making in Wulffmorgenthaler is predominantly based on artistic quality of products and not profitability (Lind-Holm, 2008, see Appendix 11 for example), hence artistic logic dominates Wulffmorgenthaler, sometimes even at the expense of economic logic (Lind-Holm, 2008, see Appendix 12 for example).
7. FINDINGS

This chapter summarises the results obtained from administering the D-SA-LSI to 21 employees, 14 creatives, six suits and one both-creative-and-suit, at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler. The third group of the sample of both-creative-and-suit includes only one person performing both creative and suit job content, and is excluded from the following categorical comparison of work groups.

The 14 creatives consisted of three women and 11 men. The six suits consisted of three women and three men. Of the 21 employees in total, six were women and 14 men. Participants ranged from 24 to 48 years of age, with a median age of 32.9 years. The six suits held the jobs of lawyer, producer, production assistant, project manager and office manager. Nine of the creatives worked as animators/ animation instructors. The remaining creatives held the jobs of creative director, text writer, graphic designer/ web designer, model builder and designer, production designer/ concept art and design.

Two of the suits had work outside the companies - the lawyer, who has independently been selling legal services for a year, and the office manager, who has held multiple jobs for the past 20 years. At the time of the survey, eight of the creatives had work outside the companies. These jobs included film director, animator, stand-up comedian, illustrator, manuscript writer, music composition and concept designer.

Of the total 14 creatives tested, 12 had a formal qualifying education to perform their job. Of the total six suits tested, five had a formal qualifying education to perform their job. The both-creative-and-suit had formal qualifying tertiary education to practice as a creative, as well as a secondary suit education (economic gymnasium).
The results obtained from the D-SA-LSI for average scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning styles</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>5.5714</td>
<td>0.81006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>4.4796</td>
<td>1.37551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>4.5612</td>
<td>0.88855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic*</td>
<td>3.5510</td>
<td>0.67440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>4.7449</td>
<td>1.06931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>3.2143</td>
<td>0.84562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>4.6633</td>
<td>0.80346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>4.9490</td>
<td>0.80736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>4.2449</td>
<td>0.93498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.1122</td>
<td>0.86112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>1.01015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>5.4490</td>
<td>0.99584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>5.8980</td>
<td>1.21403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>3.5918</td>
<td>1.06294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only scale with significant difference in means: p < 0.05

Table 8 - D-SA-LSI average scores for creatives (n=14) and suits (n=6)

The results obtained from the D-SA-LSI for sum scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning styles</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>39,0000</td>
<td>5.67044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>31,3571</td>
<td>9.62854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>31,9286</td>
<td>6.21987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic*</td>
<td>24,8571</td>
<td>4.72077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>33,2143</td>
<td>7.48515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>25,5000</td>
<td>5.91933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>32,6429</td>
<td>5.62422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34,6429</td>
<td>5.65151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>29,7143</td>
<td>6.54486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>28,7857</td>
<td>6.02787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>25,0000</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>38,1429</td>
<td>6.97090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>41,2857</td>
<td>8.49822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>25,1429</td>
<td>7.44061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only scale with significant difference in means: p < 0.05

Table 9 - D-SA-LSI sum scores for creatives (n=14) and suits (n=6)

---

5 See Appendix 14 for maximum and minimum scores.

6 See Appendix 15 for maximum and minimum scores.
8. ANALYSIS

The aim of this chapter is to examine and interpret the findings by placing them in a larger context. The findings obtained in chapter 7 represent the preferences of the tested creative and suits to think in learning situations within the context of their work at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler, located within the film and animation industry. The findings do not reveal how the creatives and suits will act at work, nor do they reveal the abilities or capabilities of the respondents. Learning styles vary across tasks and situation, and people will, at least somewhat, alter and adjust their learning styles to the task at hand or demands of the context (Sternberg, 1994). What the findings report however, are creatives’ and suits’ preferences for perceiving and handling problems and situations in a learning context within the film and animation industry (Nielsen, 2007). The creatives and suits will feel drawn towards those problems and solutions that enable the use of their preferred learning styles and mental preferences. Furthermore, they will perceive the problems and situations they encounter as being of a specific type, and based on this perception, whether it is correct or not, they will engage and handle them in certain ways (Nielsen, 2007).

If the variation in learning styles between creatives and suits are marked and systematic, this can help increase understanding of why the differences in perception and problem solving ultimately lead to conflict. However, should the differences in learning styles between creatives and suits be minimal and insignificant, this will challenge the creative-suit definitions, challenge the assumption of inevitable conflict and suggest that creative and managerial processes might be complementary rather than antagonistic (Bilton, 2007).

8.1 Differences between creatives and suits: Significant findings

Following Gridley’s (2007) approach, despite the small sample size, a t-test was conducted to investigate whether the two samples are likely to have come from the same underlying populations with the same means (see Appendix 16).

As table 8 and 9 show, only the D-SA-LSI’s monarchic scale was found to be statistically significant with a p < 0.05. The suits have a mean of 2,7381 (SD=0,53769) corresponding to a weak preference for the monarchic learning styles, whereas the creatives have a mean of 3,5510 (SD=0,67440) corresponding to a medium strong preference for the monarchic learning style. This indicates that the creatives of the sample, significantly more than suits, prefer to fulfil one goal at a time, immerse themselves in one project and devote
almost all their energy and resources to finding the solution. This can make sense because creatives frequently work on project-oriented, freelance contracts where the goal is successful creation of a unique product.

In general, monarchic people are single-mindedly driven, relative inflexible, self-unaware, believe the ends justify the means, have a tendency to oversimplify and pose a problem, both in school and business, due to their myopic desire to constantly think about and want to do one thing (Sternberg, 1995; Sternberg, 1999). Nevertheless, their task-focus can make them exceptionally efficient (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) and decisive. This partially fits with the creative persona, described in the creatives and suits section, who can be single-mindedly driven, borderline-obsessed, inflexible and prefer problem immersion. Yet, it does not fit elegantly. Creativity is regarded to be a higher-order cognitive process requiring deep learning and complex information processing, and the monarchic learning style is a cognitively simplistic and conforming learning style (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Lubart & Sternberg (1991) found that artists in general are characterised by a low score on the monarchic scale. The preference mean is located in the lowest end of the medium-strong range, indicating that the creatives in the sample have some, but not near all, characteristics of the monarchic style, and that it is not a preferred style. Consequently, it can be expected that creatives and suits will have higher preferences for attainment of multiple rather than single goals.

The impressive p-value of 0.0182 provides strong evidence for separate creative and suit means on the monarchic scale. Furthermore, the findings that creatives have a medium strong preference for the monarchic learning style is interesting and should be investigated further, as it is partially at odds with both creative industries research and learning styles theory. For comparability with the current study, further research should occur in the same or similar industries, i.e. film and animation. Based on the findings in the study, it is therefore possible to postulate the following hypothesis for future verification or falsification:

**Hypothesis 1**
By comparison with suits, creatives have a stronger preference for the monarchic learning style

### 8.2 Differences between creatives and suits: Noteworthy non-significant findings

The unfortunate small size of the sample resulted in inconclusive p values for 13 of 14 learning styles. Despite the fact that the t-test is designed to deal specifically with small-sample statistics, it can be argued that the sample in question is indeed too small for even a t-test to be conducted. The potential arbitrariness of individual scores can unduly influence the
results obtained with such a limited number of people. With this caution in mind, let us proceed to consider two groups of interesting, but non-significant findings obtained, and use these to construct bold hypotheses for future research.

The first group consists of the local and judicial learning styles, with relatively low p values in comparison to the other learning styles. The mean score of suits on the D-SA-LSI’s local scale was 31,00 (SD=2,44), indicating, though not significantly, that they preferred to engage with details and specifics more (t=-1,168, p < 0,25, df=18) than creatives did (M=28,79, SD=6,02). This is plausible because suits have to ensure day-to-day operation and economic profitability. Furthermore, the suits’ mean score of 34,33 (SD=4,03) on the judicial learning style indicated, though not significantly, (t=-1,028, p < 0,32, df=14,57) that they had a stronger preference for evaluation, analysis and judgement than the creatives (M=31,93, SD=6,22). This is likely because suits are throughout education taught to be critical and evaluative, whereas creatives have a reputation for preferring an attitude of “anything goes” (Gridley, 2007). Although the sample is too small to provide convincing evidence for definitive conclusions on the local and judicial learning styles, their relatively high p values enable the construction of the following bold hypotheses for future verification or falsification using larger samples for testing:

**Hypothesis 2**

By comparison with creatives, suits have a stronger preference for the local learning style

**Hypothesis 3**

By comparison with creatives, suits have a stronger preference for the judicial learning style

The second group consists of the conservative, hierarchic and external learning styles, but are less significant than the learning styles in group one with an average of p < 0,5. They therefore hold promise in future research, although not as much as group one.

The mean score of creatives on the D-SA-LSI’s conservative scale was 25,14 (SD=7,44), indicating, though not significantly, that they preferred to used tested and tried methods more (t=0,725, p < 0,48, df=10,39) than suits did (M=22,67, SD=6,80). This indicative finding is counter-intuitive both to the descriptions of creatives in creative industries research and to the learning styles research. In learning styles theory, creative individuals have displayed a preference for choosing their own activity and how to perform it (Sternberg, 1999), thus displaying high legislative scores and low conservative scores (Gridley, 2006). However, it is important to note that the creatives in the sample are from the film and animation industry, where teams of diversely skilled specialists are brought together
to create a film/ perform a complex, non-routine task within a temporary and purpose-specific project structure. For effective production, adherence to strict production schedules and following of briefs, participants are thus, heavily dependent on role specialisation; that the individuals involved know what to do, why and by whom (Musial, 2008). Film and animation, in particular, are heavily dependent on a highly educated, technically skilled workforce that makes use of state-of-the-art technology in production (Birch, 2008). Perhaps the labour intensity and high demands on brainpower and handiwork in these industries, makes the workforce dependent on tested and tried methods within which to be creative, and to selectively expand? According to the current study, the creatives of the sample have a medium strong preference for the conservative learning style, whereas the suits have a weak preference. However, further study is needed to determine if this counter-intuitive indication is a significant and systematic difference between the learning styles of creatives and suits.

The mean score of suits on the D-SA-LSI’ hierarchic learning styles was 35,33 (SD=5,43), indicating, though not significantly, that they preferred a prioritised ordering of tasks and view competing goals as acceptable (Gridley, 2007) more (t=0,710, p < 0,49, df=13) than creatives did (M=33,21, SD=6,97). This is probable, as suits are priority setters who carefully and responsibly allocate investor resources (Austin & Nolan, 2007), and are systematic, planned and organised in their solutions and decision-making. However, the hierarchic learning style is an equally important creative style (Gridley, 2006). It allows for completion of tasks that have little structure and require individuals to process information in a more complex way, enabling high levels of originality and freedom in execution (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Thus, testing a larger sample is needed to determine which group has the highest significant preference for the hierarchical learning styles.

The mean score of suits on the D-SA-LSI’ external learning styles was 40,00 (SD=5,29), indicating, though not significantly, that they preferred working with others and focusing outward (Sternberg, 1999) more (t=0,651, p < 0,52, df=12,53) than creatives did (M=38,14, SD=6,97). This can make sense, as creatives generally have a more pronounced tendency for personal introspection. However, film and animation are team-based products dependent on well-functioning creative teams for production, and a team-oriented attitude from the individual creative. Therefore, it is unclear whether creatives or suits have the highest, significant preference for collaboration and teamwork. However, using a larger sample to test the learning styles of creatives and suits should enable more convincing evidence for more robust conclusions.
Based on the above, the following three hypotheses are stipulated:

**Hypothesis 4**
A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the conservative learning style

**Hypothesis 5**
A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the hierarchical learning style

**Hypothesis 6**
A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the external learning style

### 8.3 Interesting similarities between creatives and suits

The results obtained from the creatives and suits do not just diverge interestingly. For two of the highly creative learning scales, namely legislative style and progressive style (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005), the scores of the groups converge interestingly. Also, for the task and context dependent oligarchic style, creatives and suits obtain very similar scores.

For the legislative style, 20 out of 21 respondents obtained a score of strong or very strong, indicating that they have most or all the characteristics of the legislative learning style (see Appendix 17). One creative obtained a medium strong average score of 4. However, this person utilised the lower end of the scale to full advantage, making 4 a high personal score.

For the progressive style, 16 respondents obtained a very strong score, indicating they have all the characteristics of the style, with another two obtaining a strong score, indicating they have most characteristics of the progressive learning style (see Appendix 18). Of the remaining three, one creative obtained a medium strong average score of 4.3 – a high personal score, and another obtained a weak average score of 3.1 – an average personal score. Finally, the last creative obtained a medium strong preference for the progressive style and was located in the top end of the range with an average score of 4.3.

These results show that the majority of creatives and suits employed at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenhaler have a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that involve substantial novelty and ambiguity (Zhang and Sternberg, 2002) and require creation, formulation and planning of ideas, procedures, structure and content (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Combined, this shows a preference for self-structured and/or self-defined work that seeks to maximise change and defy conventions.
This is especially evident in the operations of Wulffmorgenthaler - the personal playground of Wulff and Morgenthaler, where artistic logic dominates decision-making and the entire company is geared towards cultivation of crazy ideas and products, and spread of satirical, absurd humour (Lind-Holm, 2008). Despite being the more fiscally responsible mother company, Copenhagen Bombay, also nurtures creativity and broadening of existing principles of practice through the vision of creating original stories for children and youth (Copenhagen Bombay, 2008) that nurture the offbeat and absurd, rather than conventional family entertainment (Danish Film Institute, 2008).

The expected high scores of creatives on the legislative and progressive scale, and the similarly unexpected high scores of suits on the same scales, can reflect socialisation effects. Learning styles are dynamic entities, socialised, at least partially, by the environment in which people live and work (Zhang, 2005). Thus “we need to be aware of the environment we enter, because we become like that environment” (Sternberg, 1995: 286). Additionally, learning styles are objectively, but not normatively value-free (Boysen & Nielsen, 2008), i.e. the value placed on specific learning styles vary in different sub-cultures and contexts. At Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler, the legislative and progressive learning styles representing creativity and comfort with change, are clearly valued both at the organisational and individual level, projecting that these are factors that lead to success and recognition (Musial, 2008). The socialisation of styles is further enhanced by the fact that people emulate role models throughout life, trying to be like and/or exhibit the same traits (Sternberg, 1994). When leading creative figures in the companies, like Wulff and Morgenthaler, display by both words and action that creativity and doing things in new ways are prized values, it is likely that their behaviour will be emulated.

However, it is important to note that the socialisation process begins even before employment. People self-selectively seek out organisations they can identify with, in this case Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler. Then, a recruiter or another type of gatekeeper at the companies evaluates if the applicant matches the organisational culture, is enjoyable to work with, based on previous experience or reports from the interconnected freelance network, and if they possess the right skills and artistic style for a specific project (P. Lindblad, personal communication, May 7, 2009). Only then, is the applicant granted access to the organisation(s), but by that time a relatively high alignment with organisational values is already ensured. Therefore, the socialisation scenario of learning styles at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler - and other creative industries firms in general - can be
expected to be: “Take people who already are alike each other and through interaction and deliberate work assignments directly and indirectly make them more alike.”

At Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler, the suits of the sample display strong type 1 creative learning styles. An assumption based on this, could be that for suits to survive in creative production environments, they need to adapt and/or exhibit certain key creative learning styles themselves, leading to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 7**

By comparison with suits outside creative industries or creative production, suits who operate in creative industries and/or creative production exhibit creative learning styles

However, it is important to note that socialisation of learning styles is a relatively new topic of research. Learning styles theory stipulates that socialisation of styles occurs (Sternberg, 1999), but the extent to which it happens and how people change their preferences for perceiving and handling tasks/problems/situations remains uncertain. Thus, based on limited knowledge on socialisation of styles and the limited sample size of the study, it is difficult to identify and list the key creative learning styles suits within creative industries or creative production might exhibit after socialisation within these contexts. Further research is thus needed to obtain significant findings and more robust conclusions. A research study to be initiated at Copenhagen Business School fall 2009 will investigate socialisation of learning styles amongst bachelor students, measuring their learning styles as they enter and exit three years later. This will undoubtedly provide important information on this understudied topic. In terms of creatives and suits, socialisation of suits’ learning styles can be investigated by comparing the learning styles of suits inside and outside the creative industries and/or creative production. Through this, it would be able to determine if suits in creative production start to exhibit more creative learning styles due to cooperation with creatives.

For the oligarchic style, 17 people of the sample obtained very weak or weak scores on the scale, indicating they have none or few characteristics of the style (see Appendix 19). The four remaining creatives scored 3.7, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.7 respectively.

These results show that the majority of creatives and suits employed at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler do not have a predilection for tasks, projects and situations that involve the use of multiple methods to pursue multiple goals of equal perceived importance (Sternberg, 1999). Creatives in film and animation have to be able to follow a brief or work on their own initiative, and are expected to meet strict production schedules (Leaving school, 2009). Both require an ability to valuate and prioritise tasks, thus allocating different amounts of attention, energy and time to task completion. Similarly, suits are
dependent on prioritising and being systematic in their problem-solving approach to ensure that the stipulated goals for the organisation or a project are met, and to manage the triple constraints of cost, time and scope. Due to their inability to prioritise, oligarchic people often feel helpless, tense or conflicted (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). Thus, determining the order for dealing with tasks according to their relative importance is an essential quality for both creatives and suits. It can therefore be hypothesised that:

**Hypothesis 8**
Both creatives and suits have a low preference for the oligarchic learning style

### 8.4 Style grouping according to creativity and conformity

To investigate the differences in the learning styles of creatives and suits based on creativity and conformity, the learning style scores of the groups can be cross-tabulated with Zhang & Sternberg’s (2005) learning styles grouping into type 1, type 2 and type 3, as well as Gridley’s stipulated creative learning styles and the additional democratic learning style. Based on previous study, creatives were expected to have type 1 learning styles - legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global and progressive - as well as anarchic and internal like the artists in Gridley’s study. Suits, however, constituted an unknown size within learning styles theory, and there were no psychological arguments for referring to a stylistically distinct group of suits, making hypothesising difficult. The following table shows which group has the highest mean for specific learning styles, grouped as described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th>Diff. in means avg. score</th>
<th>Diff. in means sum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1 styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative styles</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>0.0714</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>0.3436</td>
<td>2.4047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>0.3027</td>
<td>2.1190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>0.0544</td>
<td>0.3810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>0.2210</td>
<td>1.5676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2 styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm-favouring styles</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
<td>8.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monarchic</td>
<td>0.8129</td>
<td>5.6894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.3164</td>
<td>2.2143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>0.3537</td>
<td>2.4762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3 styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task and context contingent styles</td>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>0.1667</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>0.0919</td>
<td>0.6429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>0.0953</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridley’s creative styles*</td>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>0.0919</td>
<td>0.6429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>0.0953</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic learning scale</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>0.0272</td>
<td>0.1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gridley’s style not already included in the type 1 or type 2 styles

Table 10 – Style grouping of creative and suits according to creativity and conformity
The table provides an unexpected and interesting picture of the creatives and suits in the sample contrasted with the creative and norm-favouring learning styles: Suits score highest on three type 1 creative styles, creatives score highest on three type 2 norm-favouring styles, and Gridley’s (2007) additional creative styles are split between creatives and suit. For the two type 1 styles where creatives have the highest mean, the legislative and global styles, the means are only marginally larger than that of the suits. For Gridley’s (2007) additional creative styles and the democratic learning styles, the differences in means for both creatives and suits are also marginal. Thus, the table illustrates the current samples lack of fit with the creative and suit personas described in creative industries research and partially with learning styles theory, as well as the inconclusiveness of the findings and the need to conduct similar research using a larger sample, preferably in the same or similar industries.

8.5 The learning styles of creatives

For investigation of the learning styles of creatives, an interesting comparison is with the results obtained for the 71 independent artists in Gridley’s (2007) study. Comparing the learning styles of the two groups, it is evident that the means and standard deviation scores for the legislative, hierarchic and anarchic learning styles of quite similar, but that the scores on the executive and internal styles are quite different (see Appendix 20).

The mean score of the creatives from the sample on the executive scale was 4.48 (SD=1.38), indicating that they preferred to execute the plans of others more than the independent artists of Gridley’s study with an executive style mean score of 3.21 (SD=1.03). This makes sense because animators and film creatives often work from briefs that must be implemented by strict deadlines and production schedules (Leaving School, 2009, April 23). Consequently, they must be able to take directions from senior animator, directors and clients (Leaving School, 2009, April 23). In contrast, the independent artists of Gridley’s (2007) study preferred more independent work where they did not take directions from others.

The mean score of the independent artists on the internal scale was 5.19 (SD=0.78), indicating that they preferred to work alone, in contrast to the creatives (M=3.57, SD=1.01), whose low score shows an acceptance for outside intervention. Gridley (2007: 179) explains the high internal score among independent artists by saying:

“‘Follow your own muse’ is a widely held dictum among artists. To take input from others during the creation of an artwork is often felt to accompany the loss of integrity. Working alone is one factor leading to development of an original piece of art. Making art is almost exclusively a solitary activity and includes adherence to the subjective, inward-turning aesthetic.”
However, in the context of film and animation, art is a communal activity dependent on effective creative teams and cooperation between diversely skilled workers for its realisation (Caves, 2000). The multiplicative production relationship and interdependence of production functions requires team members to have a team-oriented attitude, good communication and negotiation skills, and the ability to take criticism well (Leaving School, 2009, April 23).

Furthermore, film and animation projects need to be closely coordinated in relatively short and finite time frames (Flew, 2004) to achieve economic profitability and prompt realisation of revenues (Caves, 2000). The time-pressure, temporality, necessary cooperation with known and unknown co-workers, and networking to potentially attain more work in the future, makes an external orientation in the film and animation industry a must. Film creatives can therefore not afford to pursue their art entirely alone, focusing only on a world of objects and ideas. Furthermore, based on the findings from the sample, where 11 of the 14 creatives had a strong or very strong preference for the external style and cooperation with other people, they would most likely not prefer it either.

Based on the substantial differences in learning style preferences between independent artists and film creatives, it can be speculated whether there are in fact sub-categories of creatives and suits with their own distinct preferences for perception and problem solving. This assertion is supported by Kaufman’s (2002) research on writers, where journalists were found to be more executive than the creative writers, who in turn were more legislative than the journalists. Furthermore, Gridley (2006) has shown that preferences for certain modes of information processing and problem solving do in fact differ according to the occupation of the respondent. Based on the above reasoning, the following three hypotheses are proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By comparison with independent artists, film creatives have a stronger preference for the executive learning style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By comparison with film creatives, independent artists have a stronger preference for the internal learning style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By comparison with independent artists, film creatives have a stronger preference for the external learning style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6 Inconclusive learning styles

Despite the small sample size and inconclusive findings, it has been possible to draw up some bold hypotheses for most learning styles based on differences, similarities, style groupings or data from secondary sources. However, for the anarchic, democratic and global learning styles, it has been difficult to hypothesise due to similar means and standard deviations, high p-values and a more even distribution of responses than other styles. There have been no hypotheses generated based on the anarchic, democratic and global styles of creatives and suits, and therefore, special attention will have to be paid to them in future research.

8.7 Conclusion on analysis

The results obtained on the learning styles of creatives and suits were disappointingly inconclusive, with only one statistically significant finding. Creatives were found (M=3.55, SD=0.67) to significantly more (t=2.862, p < 0.02, df=11.92) than suits (M=2.74, SD=0.54) favour the monarchic learning style, which entails a preference for utilising all available energy and resources to achieve a single goal. However, this finding is partially at odds with creative industries research and learning styles theory, thus future research is necessary to obtain greater understanding of this preferential difference between creatives and suits.

Given the lack of conclusive and significant findings, the goal became to generate bold hypotheses that can function as starting points for future research. Non-significant p-values were used to generate bold hypotheses on the local, judicial, conservative, hierarchic and external learning styles. However, it is important to remain critical to the p-values of such a small sample. For more conclusive results and verification or falsification of the hypotheses generated, a larger sample is needed.

The categorical distribution of the legislative, progressive and oligarchic learning styles enabled generation of further hypotheses. The high convergence for creatives and suits on the three styles indicates socialisation of styles at Copenhagen Bombay and Wulffmorgenthaler. These findings align with learning styles theory, which states that learning styles are indeed dynamic entities socialised, at least partially, by the environment in which we live and work (Zhang, 2005). The socialisation process is enhanced by self-selection, recruitment and organisational socialisation effects. The findings on the oligarchic learning style indicate that both creatives and suits have a higher preference for attainment of multiple prioritised goals than goals of perceived equal importance. The convergence of the legislative and progressive styles indicates that suits become more like the creative environment they are in (Sternberg, 1995). Consequently, it would be interesting to compare
the learning styles of suits inside and outside creative production, with special focus on the creative Type 1 learning styles, to see if there is a significant difference.

The grouping of the creatives’ and suits’ learning styles according to creativity and conformity based on largest mean, revealed an unexpected and interesting picture, with suits dominating the creative styles, and creatives dominating the norm-favouring styles. This clearly showed that more research is needed on the topic, and that the stylistically compared differences between creatives and suits of the sample do not correspond well with creative industries research or learning styles theory.

Contrasting Gridley’s (2007) learning styles of independent artists with the learning styles of film creatives showed that the creatives had a higher preference for the executive learning style and a lower preference for the internal learning style than the independent artists. This posited the possibility of creative and suit sub-categories, each with their own and specific stylistic preferences. However, more context-specific and comparative research on this topic is required to identify sub-categories of creatives and suits.

Given that there is prior research on the learning styles of artists and creatives but not on suits, the discussion naturally reflects a bias towards discussing if and to what extent suits exhibit creative learning styles versus creatives exhibiting suit learning styles. However, given the small sample size and no prior research on the learning styles of suits, it is difficult to speak of typical “suit leaning styles” without committing the ultimate creative industries fallacy of equating them with the type 2 norm-favouring learning styles. Consequently, more research is needed on the learning styles of suits and potential suit sub-categories.

The overall conclusion is that the current sample size was too small to provide convincing evidence for definite conclusions, necessitating a larger future study if the learning styles of creatives and suits are to be discerned. Future research should take place within the same or similar industries, given (a) the possible existence of sub-categories of creatives and suits, and (b) that the “distinctive characteristics of creative labor are best understood within particular sector and market contexts” (Thompson, Jones & Warhurst, 2007: 636).
9. CONCLUSION

The motivation to write the thesis spurred from the inadequate and limiting way creatives and suits are presented in creative industries research. Generally, suits are presented as what creatives are not and vice versa, as though they are a pair of binary opposites. Despite attempts to soften the conceptual dichotomy the result is, more often than not, that suits are presented as bureaucratic managers who could be made to work harder through either the carrot or stick, and creatives are reduced to divinely inspired, intrinsically motivated, incomprehensible creative geniuses. Therefore, the overall purpose of the thesis has been to provide a new analytical perspective on the simple, yet powerful, creative-suit dichotomy by linking creative industries research on creatives and suits with the theory of mental self-government. In this way, learning styles theory has been used as a catalyst to shed light on the creative and suit concepts, leading to greater nuancing of the abstractions.

The aim of the study has been to investigate what the learning styles of creatives and suits are - and if they differ systematically. However, there is no prior research on the topic. Therefore, one of the main accomplishments of this thesis has been linkage of the former disparate fields of knowledge, and development of a methodology that future studies on the learning styles of creatives and suits can utilise and replicate.

The empirical investigation took place at film production company Copenhagen Bombay and media company Wulffmorgenthaler with 21 respondents – 14 creatives, 6 suits and one person performing both creative and suits job content. The results obtained were disappointing inconclusive, with only one statistically significant finding: Creatives were found to favour the monarchic learning style (focus on single task) significantly more than suits. However, the creatives only displayed a mean medium strong preference for the style, indicating it is not one of the preferred learning styles of creatives. Given the inconclusiveness and lack of significant findings, educated and bold hypotheses were proposed, so potential future research on the learning styles of creatives and suits would have multiple, concrete starting points:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1</th>
<th>By comparison with suits, creatives have a stronger preference for the monarchic learning style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>By comparison with creatives, suits have a stronger preference for the local learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>By comparison with creatives, suits have a stronger preference for the judicial learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the conservative learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the hierarchical learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>A study utilising a larger sample of creatives and suits will find a significant difference between creatives’ and suits’ preferences for the external learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>By comparison with suits outside creative industries or creative production, suits who operate in creative industries and/or creative production exhibit creative learning styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>Both creatives and suits have a low preference for the oligarchic learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>By comparison with independent artists, film creatives have a stronger preference for the executive learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 10</td>
<td>By comparison with film creatives, independent artists have a stronger preference for the executive learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 11</td>
<td>By comparison with independent artists, film creatives have a stronger preference for the external learning style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 – The proposed hypotheses of the thesis

The sample in the study was too small to provide significant evidence for distinctive creative and suit learning styles. Consequently, further research utilising larger samples is necessary, if the learning styles of creatives and suits are to be discerned. Future research should take place in the same or similar industries for comparability to this study and/or testing of the hypotheses stipulated above. Furthermore, the “distinctive characteristics of creative labor are best understood within particular sector and market contexts” (Thompson, Jones & Warhurst, 2007: 636). Thus, future research should link the obtained creative and suit
learning styles to their organisational and sector-specific context, both for explanatory value and due to the existence of context-dependent creative and suit subcategories.

The fundamental result from applying learning styles glasses to creatives and suits is weakening of the concepts, and a rejection of the creative industries dogma that the suit is the antithesis of the creative. The learning styles for creatives and suits in the sample were in fact similar and overlapping, rather than opposite preferences. Lack of distinct differences between the learning styles of creatives and suits, and socialisation of styles can indicate that creatives’ and suits’ preferences for perceiving, and handling problems/ tasks/ situations may not be all that different, and certainly not as different as indicated by creative industries literature. Furthermore, the studies of Kaufmann (2002), Gridley (2006, 2007) and Lubart and Sternberg (1991) as well as comparison of the learning styles of independent artists and creatives, challenge the unitary assumption of the creative and suits groups within creative industries theory, and point to the existence of sub-groups or categories of creatives and suits. The authors mentioned have separated the sub-groups based on occupation, e.g. writers versus journalists. However, separation into sub-groups based on learning style groupings could be another future possibility.

Having conducted the study, the core question that comes to mind is: Is conflict between creatives and suits inevitable according to leaning styles theory? The short answer is no. Learning styles are teachable, dynamic entities that can and will be adapted to the task, person or context at hand (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Furthermore, learning styles can be used as a tool to consciously and systematically interchange between matching and mismatching to people with different preferences for perceiving and processing information. Thus, it is possible to reach and communicate well with people who are stylistically different. This does require transformation of natural preferences into conscious choices, coupled with understanding of others’ stylistic preferences and their manifestations (Nielsen, 2007; Nielsen, 2008). In conclusion, conflict between creatives and suits is not inevitable according to learning styles theory, and seen in this light, artistic and managerial processes might be complementary rather than antagonistic (Bilton, 2007).

Despite the inconclusiveness of the pilot study, it is my firm belief that further research has the potential to develop Sternberg’s learning styles framework into a tool for proactively managing the conflict between creatives and suits. For a creative industries manager, learning styles as a tool could provide the following benefits:
• A shared and agreed conceptual framework and vocabulary
  This can lead to more meaningful exchanges of information, easier understanding and quicker problem solving between creatives and suits

• A group neutral tool not biased towards creatives or suits
  Learning styles should thus be equally applicable to both creatives and suits

• Knowledge and awareness of own style in relation to others
  This can lead to increased understanding and tolerance for differences, more specific knowledge on what the differences are and how to interpret communication instances

• Improved communication with employees, colleagues and superiors
  Conscious matching and mismatching to other people’s learning styles or just simply differentiation in personal styles can enable all employees to communicate in ways that resonate better with colleagues, employees and superiors, thus improving inter-organisational communication, and “hopefully increasing the effectiveness of organisational behaviour” (Zhang, 2005: 1924).

• Enhance cooperation in cross-disciplinary project teams
  Research on student teams has shown that learning styles can be used actively for team formation and facilitation of teamwork (Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard, 2008b).

• Improve management training and development programmes
  Providers of management training and development programmes can use knowledge on learning styles to “create training and development programmes that match training to the thinking styles of the trained personnel” (Zhang, 2005: 1924)

• Learning styles can be used as a tool for self-development
  They are changeable preferences that can be consciously worked with and changed

• Learning styles are not intrusively personal
  Learning styles are changeable preferences for information processing and problem solving, not abilities, and can be shared in the workplace without disclosing too private information

• Cause top management to view employees as a diversified human resource portfolio
  Top management and human resource management personnel awareness of employees’ learning styles could make both “more likely to view their employees as a diversified human resources portfolio” and manage them more wisely by taking their styles into account (Zhang, 2005: 1924).

Figure 7 – The possible benefits of utilising learning styles in a creative industries context
  Based on own development, Zhang (2005) and Nielsen, Hvas & Kjærgaard (2008)
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Appendix 1 – List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SA-LSI</td>
<td>Danish Self-Assessment Learning Styles Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISQ</td>
<td>Intellectual Styles Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Glossary

A list/ B list property – Differentiated skills, originality and proficiency of creative personnel are vertically ranked and assessed within their industries by producers and other content aggregators, resulting in an A list/ B list phenomenon (Caves, 2000; Flew: 2004).

Anarchic learning style – Preference for fulfilling multiple goals/ needs of uncertain importance via an unsystematic approach, thus solve individually chosen or random problem sand breaking with existing solutions/ procedures.

Ars longa property - Durable rents and durable products: Creative products are durable and can continue to extract rents, e.g. copyright payments, long after the period of production (Caves, 2000; Flew, 2004).

Art - an abstract quality that surfaces in “specific aesthetics or individual reactions by the recipient, and needs no external legitimisation” – it exists only in subjective interpretations (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 526).

Art for art’s sake – Creative workers care vitally about their product (quality, originality, technical features, harmony in the creative act) and derive non-economic, i.e. emotional and/or psychological satisfaction from their work and creative activity. Creative workers create out of inner necessity and with concern for artistic achievement (Caves, 2000; Flew, 2004; Vogel, 2008).

Artistic logic – ”is marked by the desire to produce l’art pour l’art. Art itself is seen as an abstract quality that surfaces, for example, in specific aesthetics or individual reactions by the recipient, and needs no external legitimisation. Although market value may exist, according to the artistic logic the principal legitimisation for producing specific (patterns of) practices is their involvement with art, regardless of kind. Thus, social practices can be interpreted to follow an artistic logic of practice if they are produced with the primary intention of contributing to art as a greater good” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 526).

Bohemians - constitute the artistically creative part of the Creative Class (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007) and their “economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/or creative content” (Florida, 2004: 8).

Bridgebuilders – People who have credibility in both steward and creator camps. They can generate and capture economic value without being pure stewards, and appreciate a mysterious new technology without being pure creators. Bridging personalities are rare, but very helpful, and are capable or reducing difficulties by mediating disagreement and explaining different points of view in a conflict (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

Central paradox of economic production - “Economic logics tend to crowd out artistic logics, and thus endanger the resources vital to creative production” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 536).
Class - cluster of people who have common interests and tend to think, feel and behave similarly. These similarities are determined by economic function and the type of work they do for a living (Florida, 2004: 8).

Class 1 disagreements – A disagreement where the parties who disagree in a conflict cannot describe to each other’s satisfaction the other party’s point of view (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

Class 2 disagreements – A disagreement where each party who disagrees in a conflict can completely describe to the other’s party’s satisfaction the other party’s point of view (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

Conservative learning style – Preference for doing things in tried ways, avoiding ambiguity, adhering to rules and procedures and minimising change.

Creative – people working within creative industries with creative job content: Skilled, specialised and highly capable creative employees responsible for the creation, development and design of experiential objects emotional reactions, expressions, and thoughts (Austin & Nolan, 2007; Caves, 2000; Vogel, 2008).

Creative class – Cluster of people common interests and the tendency to think, feel and behave similarly. These similarities are determined by their economic function, i.e. the work they do for a living. The Creative Class is people who are primarily paid to be mentally present and think, create and innovate (Florida, 2004). The means of production are their brains, knowledge and talent (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007).

Creative industries – the “creative” industries supply “goods and services that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic or simply entertainment value. Characteristics:

a) Encompasses specific sectors:
“Publishing and magazine publishing, visual arts (painting, sculpture), the performing arts (theatre, opera, concerts, dance), sound recordings, cinema and TV films, even fashion and toys and games” (Caves, 2000: 1).

b) Displays unique characteristics:
Globally connected industries, tendency to agglomerate in clusters in big cities, can develop space-specific brands e.g. Danish design, often integral part of public authorities’ development strategies, durable product and durable rents, production of symbolic goods that serve an aesthetic or expressive rather than utilitarian function, uncertain demand for creative products due to the unpredictability of subjective experience, infinitely differentiated products allowing small firms to view the giants and possibly attain a monopolistic regime of competition, highly educated & technically skilled labour force with vertically differentiated skills in A list/ B list format, diversely skilled production crews, advanced use of technology in production, time pressure to produce and finalise creative products, and art for art’s sake motivation - creators care vitally about their products and derive non-economic psychological satisfaction from their work (Bille, 2007; Birch, 2008; Caves; 2000; Gibson & Kong; 2005; Power & Scott; 2004).

Creative product - “experience goods” characterised by the fact that a buyer’s satisfaction will be a subjective reaction (Caves, 2000: 3).
**Creative professionals** - knowledge-based professionals not directly connected with artistic creation or technological development. Their economic function is to educate, manage, care-take, and develop models and thoughts to facilitate economic development (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007).

**Creative task** - task that does not have “a clear and readily identifiable path to solution” (Amabile, 1996: 35).

**Creativity** – The ability to generate and execute original ideas that are useful, appropriate and actionable based on individual expertise, creative thinking skills and motivation, all occurring in a domain (rules, procedures and instructions for action) with relation to a field (external evaluation of appropriate creative capability). In other words, an incremental activity based on careful, concentrated effort, an individual’s accumulated memories and experience, as well as domain-specific expertise – knowledge of own and other’s ideas within a given domain (Bilton & Leary, 2002). It results from the ordinary thought processes of ordinary individuals, and is not a mysterious quality of geniuses (Weisberg, 1986: 12). According to the action theory of creativity, creativity is the execution of creative work: Creativity takes place over time, and occurs whilst having an idea and performing the work (Sawyer, 2006). In contrast to idealist theory of creativity, which stipulates that the creative process is finished once a creative idea has been generated.

**Creator** - often skilled, specialized employees, and their focus is on a grand vision and mission; they frequently view business concerns as secondary (Austin & Nolan, 2007).

**Democratic learning style** – Preference for fulfilling own & others’ goals/ needs, as both are seen as equally important, often taking a dialogic approach. The goal is to find the best solution for the group.

**Economic logic** – “is characterised by an explicit market orientation. The central idea is that the individual benefits are gained from exchanging goods and services via markets of whatever kind, for example product markets, capital markets or labour markets. Practices produced following economic logics often involve attempts to measure quantity and quality of the output, in order to foster market exchange and to achieve cost efficiency, that is the most profitable use of financial resources involved in producing (social) practices. (...) the principal legitimisation for producing specific (patterns of) practices is market value. Thus, social practices can be interpreted to follow economic logic of practices if they are produced with the primary intention of exchanging outputs on a market” (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 526).

**Executive learning style** - Preference for following rules, procedures, prescribed methods and do what he/ she is told, i.e. execution of tasks within established guidelines.

**External learning style** – Preference for working with others, focus outward, be interdependent. Sees interaction and co-operation essential part of problem.

**Extrinsic motivation** – motivation to “get something desirable or enjoy something pleasurable” (Amabile, 1998: 79, thus entails and ability to respond to outside motivators, e.g. ordinary economic incentives (Caves, 2000; Vogel, 2008).
Forms of mental self-government – approach to solving problems and fulfilling goals, see monarchical, hierarchic, oligarchic, anarchic and democratic learning style.

Functions of mental self-government – governing functions of the mind; see legislative, executive and judicial learning style.

Global learning style – Preference for general problems on a high level of abstraction. Can see the forest, but not the trees

Hierarchic learning style – Preference for fulfilling a hierarchy of goals/needs, and taking a balanced, prioritised and systematic approach, thus solving prioritised sub-problems.

Holographic organisations – A type of hybrid organisation where both identity elements are present in all units of the organisation and not restricted to structural roles, e.g. a hospital (Albert & Whetten, 2004; Glynn, 2006).

Humdrum inputs – “demand a wage at least equal to what they earn outside the market for inputs of their type. They do not care who employs them or what task (within their competence) they are asked to undertake. They are just in it for the money” (Caves, 2000: 4).

Hybrid identities – Organisational identities consisting of two different identity elements not typically found together (Albert & Whetten, 2004). The typical hybrid consists of normative and utilitarian elements that are potentially conflictual because they give rise to “two logical systems of management” (Glynn, 2006): One espousing norms of artistic excellence and the other espousing norms of fiscal guardianship.

Ideographic organisations – A type of hybrid organisation where each organisational unit is specialised in its identity with an attendant set of capabilities, expertise, professionalism and structural roles (Glynn, 2006), e.g. a theatre with an administrative unit and an artistic unit.

Intrinsic motivation – a personal desire to do something based on deep interest, passion, curiosity and challenge. Engagement with the work for challenge and enjoyment – the work itself is motivating (Amabile, 1998).

Infinite variety property – Creative goods produced can be horizontally differentiated in an infinite number of ways (Caves, 2000)

Internal learning style – Preference for working alone, focus inward for answers, be reserved, be self-sufficient, less socially sensitive than externalists

Judicial learning style – Preference for judging and evaluating people, things, procedures, methods, structure and content. Prefers to evaluate, analyse & critique.

Leanings of mental self-government – preferences for continuity and ambiguity, see progressive and conservative learning style.

Learning style – A style is a way of thinking (Sternberg, 1995). Learning styles are propensities for how to use one’s abilities (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993) and can be described as modes of thought individuals find comfortable and suitable for themselves (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). Learning styles are presented in a profile of styles
describing a person’s preferred ways of perceiving and handling problems and situations in a learning context (Nielsen, 2007).

**Legislative learning style** - Likes to create, invent, design, do things his/ her own way, have little assigned structure, define problem(s), set goals and plan strategy

**Levels of mental self-government** - level of focus, see global and local learning style.

**Local learning style** – Preference for concrete problems involving details in perception or solution. Can see the trees, but not the forest.

**Monarchic learning style** – Preference for doing one thing at a time and fulfilling one goal, devoting to it almost all energy and resources, thus finding the solution.

**Motley crew property** - The collective nature of creative production and commercialisation of complex creative goods necessitates co-operation between diversely skilled and specialised workers, who often posses diverse interests and expectations about the final product (Caves, 2000; Flew, 2004).

**Nobody knows property** – Demand is uncertain because creative goods are experience goods. Forecasting the likely demand for creative products or understanding the reactions after the fact can be near impossible because buyers lack information prior to consumption, and where the satisfaction derived is largely subjective and intangible (Caves, 2000; Flew, 2004).

**Oligarchic learning style** – Preference for fulfilling multiple goals/ needs of same importance, multi-systematic & even competing approaches. However, the desire to solve several problems simultaneously can result in problems prioritising.

**Progressive learning style** – Preference for doing things in new ways, defying conventions and maximising change. Comfortable with ambiguity, and will seek out the new and unknown.

**Routine task** – task where “the path to the solution is clear and straightforward” (Amabile, 1996: 35),

**Scopes of mental self-government** – preferences for dealing with internal and/ or external issues, see internal and external learning style.

**Stewards** – “are usually managers; their goal is the careful allocation of the organization’s resources, with an aim of achieving an optimal return on investment” (Austin & Nolan, 2007). See also suit or humdrum inputs.

**Suit** - people working within creative industries with “humdrum” job content: Suits perform the necessary administrative and support work that allows for commercialisation of creative, experiential products and services, and are most commonly managers responsible for the careful allocation of the organization’s resources with the aim of achieving an optimal return on investment (Austin & Nolan, 2007).
Super creative core - consists of people who “invent, take out patents and thereby drive economic and technological development” (Andersen, Vinther & Lorenzen, 2007: 11) by producing new forms and designs that are readily transferable and broadly useful.

The theory of mental self-government - the forms of governments in the world are not arbitrary or coincidental constructions (Sternberg, 1999: 148). Rather, they are externalised social manifestations of fundamental inner, individual psychological processes (Boysen & Nielsen, 2008). They reflect alternative ways in which people can govern and organise themselves (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005), and can thus be construed as mirrors of our minds on a grand scale (Sternberg, 1995). Both individuals and governments must manage their everyday activities, decide on priorities, allocate resources and be responsive to changes in the world (Sternberg, 1995; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1993). People are, therefore, assumed to govern their mental thinking in the same fundamental ways as can be observed in governmental structures (Nielsen, 2006a).

Time flies property - diverse creative activities need to be closely coordinated in a relatively short and finite time frame to achieve economic profitability and prompt realisation of revenues (Flew, 2004; Caves, 2000).

Type 1 styles - the creative styles: Legislative, judicial, global, hierarchical and liberal (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005).

Type 2 styles – the norm-favouring styles: Executive, local, conservative and monarchic (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005).

Type 3 styles – the task and context contingent styles: Oligarchic, anarchic, external and internal (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005).
Appendix 3 – The creative industries

The aim is to define and describe the creative industries – the context in which creatives and suits operate. Explicitation of the term is vital, as there is no universal definition of creative industries (Bille, 2008).

The fundamental tenet of creative industries theory is that creative industries display some distinctive form of competitive behaviour compared to other industries (Caves, 2000: 1-2): “Creative goods and services, the process of their production, and the preferences or tastes of creative artists differ in substantial and systematic (if not universal) ways from their counterparts in the rest of the economy where creativity plays a lesser (if seldom) negligible role.”

However, there is no universal or generally accepted definition of the creative industries (Bille, 2008: 6) and the definitions used are often imprecise, oversimplified and too broad in scope (Birch, 2008; Bilton, 2007). Consequently, the creative industries term is disputed and highly context-/country-dependent. There is a need for a more robust definition. In the following, I will present a multiple definition, creative industries framework based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative definitions. Specifying qualitative characteristics of ‘the organisation of creative production’ in conjunction with a quantitative listing of specific creative industries has the benefits of increased precision, dual-dimension limitations on the field and possibility of reinforcing research (Gibson & King, 2005: 546). It enables exclusion of instances where production occurs in one of the pre-specified creative industries, but competitive strategy is based on imitation and industrial replication with little regard to originality, aesthetic innovation and usefulness.

Creative industries framework

The creative industries can be defined along two dimensions:

1) Quantitative dimension: The sectoral approach to creative production

*Creative industries encompass specific industries* (Caves, 2000)

2) Qualitative dimension: Theories on organisation of creative activities

*Creative industries display distinctive structural, axiomatic properties* (Caves, 2000; Gibson & Kong, 2005; Power & Scott, 2004).
CREATIVE INDUSTRIES FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectoral and industry specific</th>
<th>15 characteristics of creative industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Book publishing and magazine publishing</td>
<td>• Globally connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual arts (painting, sculpture)</td>
<td>• Tend to agglomerate in clusters in big cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performing arts (theatre, opera, concerts, dance)</td>
<td>• May rely on space-specific brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sound recordings</td>
<td>• Occasionally connected to public authorities’ regional development strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cinema &amp; TV films</td>
<td>• Durable products &amp; durable rents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fashion</td>
<td>• Production of symbolic content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Toys and games</td>
<td>• Nobody knows: Demand is uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Globally connected

Tend to agglomerate in clusters in big cities

May rely on space-specific brands

Occasionally connected to public authorities’ regional development strategies

Durable products & durable rents

Production of symbolic content

Nobody knows: Demand is uncertain

Infinite variety: Differentiated products

Operate in a regime of monopolistic competition

Highly educated & technically skilled labour force

Advanced use of technology in production

A list B list: Vertically differentiated skills

Motley crew: Creative products require diverse skills

Time flies: Time is of the essence

Art for art’s sake: Creative workers care about their products

Figure Appendix 3 – Creative industries framework


Creative industries are a special sphere of economic production where the business field and the cultural/ creative field overlap (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). They constitute systems of organisations that mediate the flow of creative goods between producers and consumers (Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000:265; Hirsch, 1972). The aim is to turn creativity into appropriate commercial products (Movitz & Sandberg, 2009). By combining industrial scale-production and cultural content (Towse, 2003: 170), artistic motivation becomes the primary resource of economic production (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006). Thus, there is constant need to integrate the expression of artistic values and mass entertainment and balance the interests of creatives and suits (Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000; Caves, 2000).

Additionally, the qualitative characteristics also enable identification of large organisations outside the defined creative industries that have an in-house design, architectural, media facility (Smith & Mckinlay, 2009a) or other specific departments where production occurs according to creative production principles.
Creative industries are globally connected and their products are a steadily rising part of international trade (Birch, 2008). They tend to agglomerate in specialised clusters in or close to big cities (Power & Scott, 2004: 4) to achieve economies of scale and scope through a specialised work force, interrelated firms, consumers, producers, and supporting organisations (local authorities, financial institutions, chambers of commerce) (Birch, 2008). Successful creative clusters exert “artistic gravitation”, causing talented individuals to selectively move there for professional fulfilment (Power & Scott, 2004). The tight interweaving between place and production may lead to space-specific brands, e.g. Danish furniture, with local symboligies and authentic character imbued in the products (Power & Scott, 2004). To capitalise on this and increase the standard of living in a region, creative industries can be connected to public authorities’ development strategies (Birch, 2008).

Creative industries are often dubbed “the copyright industries” (Towse, 2003), as they create, distribute and depend on copyrighted materials as their primary products: Their most valuable currency is ideas and intellectual property (Howkins, 2002). Consequently, they are dependent on exclusive monopoly rights on durable products and royalties/rent payments, which are collected in small lump-sum payments over long periods of time (Vogel, 2008).

Creative industries supply “experience” goods and services we associate with cultural, artistic or simply entertainment value (Caves, 2000: 1), and are directed at a public of consumers for whom they serve an aesthetic or expressive rather than utilitarian function (Caves, 2000; Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000). The competitiveness of creative goods and services flow from “their ability to entertain, provide a form of social identity, or confer status, over and above their utilitarian value” (Rantisi, 2004: 91). Thus, creative products have two complementary values: The value of the intangible, intellectual property and the value of the physical carrier or platform (if any) (Howkins, 2002: 85). The satisfaction and value derived by the end-user (viewer, audience, reader, consumer) is largely a subjective reaction dependent on the meaning ascribed to the symbolic goods (ideas, experiences, images) (Caves, 2000; Bilton & Leary, 2002): Consequently, creative products differ unpredictably in the quality levels consumers see in them (Caves, 2000: 7): Demand is uncertain - nobody knows in advance how consumers will value new products and services (Vogel, 2008).

Creative goods can be horizontally differentiated in an infinite number of ways. This can allow small creative industries firms to “vie the giants in the creation of virtual product monopolies” (Power & Scott, 2004: 6), attaining a regime of monopolistic competition and specialisation. To achieve this, creative industries employ a specialized, well-educated, mobile workforce (Musial, 2008) that is strongly motivated, technically skilled and makes use...
of state-of-the-art technology in production (Birch, 2008). Creative industries are, thus, labour intensive due to high demands on brainpower and handiwork (Ibid: 29). Work is carried out in project-based, network economies - shifting networks of specialized but complementary firms, making part-time, temporary and freelance work prevalent (Power & Scott, 2004). Access to new contacts and future projects is gained through one’s professional and social interconnected networks (DeFilipi & Arthur, 1998). Consequently, creative personnel’s skills, originality and proficiency are vertically ranked and assessed, creating an A list/ B list (Caves, 2000) from which producers and other content aggregators can draw (Flew, 2004).

Internally in creative industries firms, the collective nature of creative production necessitates co-operation between diversely skilled workers: A motley crew of creatives and suits. However, the multiplicative production relationship and interdependence of production functions is often threatened by diverse interests, expectations, professional backgrounds, priorities and preferences, making it a challenge to sustain cooperation between creatives and suits during production (Caves, 2000). Another complication is time pressure. Diverse creative activities need to be closely coordinated in relatively short and finite time frames (Flew, 2004) to achieve economic profitability and prompt realisation of revenues (Caves, 2000). Finally, conflict between creatives and suits is enhanced by the famous art for art’s sake property: Creative workers care vitally about their product (quality, originality, technical features, harmony in the creative act) and derive non-economic, psychological satisfaction from their work and creative activity (Caves, 2000; Flew, 2004; Vogel, 2008). This creates new and unique challenges for market-oriented and profit-focused business managers, who do not understand how to create on cue or how to innovate reliably to a deadline (Austin & Devin, 2003).

Additional references

Appendix 4 – Examples of how actors act in accordance with economic logic of practice

Example of how actors consciously allocate their creative resources:

“If I’m shooting a film with a prestigious director in the morning and am scheduled to play a minor character in the nightly show the same day—I don’t think twice about how to allocate my energies for that day. I’m sure the theatre manager won’t like it, but that’s just the way the business goes.”

- Ensemble actor
  (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 529).

Example of how actors control the outcome of their efforts:

“You are not only exposed to external judgment all the time, you also constantly monitor your own work. […] There is a low barrier to panic and you are always afraid that you will be cast for too little or too small roles—you are always afraid that theatre management and audience will not love you enough.”

- Actor
  (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 529).

Example of how actors strategically invest in social capital to increase employability:

“If you want to work with a certain director, you have to actively seek contact with him or at least make sure that he - through third parties —gets to know about your interest.”

- Ensemble actress
  (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007: 528).
Appendix 5 – The problem with creative people

“The problem with creative people is that they’re unpredictable and unreliable. The problem with creative people is that they’re morose, arrogant and impossible to manage. The problem with creative people is that they think they’re always right. The problem with creative people is that you can’t rely on them to get things done. The problem with creative people is that you can’t tell if they’re any good before it’s too late. The problem with creative people is that you can’t replace them with machines. The problem with creative people is that they think they are indispensable. The problem with creative people is that they don’t know the meaning of money. The problem with creative people is that they won’t listen, they won’t cooperate and they won’t toe the line. The problem with creative people is that they’re impulsive, hostile and out of control. The problem with creative people is that they live in a dream world. The problem with creative people they think they are so different from the rest of us. The problem with creative people is that they think they’re the only people who can be creative. The problem with creative people is that most of them can’t even tie their own shoelaces. The problem with creative people is that they’re anxious, unreasonable and antisocial. The problem with creative people is they would rather be living on a different planet. The problem with creative people is that there are so many bad ones and so few good ones. The problem with creative people is that they think they can change the world.”

Appendix 6 – Overview of the dichotomous differences between creatives and suits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological level</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype</td>
<td>Economic man/ Homo economicus</td>
<td>Creative man or Homo ludens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Economic logic</td>
<td>Artistic logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Business field</td>
<td>Cultural field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>l’art pour l’art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>Exchange output on a market</td>
<td>Contribute to art as greater good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimisation</td>
<td>Market value</td>
<td>Involvement with art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Profitable use of financial resources, foster market exchange, achieve cost efficiency</td>
<td>Subjective aesthetics, specific aesthetics by recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Measure quality &amp; quantity of output</td>
<td>Engage with art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual benefits from market</td>
<td>Exchange of goods and services via markets</td>
<td>Accumulated cultural capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational level</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enactment of hybrid organisational identity</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical system of management</td>
<td>Fiscal guardianship</td>
<td>Artistic excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of structural roles</td>
<td>Balance budgets</td>
<td>Create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural role stereotype</td>
<td>Obstructive, bureaucratic manager</td>
<td>Unmanageable, creative genius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valued individual capital</td>
<td>Economic capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical period</td>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>Romanticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Agent-theory</td>
<td>Creativity theory, creative industries research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative class group</td>
<td>Creative professionals</td>
<td>Bohemians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Bourgeoisie?</td>
<td>Bohemian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing impulse</td>
<td>Allocate investor resources responsibly</td>
<td>Realize the grand vision at all costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude on point of diminishing return</td>
<td>Going beyond it would be bad business</td>
<td>Don’t know where it is, don’t care where it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude on compromise</td>
<td>An inevitable part of many practical business solutions</td>
<td>Not to be considered when trying to achieve a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question always in mind</td>
<td>What’s the business model?</td>
<td>It is “cool”, fun, exciting or potentially important to humankind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation in producing economic value</td>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>Value creation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Own development
Appendix 7 – Example of a learning styles profile

Learning styles profile for NN

Below you can see your learning styles profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING STYLES</th>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functions of mental self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of mental self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic</td>
<td>Medium strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of mental self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopes of mental self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Medium strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanings of mental self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength evaluation:

- **Very strong** (marked) = you have almost all/ all characteristics of the style
- **Strong** = you have many characteristics of the style
- **Medium strong** = you have some characteristics of the style
- **Weak** = you have few characteristics of the style
- **Very weak** (negligible) = you have no characteristics of the style
Appendix 8 – Teaching style focus and favouritism of participants with certain learning styles

The connection between teaching style focus and favouritism of participants with certain learning styles – freely according to Sternberg (1988, 1994, 1997)

Favouritism of participants with specific styles is determined by the teacher’s teaching style, so that…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The more teaching styles focus on…</th>
<th>The more favoured are participants with…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Independence and initiative in topic, method etc.</td>
<td>→ Legislative style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher’s definition of topic, method etc.</td>
<td>→ Executive style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Judge, evaluate, critical stance</td>
<td>→ Judicial style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To reach the right solution</td>
<td>→ Monarchic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prioritised tasks, solutions, time</td>
<td>→ Hierarchic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple, unprioritised tasks, solutions, time</td>
<td>→ Oligarchic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Free choices across the board</td>
<td>→ Anarchic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The “best” solution for everyone</td>
<td>→ Democratic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual work, internal sources of reference</td>
<td>→ Internal style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cooperate, external sources of reference</td>
<td>→ External style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The abstract and general</td>
<td>→ Global style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The concrete and detailed</td>
<td>→ Local style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Known material and methods</td>
<td>→ Conservative style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New material and methods</td>
<td>→ Progressive style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 9 – D-SA-LSI survey and background information survey in English

For information on the D-SA-LSI survey, please contact:

Tine Nielsen  
Educational Senior Adviser - BSc, MSc, PhD Psychology  
CBS Learning Lab  
Kilevej 14A, 2.  
room K 2.62  
DK 2000 Frederiksberg  
Telephone: +45 3815 2988  
Fax: +45 3815 2784  
E-mail: tn.ll@cbs.dk
Appendix 10 – Organisational structure for Copenhagen Bombay
See following page.
APPENDIX 11 – Copenhagen Bombay’s value chain for production of a typical feature film

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-production</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Post-production</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>Film development</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Scenography</td>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>strategy</td>
<td>Video/ DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Strategy for</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Digital</td>
<td>launch</td>
<td>Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shooting of film</td>
<td>manipulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copenhagen Bombay A/S  
Nordisk Film

Reference

APPENDIX 12 – Example of how decision-making in Wulffmorgenthaler is based on the artistic quality of products

Example of how decision-making in Wulffmorgenthaler occurs predominantly on the basis of artistic quality of products and not profitability

”Anders and Mikael had an idea for an online TV show. They produced the material but ended up with not launching it, even though it may have had generated a positive ROI. All because they did not feel it was in their spirit and didn’t fully mach their universe. The result of this decision was thousands of DKK in sunk cost. Similar situations often characterize Wulffmorgenthaler, hence, I will argue that the artistic logic often jeopardize the economic logic of practise in an organization as Wulffmorgenthaler” (Lind-Holm, 2008: 4).

APPENDIX 13 – Example of how artistic logic dominates Wulffmorgenthaler

Example of how artistic logic dominates Wulffmorgenthaler, sometimes at the expense of economic logic

”When Anders and Mikael, [winter 2007], shot their advertising film for the WM strip calendar 2008 they had so much joy in shooting the scenes that they ignored all the opportunities for cost minimizing the project. Everything developed so fast that they, knowing full well, ended up with ruin a brand new stationary computer, new partitions and other technical materials by not switching the equipments with some old ones. Though more of us suggested switching the new computer with an old one, Anders refused and said it could destroy the creative moment” (Lind-Holm, 2008: 3).
APPENDIX 14 – D-SA-LSI average mean scores

For creatives (n=14) and suits (n=6) also including maximum and minimum points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning styles</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>6,86</td>
<td>5,5714</td>
<td>.81006</td>
<td>5,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1,86</td>
<td>6,14</td>
<td>4,4796</td>
<td>1,37551</td>
<td>2,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>3,14</td>
<td>5,71</td>
<td>4,5612</td>
<td>.88855</td>
<td>4,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic</td>
<td>2,43</td>
<td>4,71</td>
<td>3,5510</td>
<td>.67440</td>
<td>2,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>6,43</td>
<td>4,7449</td>
<td>1,06931</td>
<td>3,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>4,71</td>
<td>3,2143</td>
<td>.84562</td>
<td>2,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>3,14</td>
<td>6,00</td>
<td>4,6633</td>
<td>.80346</td>
<td>2,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>3,29</td>
<td>6,14</td>
<td>4,9490</td>
<td>.80736</td>
<td>3,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>6,57</td>
<td>4,2449</td>
<td>.93498</td>
<td>2,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>5,57</td>
<td>4,1122</td>
<td>.86112</td>
<td>4,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>5,14</td>
<td>3,5714</td>
<td>1,01015</td>
<td>2,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>3,71</td>
<td>7,00</td>
<td>5,4490</td>
<td>.99584</td>
<td>4,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>3,14</td>
<td>7,00</td>
<td>5,8980</td>
<td>1,21403</td>
<td>4,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>1,29</td>
<td>5,29</td>
<td>3,5918</td>
<td>1,06294</td>
<td>2,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 15 – D-SA-LSI sum mean scores

For creatives (n=14) and suits (n=6) also including maximum and minimum points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning styles</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SUITS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. error mean</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39,0000</td>
<td>5,67044</td>
<td>1,51549</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38,5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31,3571</td>
<td>9,62854</td>
<td>2,57334</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29,5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31,9286</td>
<td>6,21987</td>
<td>1,66233</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34,3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,8571</td>
<td>4,72077</td>
<td>1,26168</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33,2143</td>
<td>7,48515</td>
<td>2,00049</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35,3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25,5000</td>
<td>5,91933</td>
<td>1,58201</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21,3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32,6429</td>
<td>5,62422</td>
<td>1,50314</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32,0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34,6429</td>
<td>5,65151</td>
<td>1,51043</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34,8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29,7143</td>
<td>6,54486</td>
<td>1,74919</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29,3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28,7857</td>
<td>6,02787</td>
<td>1,61101</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31,0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25,0000</td>
<td>7,07107</td>
<td>1,88982</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25,6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38,1429</td>
<td>6,97090</td>
<td>1,86305</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40,0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41,2857</td>
<td>8,49822</td>
<td>2,27125</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42,8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25,1429</td>
<td>7,44061</td>
<td>1,98859</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22,6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 16 – T-test for equality of means tested on sum scores for each learning scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Scale</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEG_s1</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC_s1</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUD_s1</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON_s1</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIER_s1</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
<td>-0.710</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLG_s1</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAR_s1</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>[-4.57708, 5.57708]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO_s1</td>
<td></td>
<td>,070</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,945</td>
<td>-19048</td>
<td>2,70226</td>
<td>-5,86772</td>
<td>5,48676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,073</td>
<td>10,265</td>
<td>,943</td>
<td>-19048</td>
<td>2,61582</td>
<td>-5,99855</td>
<td>5,61760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,121</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,905</td>
<td>,38095</td>
<td>3,14590</td>
<td>-6,22834</td>
<td>6,99025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,124</td>
<td>10,058</td>
<td>,904</td>
<td>,38095</td>
<td>3,07204</td>
<td>-6,45865</td>
<td>7,22056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,859</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,402</td>
<td>-2,21429</td>
<td>2,57778</td>
<td>-7,62999</td>
<td>3,20142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,168</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>,258</td>
<td>-2,21429</td>
<td>1,8615</td>
<td>-6,19794</td>
<td>1,76937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,209</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,837</td>
<td>-6,6667</td>
<td>3,18589</td>
<td>-7,35998</td>
<td>6,02665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,244</td>
<td>13,857</td>
<td>,811</td>
<td>-6,6667</td>
<td>2,73542</td>
<td>-6,53926</td>
<td>5,20593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,581</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,568</td>
<td>-1,85714</td>
<td>3,19497</td>
<td>-8,56953</td>
<td>4,85525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,651</td>
<td>12,536</td>
<td>,527</td>
<td>-1,85714</td>
<td>2,85265</td>
<td>-8,04317</td>
<td>4,32888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,389</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,702</td>
<td>-1,54762</td>
<td>3,97693</td>
<td>-9,90285</td>
<td>6,80761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,418</td>
<td>11,268</td>
<td>,684</td>
<td>-1,54762</td>
<td>3,70401</td>
<td>-9,67653</td>
<td>6,58129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS_s1</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>,698</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>,494</td>
<td>2,47619</td>
<td>3,54683</td>
<td>-4,97542</td>
<td>9,92780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>,725</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>,484</td>
<td>2,47619</td>
<td>3,41549</td>
<td>-5,09526</td>
<td>10,04764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 17 – Legislative learning style – categorical distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATIVE STYLE</th>
<th>Medium strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 18 – Progressive learning style – categorical distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRESSIVE STYLE</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Medium strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 19 – Oligarchic learning style – categorical distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLIGARCHIC STYLE</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Medium strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 20 – Learning styles of independent artists versus the sample creatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT ARTISTS</th>
<th>CREATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>5,95</td>
<td>0,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3,21</td>
<td>1,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchic</td>
<td>4,81</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>4,55</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>5,19</td>
<td>0,78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gridley (2007)