

Article

The Sustainability of Creativity

Anna-Maria Kanzola and Panagiotis E. Petrakis *

Department of Economics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 10562 Athens, Greece; annmkanz@econ.uoa.gr

* Correspondence: ppetrak@econ.uoa.gr

Abstract: Creativity is a critical element of sustainable development. In current paper it is described through Social Identity by identifying the main factors that shape the background of creativity. We conclude that health, maturity, and positive attitudes of cultural change as well as the social stability, the environmental care and finally, the incentives, material and non-material, shape the human creative dynamism.

Keywords: creativity; culture; Greece



Citation: Kanzola, A.-M.; Petrakis, P.E. The Sustainability of Creativity. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 2776. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052776>

Academic Editors:
Mohammad Nurunnabi and
Andrea Pérez

Received: 31 January 2021
Accepted: 23 February 2021
Published: 4 March 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The concept of creativity refers to the development of a new product, service or means of solving a problem and it is highly important for both the individual and society in general [1]. Cultural background includes social beliefs, customs, systems of sanctions and rewards, and social institutions [2,3]. It is fostered and promoted through social learning [4] and social interactions. Sustainability of economic development is a major issue of policy making as new creative ideas must be applied in order to achieve sustainable development. A culture that focuses to sustainability goals embeds creativity as well because it is a critical factor of change, after all, creativity and sustainability are closely linked [5]. On the other hand, the development of the social background hinges on human inventiveness and creativity. The development of the social background hinges on human inventiveness and creativity.

In economic science, creativity is an essential component of development and entrepreneurship [6–10]. It is probably the basic source of business ideas responsible for the successful growth of the economy. At times (like today) characterized by conditions of intense uncertainty and low nominal returns, the creative function plays an important part as it seeks out (rare) business opportunities and contributes to their successful implementation. Creative individuals are the ones who bring about a productive change in the system.

This paper attempts to quantify creativity and the factors shaping it in relation to Greek society, utilizing empirical field research data from the two-year period 2019–2020. It is noted that the behavioral profile of 2020, despite displaying certain effects from the COVID-19 crisis, shows a comparative stability in relation to that of 2019, [11] mainly due to the widely held conviction that COVID-19 is a short-term crisis.

Usually, creativity is approached through the observation of individual (psychological) traits [12]. Here, a wider approach to the factors impacting creativity is selected, through social identity theory. A similar approach has been attempted in the past [13] focusing on those traits of social groups which shape creativity and how it is received by the environment. Next, the behavioral profile is elaborated of (Greek) society, as it is affected by objective factors (education, age, etc.) and its influence on creativity is discussed.

Part 2 is devoted to a theoretical analysis of the behavioral profile of societies and the factors determining creativity and how identity relates overall to creativity. In Part 3, issues are presented to do with the measurement of the behavioral profile and creativity,

the specifications of the variables and the information used. In Part 4, the results are presented of the quantitative analysis of the data and Part 5 is a discussion of the findings and of how creativity may be fostered within society.

2. The Theoretical Background of Behavioral Identity and Creativity

In the past, when societies were more compact, identity was to a large degree assigned, not chosen or adopted. In modern times, the concept of identity is laden with the sense of personal *being* as a function of the rate of changes in the social frameworks. Such changes may concern the social groups and networks wherein individual identities have been incorporated but also the social structures and practices under which the networks themselves are subsumed. [14]

Identity Theory [15] focuses on the interconnections between societal interrelationships and how they in turn shape Social Identity (Social Identity Theory) [16]. Social identity incorporates emotional parameters and is correlated to psychological state [17]. Certainly, it can have a personal character, hence Burke's [18] theoretical approach which centers on self-reflection processes. The distinction between social identity vs. identity is weakened as the individual's complexity is constrained by the multiple roles the person needs to adopt in order to fulfill their goals within society. Thus, the perception of the self is affected by the individual's broader social framework.

Social identity theory explains [19] people's perception of themselves as members of particular social groups and the ways in which this perception affects their attitudes [20,21]. The theory assumes three important parameters: Social categorization, social identification and social comparison. The basic tenet of this theory is that people place themselves in categories and groups, so they automatically practice "self-categorization" [17].

In applying the above view, an important distinction is posited between two likely outcomes: The possibility of the activation of an identity under particular circumstances and the certainty of its activation. In other words, we need to recognize certain imperative conditions which certainly activate aspects of an identity (such as, for instance, cases of risk). In general, however, theoreticians of identity tend to treat the concepts of activation and salience as identical. The different aspects of identity and the respective roles assigned to them, may either accord or clash with one another, in dictating particular patterns of behavior.

The study of creativity is rooted in the 1930s [22–24] and the 1950s [25]. The definition of the concept of creativity concerns the joint occurrence of two elements, originality and effectiveness [26]. Originality cannot be easily defined because it is not a unitary construct. It is an essential concept for creativity but due to its nature it may not refer to "creativity" as examined in current paper. Effectiveness on the other hand, concerns of usefulness, fitness, and appropriateness. Thus, the concept of effectiveness is intrinsic to value. That been the case, we can list four types of creativity that are not always linked with economic performance: Responsive creativity, expected creativity, contributory creativity, and proactive creativity. Thus, individual creativity does not always result in new entrepreneurship or new creative initiatives with a direct economic outcome, although it may bring about improvements in particular sectors, such as state services, or certain aspects of social life.

The main questions the researcher is called to answer concern the process of creativity. Why do people become involved in creative processes and under what stimulus does this occur? Does creativity possess sustainable characteristics in the sense that it is shaped by permanent cultural by nature influences or it is a random phenomenon dependent on accidental circumstances? Within the field of social psychology, to answer these questions, empirical analysis needs to focus on particular social factors (vis a vis unitary social environments).

The foremost and most self-evident task is the research of social constraints, then, subsequent research to define the precise mechanisms whereby exogenous constraints obstruct creativity. Third, for reasons both theoretical and practical, an attempt will have

to be made to shift those social constraints so that they promote and benefit creativity. Therefore, research will have to determine the conditions under which a model of social identity affects creativity, whether positively or negatively, incorporating universal social environments-families, and cultures.

The factors positively affecting creativity hinge on a range of spaces [27,28]: Cultural background: Whether in the form of personal character traits or of collective expression, it fosters creativity. Motives: Personal motives are a basic source of mobilizing individual creativity, particularly endogenous motives relating to wellbeing, spontaneity and the improvement of the material and non-material quality of life (motives for greater wealth, improvement of quality of living [...]). The prevailing motives are part of the basic behavioral identity. Knowledge and education: Cognitive skills constitute basic mental models [29] which individuals use to process the information they access. The way in which the level of education affects the level of creativity differs among individuals, as the role of each person's wider environment is particularly critical, inducing differences in the perception of discovery, invention and innovation. Financial Political Institutions and Networking Conditions: The institutional environment (economic, political, social) and environment impacts on entrepreneurial activity either as obstacle or as support [30,31]. Specifically, the economic environment influences the degree of creativity mainly through wealth, financial stability, the availability of capital and taxation [29,32,33], while the political environment does so through political will and freedom as well as the degree of concentration of power [34,35]. Networking can affect positively creativity [36].

There are several approaches to the concept of representations of the self, emphasizing aspects such as the dynamic change of time and the field of reference. For example, personal and social identity theories [37] differ in terms of the perception of the individual's uniqueness and in terms of those elements that differentiate the personal sense of the self from the social one. The structure of the self is affected by the cultural background and relationships with others [38].

In this paper, we focus on social identity, ascribing the highest importance to the social milieu and in the empirical analysis, this is examined in terms of self-categorization. As expected, the focus on this aspect of the factors influencing creativity, i.e., social identity, only offers a partial interpretation of social creativity. The degree of interpretation of creativity is further delimited as it does not include variables such as availability of resources, degree of social diffusion of creativity, level of economic development and a range of other economic factors. Moreover, it is important to note that only because someone may identify themselves as "creative" that does not necessarily make them so. Nevertheless, the answers to questions such as "it is important for the subject to be creative" provide an indication of the degree of creativity in a society and how that is assessed. It makes sense that the higher the index of recognition of creativity, the higher the creative forces in a society and, hence, in an economy.

3. Data and Methodology

The elaboration of identity relates to the way the social group in which the individual belongs affects the knowledge, interpretations and beliefs, strategies, and behaviors which determine individual and collective action. There is no particular consensus about the construction and measurement of social identity [39]. Likewise, there are disagreements about the methodological approach to the content and goals of identity and to how its component parts (knowledge, interpretations, etc.) interact with and affect identity.

In order for agreement to be reached between the theoretical approaches and the findings of empirical research, any technique of measurement of identity needs to possess four characteristics [40]. First, the standards of quantitative analysis need to be able to be used in multivariate analysis. Second, it will need to produce interpretative means for the complex role of identity. Third, it will have to sufficiently determine the main factors affecting the quantitative method and fourth, it will have to include the concepts of self

and of role. Most relevant research, although it quantifies such concepts in order to explain them, rarely satisfies all four of those criteria.

There are also issues with the fact that, if identity is an independent variable with explanatory power as regards social, political and economic phenomena, then, how and why does it fluctuate and, more importantly, how is the researcher able to identify these modulations? So far, in order to counteract the difficulties in the literature, we encounter “identity-like language” (“we are like . . .”, “they are like . . .”) used to describe identity in order to define it [41]. It becomes clear that the use of identity as a variable is a challenging project, even though we come across it with increasing frequency [42]. More frequently, analysis is based on detailed interviews. The major issue is the formulation of the questions used in field research, which are the result of an interdisciplinary approach to the fields wherein social identity is shaped. Below are the arguments for choosing the variables that were used.

In our analysis we take age into consideration [43] as a factor indicative of the level of maturity in identity, and also the person’s state of health [44] insofar as it makes sense for a healthy person to have high motivation in seeking new experiences. A predisposition that is megalothymia [45,46] and equitable [47–49] also described by Fukuyama [50] are basic indicators of social identity as they concern the ways in which a person defines themselves in relation to their environment.

An important factor in shaping identity is considered to be the educational background [51]. The overall development and cultivation of the person’s mental and emotional qualities through agencies of socialization, such as educational institutions, affect the person’s attitudes and beliefs about the world and their relationships with others. Thus, for example, people of a common educational background may show similarities in their intention to protect the environment [52] and to offer selfless assistance to their fellow men (altruism) [53]. In tandem with altruism, the degree of trust [54] which people display towards their fellow man, is important.

People’s income indicates the means and degree of ease in acquiring material goods and accessing services, so another dimension of identity is income status [48] including motives as to become wealthy [46] given the role played by income in social life. Political self-position [55,56] affects beliefs about the role of the state in economic development [57] as it concerns the policies of wealth distribution and the welfare system. Overall, securing one’s means of livelihood offers the individual the opportunity to pursue felicity and having a good time [58] so, it relates to levels of happiness [44] and life satisfaction [58].

The feeling of security [59] assures people’s ability to pursue their wishes and live their life freely, hence it influences their level of felicity. People who state they feel safe are expected to recognize the importance of disciplinary rules [60] such as the educational role of socialization agencies, and to acknowledge external values [61] such as consistency in carrying out instructions issued by superiors.

When common elements emerge among identities, then, cohesive structures are created leading to new formations, i.e., to collective identities. One of the most salient examples of collective identity is national identity. Individuals sharing the same national identity have as shared reference points, common customs and traditions, language, political notions and, exceptions notwithstanding, the willingness to defend their national identity. Common religion [62] and adhering to traditions [63] are important elements of cohesion and mutual recognition of the members of a social group. At the same time, the issue of the shifting of national identity [64,65] i.e., the issue of the redefinition of cultural values [66,67] may explain behaviors relating to the role of migrants. It becomes clear, then, that identity is instrumental in social cohesion or in creating rifts and is thus of major significance as a causal factor in a variety of social, economic and political phenomena.

There are 26 questions describing social identity found in in Table A1 in the Appendix A. This selection has been done according to the above premises of the theory. They fall into two sections. In the first are presented the degree of satisfaction and the state of the individual (happiness, satisfaction, state of health, feeling of security). In the

second section three subsections are included, as follows: (a) Basic traits of the respondent (equitability, megalothymia, religion, tradition, abiding by rules, acknowledgment of external values, pursuit of felicity), (b) elements of life attitude (role of migrants, role of the state, political change, altruism, environment, trust, motive for wealth increase, surprises, decision making, adventure seeking, political self-position), and (c) demographic data (income status, age, and educational background). It is noted that we consider creativity a dependent variable so, it is not included as an integral component of behavioral identity.

As in the case of identity, the issue of the description and measurement of creativity is also complex. Overall, the three following ways have been found for resolving the issue [12]: A series of creativity tests which include traditional approaches to the characteristics of creativity (i.e., creative personality scales [. . .] as well as other tests to do with behavior and environmental traits. Another approach focuses on the traits that lead us to ascertain that an individual is creative, which are usually intrinsic in character, while, finally, subjective assessments are used such as the creation of biographical dictionaries etc. The two latter approaches are not frequently chosen.

In the present paper, the first approach is undertaken for detecting creativity within society. The answers are correlated to the question “Is it important for the person to have new ideas and be creative? Does the person like doing things in their own original way?” Field research within Greek society was conducted for two years running, 2019 and 2020. It was conducted by a survey bureau, member of the European Society for Opinion and Market Research (ESOMAR) and the Market Research and Public Opinion Companies Association (SEDEA) with personal interviews in households, using a printed questionnaire.

To avoid historical peculiarities, mainly due to COVID-19 in 2020, we treated the two years as one, increasing the number of available observations to 1600. As the number of observations is exceedingly high, we took the opportunity of eliminating extreme values through residual answers such as “I don’t know” and “I do not answer further”. This reduced the full answers to 1305 and the dimensions of the data set thus was 1305×26 .

The population of respondents were men and women over the age of eighteen from the urban and rural areas of the Greek mainland and islands, with a knowledge of Greek sufficient for the purposes of the interview. The sample size was eight hundred people each year. The sample choice was made by means of proportional to population size sampling. The research took place in October 2019 and October 2020, with the participation of 39 researchers and 8 supervisors. 25% of interviews were checked by means of re-contacting the households and 100% electronically. The results were filed according to the distribution in the population of age and gender. 51% were women and 49% were men. Their age was distributed as follows: 10% were 18–24 years old, 7% were 25–34 years old, 18% were 35–44 years old, 17% were 45–54 years old, 14% were 55–64 years old and 24% were 65 years old or older. 24% had had primary education, 50% high school education and 26% tertiary education. Seventeen percent were free professionals, 3% were farmers, producers, and stockbreeders, 36% were wage earners, 9% were unemployed, 8% were housewives, 6% were students, and 22% were pensioners. Concerning the answers about creativity, in the Greek society of 2019–2020, the majority (63.5%) replied that it was “very much” important to feel creative. After running the regression we will discuss this finding.

All the variables were standardized so that the scale of measurement of the answers to each set of questions does not play a part in the unitary quantification of the variables. For the application of Principal Component Analysis the FactoMineR and Factoextra packets were used. FactoMineR is an R packet for the analysis of research data with multiple variables. Factoextra is an R packet which facilitates the extraction and visualization of data analyses with multiple variables, such as PCA. The R packet Factoextra provides flexible and handy methods for the speedy extraction in readable form of the analysis results from the packet previously referred to (FactoMiner). Packets were used in R language in a programming environment R Studio. The FactoMineR packet was used to calculate the Principal Components and the Factoextra packet was used for the extraction, visualization and interpretation of the results.

4. Empirical Analysis

PCA is a linear method of data compression where the coordinates of a data package are redefined into another smaller system of coordinates. This process takes place on the basis of a linear combination derived from the initial variables whereby a new set of variables is created, known as principal components (PC). Every PC is a linear combination of the original variables. All the main data are orthogonal in relation to each other, so there is no redundant information. The first PC has the greatest variance and contains most of the information and following that, the next PC explain progressively less percentages within the variance. The PC cannot be correlated by definition. PCA provides a quantity of information [68,69] whose utilization is challenging.

The statistically significant PC, contain important information which mainly refers to the character of the PC formed by the partial variables which score high loadings at every PC. We utilize only those that have loadings equal to or higher than 0,30. Thus, we focus our attention on PC1, PC2, PC3, PC4, PC5, PC6, PC8, PC21, and PC24 which have a satisfactory explanatory power (R^2) of creativity, reaching to 30% of how it is shaped, a percentage we take to be satisfactory for cross section data [70,71].

The specification of these important variables via the basic Principal Components used, allows us to move onto the next stage of the analysis of the dependent variable of creativity. So, using as independent variables those with a loading greater than 0.30 and belonging to statistically significant PC (level of significance 5%) we run a regression in relation to creativity. The regression indicates the inclusion of many variables which have no statistical significance. We therefore eliminate all the variables which are not statistically significant at 5% and redefine the regression. The results are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Regression 2019–2020 (1305 × 11).

Residuals:					
Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max	
−2.2008	−0.5656	−0.125	0.4752	3.613	
Coefficients:					
	Estimate	Std. Error	<i>t</i> value	Pr(> <i>t</i>)	
(Intercept)	−2.1684	0.19341	−11.211	$<2 \times 10^{16}$	***
State of Health	0.16773	0.03064	5.474	5.27×10^8	***
Megalothymia	0.17432	0.01983	8.792	$<2 \times 10^{16}$	***
Religiosity	0.04748	0.01084	4.379	1.29×10^5	***
Tradition	0.07187	0.02409	2.984	2.90×10^3	**
Adherence to rules	0.09782	0.0281	3.481	5.16×10^4	***
The role of migrants	0.12114	0.03315	3.655	2.68×10^4	***
Cultural change	0.02831	0.01279	2.213	2.71×10^2	*
Become wealthy	0.07559	0.0182	4.154	3.49×10^5	***
Age	0.07414	0.01772	4.184	3.05×10^5	***
Happiness	−0.05217	0.01248	−4.181	3.10×10^5	***

Notes: Signif. codes: 0 “***” 0.001 “**” 0.01 “*” 0.05 “.” 0.1 “ ” 1. All variables have been eliminated which are not significant at 5%. Residual standard error: 0.8526 on 1294 degrees of freedom; Multiple R-squared: 0.2786, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2731; F-statistic: 49.98 on 10 and 1294 DF, *p*-value: $<2.2 \times 10^{16}$.

On the matter of the relationship between happiness and creativity, the main view is that happiness correlates positively with creative thought [72]. Well-being has been linked with high levels of creativity and appreciation of beauty [73] although there are finds that show a reverse causal direction. In this context, we investigate the extent to

which well-being affects creativity, so we will be paying closer attention to the presence of the variable of happiness. In our paper we found that the higher is the level of happiness the less the identification of the respondent with a creative profile. It is thus revealed that creativity is linked with the need to solve the issue of the individual's fundamental goal which is the improvement of happiness. When higher levels of happiness are attained (which implies higher levels of income status and well-being) there is less pressure to engage in creative projects, particularly in societies (such as the Greek one) where necessity entrepreneurship plays a very important role [74]. At this point, we must point out that we are not referring to the extent to which creativity contributes to improving quality of life, which may very well be the case and with which the relevant bibliography deals as a rule [75] but with the reverse relationship, i.e., the extent to which quality of life is a significant factor in developing creativity.

The relevance of the state of health, in that it affects the physical potential for creativity, has been mainly analyzed in the direction of the therapeutic potential of artistic creativity. It is certainly reasonable to assume that for an individual's active engagement, a good level of physical and mental health is required. Indeed, creativity is considered as a form of active mental health with manifestations such as positive self-regard, autonomy, and competence. We do, nevertheless, need to consider that in the present analysis, the factor of health may also enter due to the COVID-19 crisis.

The interaction of age and creativity is investigated for two main reasons: (a) Because of the concept of the enrichment of abilities from the standpoint of organizational management and (b) because of the phenomenon of ageing in developed societies. Given these considerations, the conditions need to be identified whereby older individuals can take an inventory of accumulated knowledge, to utilize in the development of creative ideas [76]. Empirical observations indicate that creativity is reduced with age; however, a more in depth investigation reveals that with particular aspects of creativity (e.g., novel writing, philosophy) this happens at a much slower rate.

On the basis of data from the World Values Survey [77], the effect of various religious on national creativity and on the level of per capita GDP was examined in 87 countries [78]. The results indicated that: (a) High religiosity correlates negatively with creativity at a national level, (b) the percentage of Protestants and Christians is positively correlated with creativity at a national level, and (c) the level of GDP positively correlated with creativity and level of religiosity, particularly amongst Christians and Protestants. Perhaps this is a result of the cultural background and the historical links of Protestantism to capitalism that allowed economic activities to flourish during 15th century [79]. The official religion in Greece is Orthodox Christianity which in the cultural dimensions of Inglehart [80] is classed near the behaviors of Catholic Europe. In this sense, a positive correlation is justified between religiosity and creativity in Greek society. In addition, in the context of this paper, the concept of religion gets a wider meaning (see below) which relates to the stability of cultural values. Thus, we differentiate from the concrete meaning of the religion and we refer to the notion of a more general framework of life. Under the above consideration age, other variables (except happiness) and religion enter in the explanatory model as positive influences.

The English word tradition derives etymologically from the Latin *traditio* which means to deliver something to someone, to transfer it. Tradition (beliefs, customs, practices) is something that is passed down from the past to the present and from the present to the future. Traditions, then—as a symbolic institution and the most significant nucleus of human energy—and creativity often appear as contrary concepts, without this being always the case. It merits examination whether they are indeed contrary concepts or complementary ones, which require one another in order to survive. Hayek [63] emphasizes the economic performance of traditions as a vehicle for the transfer of and access to information.

Mainly occasioned by methodology issues in education, when sanctions are imposed on diversity, this appears to have inhibitory effect on creativity. At the level of the workplace, ideas can originate anywhere, although this does not mean that managers are to rely

on the random appearance of creative ideas. In conclusion, it is advisable that there should be a balance [81] in the relationship between discipline and creativity, which is to not say that discipline cannot contribute to the shaping of creativity.

It is important to point out that the effects that shape creativity have certain stable and sustainable cultural characteristics. Cultural change [82] may be found in novel ideas, social norms and behaviors. This is a dynamic process requiring decades or, even, centuries [83] and is often related to external migration which in turn affects creativity [84,85]. The variety of cultural evolution [86] and the role played by intercultural differences affect creativity [84] through complex changes in different aspects of culture [87–91]. Through the study of cultural cognitive differences (usually Eastern vs. Western culture) we may evaluate the positive influence [92] of the existence and, also, the change of cultural values on creativity, the diversity of ideas, different understanding of opportunities for creativity, the disregard of rules and regulations which are not found in other categories. So, the issue of the role of migrants is relevant to the analysis, since it can affect the environment either as a factor of expanding possibilities (buying power) or as a factor of availability of inexpensive as well as specialized labor [93]. In cultural change forces are recognized which mobilize creativity. A characteristic example is the difference between usefulness and novelty in societies, particularly between Eastern and Western cultures [85]. Of interest is the attitude to cultural change not just as a source of new inspiration but, overall, regarding the wider concept of change and openness to evolution, an important part of which is creativity.

It is of interest indeed to compare the relationship of creativity to monetary and social rewards. A series of studies [46] has shown that the preference for monetary rewards includes a focus on performance while preference for social rewards includes a normative focus, which in turn weakens the motive for originality and hence leads to outcomes of a lower quality in terms of originality. The reverse happens if there is a strong focus on performance.

5. Discussion of the Evidence

In the current historical period, the Greek economy has been stabilized [94] following the Great Financial Depression of 2011–2016 [95] and in this sense, the field research of 2019 expresses relative stable social behaviors. Due to COVID-19, the year 2020 is one of exogenous recession [94–96] and for that reason, certain behavioral data (such as the emphasis on health matters) may be due to the impact of the COVID-19 crisis. Nevertheless, we chose to create a unitary data package for the 2019–2020 period, so that attention is focused on the more basic elements shaping the factors which contribute to creativity.

The Greek economy has always been characterized by a low rate of innovative products and ideas and of effective creativity overall [97,98]. Basic attributes of the Greek economy are a weak productive model, a high degree of self-employed [95,99]—who may potentially consider themselves creative actors—and a high prevalence of small-to-middle entrepreneurial activities with small predisposition to becoming larger enterprises [95,100]. Necessity entrepreneurship occurs with a high frequency [98,101] by contrast to opportunity entrepreneurship.

Also, the degree of society's satisfaction with the operation of the public sector is exceptionally low [95,102] in relation to other countries of the OECD, which means that the indicators of weak effectiveness do not only apply to the private sector, but extend to the public sector also. Thus, the weak economic effectiveness of the social and productive system can be considered to positively correlate with the weak presence of creativity in Greek society.

The variables that seem to significantly affect creativity are eleven in number: The intercept which express behaviors and forces that do not appear in our analysis, the level of happiness (a negative relation for the last one), the state of health, age, megalothymia, religiosity, tradition, adherence to rules, the role of migrants and cultural change, and finally the motive of becoming wealthy. These variables constitute the basic characteristics of

behavioral identity which shape creativity while the remaining aspects we have described do not appear to be statistically significant. Below, in Table 2 we conclude the factors shaping creativity in the Greek Society (2019–2020).

Table 2. The Shaping of Creativity in Greek Society 2019–2020.

Basic Conditions	(-) Happiness, Health, Age, Cultural Change, Role of Migrants
Stability (Basic Values)	Religion, Tradition, Adherence to Rules
Dynamism	Megalothymia, Become Wealthy

We organized the explanatory variables in three groups. The variables of health, age, happiness, and cultural change (including the role of migrants) critically affect the concept of creativity and, as such, are henceforth linked to the Basic Conditions of the development of creativity.

The variables religion, tradition, adherence to rules will be now linked with what we designate as Stability (Basic Values) of the environment in which creativity becomes active and there are connected with the human basic needs.

Finally, incentives (Megalothymia, Become Wealthy) contribute to the “dynamic” shaping of creativity and there are connected with the human goals shaping Dynamism. The factor of Dynamism is made up of incentives and their positive role in creativity [103,104]. Thus, two motives are detected which are megalothymia (the need for recognition for one’s personal achievements) and wealth seeking, which appear to be the most pronounced positive forces for creativity.

In the first group, Basic Conditions, the variables of health and age are the departure point for the development of creativity and have a positive influence. In other words, for a person to be creative, a satisfactory level of health and maturity (age) are necessary. Indeed, the average age of practicing entrepreneurship in Greece is fairly high [101]. Positive influences are exercised from the cultural change. The only negative variable is the level of happiness.

In the second group, Stability (Basic Values), three variables are included: The individual’s religiosity, their trust in tradition and their trust in discipline and rules that need to be adhered to. Within this group, three sub-concepts are distinguished: Personal identity [105] organizational stability, with its most usual form relating to hierarchic stability [106] and social stability as an attribute of the environment wherein the individual lives and develops. In relation to personal identity, older research [107] argued in favor of the positive effect of stability as a personality trait on creativity, whereas more recent research [105,108] ascertains a weaker correlation while emphasizing other human traits (plasticity, divergence etc.) as factors fostering creativity. Hierarchical structures which are a necessary component of social organization, create social stability. When power positions become weakened, individuals with little power are characterized by more flexible thinking and may have more creative ideas [106]. Consequently, in this case, stability affects creativity negatively.

The concept of Social Stability as employed in the present context, is the outcome of social cohesion and cooperation [109] which is expressed through religion [110] and tradition as elements that shape and maintain social constructions. In other words, stability is the cultural factor common to all three concepts: “Religion”, “tradition”, and “adherence to rules”. The creative individual, then, does not disregard social norms but, through the third group presented below, Dynamism, utilizes them for creative ends. Essentially, Stability (Basic Values) operates as an incubator wherein the personal system of decisions is stabilized and creativity thrives.

The third group, Dynamism, expresses the propensity for change once the necessary motives are in place for the individual to be creative. It belongs to the Goals that humans are setting for their economic actions. It is included the need for showing and promoting one’s creations which appears to be a major motive for the development of creativity,

alongside the motive for becoming wealthy. An explanation is in order as to why we designated this factor as Dynamism: Cultural change and incentives.

In conclusion, we find that Stability is diffused everywhere and operates alongside with Basic conditions and Dynamism. Let it be noted that this is the first time that the quantification is attempted of two extremely abstract concepts such as social stability and creativity.

What is highlighted in this analysis is that Social Stability is shaped by basic elements (religion, tradition) with a longstanding historical base. Only through the educational system (adherence to rules) may creativity be influenced and, from then on, interventions which foster creativity may be the development of policies making cultural change more palatable, the establishment of rewards and, finally, the strengthening of incentives for wealth seeking (reframing taxation policies and the ideological validation of wealth as a virtue rather than something reprehensible).

Two observations have already been emphasized. First, further research will need to go deeper into the concept of creativity particularly with regard to self-employment and artistic creativity and how it relates to innovation and economic activity. Second, and in connection with our conclusion: Since stability is a significant factor shaping creativity, the relation between the two needs to be further analyzed both in causal terms and in terms of policies which may be applied to entrench it. Could, for instance, the long-term stabilization of a political and social environment result in similar positive values to the ones accruing from tradition or belief in the need to adhere to stable rules of behavior?

Our findings prove that creativity does not develop in a social and cultural vacuum, insofar as creativity is “as much a cultural attainment as a psychological reality” and, so, “the true attainment of creativity is not the supremacy it bestows on the creative individual but the fact that it confirms the importance of societies and how they allow their members to actualize their individuality” [44].

In conclusion, to the question of what determines creativity the answer refers at its Basic Conditions relating to the existence of health, maturity and the positive attitudes on cultural change, the Stability of the environment and, finally, the availability of incentives, material and non-material, which motivate creativity and shape the human Dynamism. In addition, the Basic Conditions and the Stability-Basic Values groups of variables advocate against sustainable levels of creativity in the society. The creativity in the society can be effectively flourish the developmental process through the policy enforcement of appropriate material and non-material Dynamic Incentives.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, P.E.P. and A.-M.K.; methodology, P.E.P.; software, A.-M.K.; validation, P.E.P. and A.-M.K.; formal analysis, P.E.P.; investigation, P.E.P.; resources, P.E.P.; data curation, A.-M.K.; writing-original draft preparation, P.E.P. and A.-M.K.; writing-review and editing, A.-M.K.; visualization, P.E.P. and A.-M.K.; supervision, P.E.P.; project administration, P.E.P.; funding acquisition, P.E.P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: We contacted the statistical service assigned the questionnaire project and they provided us the legal documents, unfortunately some, in greek language. Attached below.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data are available at <http://ppetrakis.gr/sites/default/files/sustainability.pdf> (accessed on 3 March 2021).

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Konstantina Papaioanou for her help in the part of the quantitative methods.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. The Variables of Identity.

Q q	Name of Variable	Question	Scale of Answers and Quantification
	1. Degree of Satisfaction and Individual State		

Table A1. Cont.

Q q	Name of Variable	Question	Scale of Answers and Quantification
13	Role of the state	The less the state intervenes in the economy, the better for the country	Completely agree. Agree. Neither agree nor disagree. Disagree. Completely disagree. 1,2,3,4,5 (respectively)
14	Cultural change	Overall, is the cultural life of Greece downgraded or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?	Scale from “Cultural life is downgraded” to “Cultural life is enriched” Scale from 0 to 10
15	Altruism	It is important for the respondent to help people around her/him.	Extremely so, Yes it’s important, It’s somewhat important, A little, Not important, Not at all important 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
16	Environment	Firmly believes that it is important for people to take care of nature.	Extremely so, Yes it’s important, It’s somewhat important, A little, Not important, Not at all important 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
17	Trust	Generally speaking, would you say that we can trust most people or should we always be cautious?	Scale from “We should always be cautious” to “We can trust most people” Scale from 0 to 10
18	Become wealthy	It is important for the respondent to be wealthy.	Extremely so, Yes it’s important, It’s somewhat important, A little, Not important, Not at all important 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
19	Surprises	The respondent likes surprises and always wants to be doing new things	Extremely so, Yes, Moderately so, A little, Not so, Not at all. 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
20	Makes decisions	It is important for the respondent to make their own decisions about what they do.	Extremely so, Yes it’s important, It’s somewhat important, A little, Not important, Not at all important 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
21	Successful	It is important for the respondent to be very successful	Extremely so, Yes it’s important, It’s somewhat important, A little, Not important, Not at all important 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
22	Seeks adventure	Seeks adventure and enjoys risk taking.	Extremely so, Yes, Moderately so, A little, Not so, Not at all. 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
23	Political self-position	In politics it is customary for people to speak of “Left” and “Right”. Where would you place yourself?	Scale from “Left” to “Right” Scale from 0 to 10
2.3. Demographics			
24	Income status	In which of the following categories does the total monthly income after tax of your household belong?	<700 euro, 701–1000 euro, 1001–1250 euro, 1251–1500 euro, 1501–1750 euro, 1750–2000 euro, 2001–2500 euro, 2501–3000 euro, 3001–4000 euro, 4001 and over 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 (respectively)

Table A1. Cont.

Q q	Name of Variable	Question	Scale of Answers and Quantification
25	Age	Age of respondent	18–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, 65+ years of age 1,2,3,4,5,6 (respectively)
26	Level of education	What is the highest level of education you have completed?	Attended some primary school, Graduated from primary school, Three years of high school, Graduated from six years of high school/Lyceum, Graduated from technical school/vocational training Institute, Graduated from Technical College, Graduated from tertiary education, Completed postgraduate studies 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 (respectively)

References

- Hennessey, B.A.; Amabile, T.M. Creativity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **2010**, *61*, 569–598. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dunbar, R.; Knight, C.; Power, C. *The Evolution of Culture An. Interdisciplinary View*; Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, UK, 1999. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Richerson, P.; Boyd, R. Not By Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution. In *Bibliovault OAI Repository*; The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2005. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bandura, A. *Social Learning Theory*; Prentice-Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1997.
- D'Orville, H. The Relationship between Sustainability and Creativity. *Cadmus* **2019**, *4*, 65–73.
- Acs, Z.; Lee, S.; Florida, R. Creativity and Entrepreneurship: A Regional Analysis of New Firm Formation. *Reg. Stud.* **2004**, *38*, 879–891. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gilad, B. Entrepreneurship: The Issue of Creativity in the Market Place. *J. Creat. Behav.* **1984**, *18*, 151–161. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Nyström, K. The institutions of economic freedom and entrepreneurship: Evidence from panel data. *Public Choice* **2008**, *136*, 269–282. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Schumpeter, J.A. *The Theory of Economic Development*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1911.
- Whiting, B.G. Creativity and Entrepreneurship: How Do They Relate? *J. Creat. Behav.* **1988**, *22*, 178–183. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Petrakis, P.E.; Kafka, K.I.; Kostis, P.C.; Valsamis, D.G. *Greek Culture after the Financial Crisis: An. Economic Analysis*; Palgrave MacMillan: London, UK, 2021; (Accepted to be published).
- Amabile, T.M. *Creativity and Innovation in Organizations*; Harvard Business School: Boston, MA, USA, 1996; Volume 15.
- Haslam, S.A.; Adarves-Yorno, I.; Postmes, T.; Jans, L. The Collective Origins of Valued Originality: A Social Identity Approach to Creativity. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* **2013**, *17*, 384–401. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Howard, J.A. Social Psychology of Identities. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **2020**, *26*, 367–393. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Stryker, S.; Burke, P.J. The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* **2020**, *63*, 284–297. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Tajfel, H. Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **1982**, *33*, 1–39. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Turner, J.C.; Hogg, M.A.; Oakes, P.J.; Reicher, S.D.; Wetherell, M.S. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*; Basil Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1987.
- Hogg, M.A.; Terry, D.J.; White, K.M. A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* **1995**, *58*, 255–269. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hogg, M.A.; Ridgeway, C. Social identity: Sociological and social psychological perspectives. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* **2003**, *66*, 97–100.
- Tajfel, H. The Achievement of International-Group Differentiation. In *Differentiation between Social Groups*; London Academic Press: London, UK, 1978.
- Tajfel, H.; Turner, J.C.; Austin, W.G.; Worchel, S. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organ. Identity A Read.* **1979**, *56*, 65.
- Patrick, C. Creative thought in poets. *Arch. Psychol.* **1935**, *26*, 1–74.
- Patrick, C. Creative thought in artists. *J. Psychol. Interdiscip. Appl.* **1937**, *4*, 35–73. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Patrick, C. Scientific thought. *J. Psychol. Interdiscip. Appl.* **1938**, *5*, 55–83. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Stein, M.I. Creativity and Culture. *J. Psychol.* **1953**, *36*, 311–322. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Runco, M.; Jaeger, G. The Standard Definition of Creativity. *Creat. Res. J.* **2012**, *24*, 92–96. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Petrakis, P.E. *Culture, Growth and Economic Policy*; Springer: New York, NY, USA; Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2014.
- Petrakis, P.E.; Kostis, P. Economic growth and cultural change. *J. Socio-Econ.* **2013**, *47*, 147–157. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Audretsch, D.B.; Acs, Z.J. New-firm startups, technology, and macroeconomic fluctuations. *Small Bus. Econ.* **1994**, *6*, 439–449. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Mcmullan, W.E.; Kenworthy, T.P. *Creativity and Entrepreneurial Performance*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

31. Shane, S.A. *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham College, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, UK, 2003.
32. Bruce, D.; Mohsin, M. Tax policy and entrepreneurship: New time series evidence. *Small Bus. Econ.* **2006**, *26*, 409–425. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Djankov, S.; Ganser, T.; McLiesh, C.; Ramalho, R.; Shleifer, A. The effect of corporate taxes on investment and entrepreneurship. *Am. Econ. J. Macroecon.* **2010**, *2*, 31–64. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Roll, R.; Talbott, J. Political freedom, economic liberty, and prosperity. *J. Democr.* **2003**, *14*, 75–89. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Weymouth, S.; Broz, J.L. Government Partisanship and Property Rights: Cross-Country Firm-Level Evidence. *Econ. Politics* **2013**, *25*, 229–256. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Perry-Smith, J.E.; Shalley, C.E. The social side of creativity: A static and dynamic social network perspective. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2003**, *28*, 89–106. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. Nario-Redmond, M.R.; Biernat, M.; Eidelman, S.; Palenske, D.J. The Social and Personal Identities Scale: A Measure of the Differential Importance Ascribed to Social and Personal Self-Categorizations. *Self Identity* **2004**, *3*, 143–175. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
38. Triandis, H.C. Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural Perspectives*; University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, NE, USA, 1990; pp. 41–133.
39. Hooper, M. The Structure and Measurement of Social Identity. *Public Opin. Q.* **1976**, *40*, 154–164. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Burke, P.J.; Tully, J.C. The Measurement of Role Identity. *Soc. Forces* **1977**, *55*, 881–897. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Laitin, D.D.; Watkins, I.V.J.T. *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY, USA, 1998.
42. Abdelal, R.; Herrera, Y.M.; Johnston, A.I.; Martin, T. Treating identity as a variable: Measuring the content, intensity, and contestation of identity. *Present. APSA* **2001**, *30*, 1–33.
43. Zacher, H.; Esser, L.; Bohlmann, C.; Rudolph, C. Age, Social Identity and Identification, and Work Outcomes: A Conceptual Model, Literature Review, and Future Research Directions. *Work Aging Retire.* **2018**, *5*, 25–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Haslam, S.A.; Jetten, J.; Postmes, T.; Haslam, C. Social Identity, Health and Well-Being: An Emerging Agenda for Applied Psychology. *Appl. Psychol.* **2009**, *58*, 1–23. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Danilova, T. THE DESIRE FOR RECOGNITION IN THE CONTEXT OF FRANCIS FUKUYAMA'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY. *Anthropol. Meas. Philos. Res.* **2006**, *10*, 69–77. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Mehta, R.; Dahl, D.W.; Zhu, R. Social-Recognition versus Financial Incentives? Exploring the Effects of Creativity-Contingent External Rewards on Creative Performance. *J. Consum. Res.* **2017**, *44*, 536–553. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. Grantham, T. Creativity and Equity: The Legacy of E. Paul Torrance as an Upstander for Gifted Black Males. *Urban. Rev.* **2013**, *45*, 518–538. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Jetten, J.; Wang, Z.; Steffens, N.K.; Mols, F.; Peters, K.; Verkuyten, M. A social identity analysis of responses to economic inequality. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **2017**, *18*, 1–5. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Luria, S.R.; Kaufman, J.C. Examining the relationship between creativity and equitable thinking in schools. *Psychol. Sch.* **2017**, *54*, 1279–1284. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Fukuyama, F. *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*; Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, NY, USA, 2018; pp. 1–240. Available online: [Books.google.gr/books?id=OjpIDwAAQBAJ](https://books.google.gr/books?id=OjpIDwAAQBAJ) (accessed on 19 November 2020).
51. Kelly, S. Social identity theories and educational engagement. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.* **2009**, *30*, 449–462. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Brieger, S.A. Social Identity and Environmental Concern: The Importance of Contextual Effects. *Environ. Behav.* **2019**, *51*, 828–855. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Fowler, J.H.; Kam, C.D. Beyond the Self: Social Identity, Altruism, and Political Participation. *J. Politics* **2007**, *69*, 813–827. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Güth, W.; Levati, M.V.; Ploner, M. Social identity and trust—An experimental investigation. *J. Socio-Econ.* **2008**, *37*, 1293–1308. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Huddy, L.; Bankert, A. Political Partisanship as a Social Identity. *Oxf. Res. Encycl. Politics* **2017**, 1–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. Huddy, L.; Mason, L. Measuring Partisanship as a Social Identity, Predicting Political Activism. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology*, San Francisco, CA, USA, 7–10 July 2010.
57. Hornung, J.; Bandelow, N.C.; Vogeler, C.S. Social identities in the policy process. *Policy Sci.* **2019**, *52*, 211–231. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Wakefield, J.R.H.; Sani, F.; Madhok, V.; Norbury, M.; Dugard, P.; Gabbanelli, C.; Arnetoli, M.; Beconcini, G.; Botindari, L.; Grifoni, F.; et al. The Relationship Between Group Identification and Satisfaction with Life in a Cross-Cultural Community Sample. *J. Happiness Stud.* **2017**, *18*, 785–807. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Theiler, T. Societal Security and Social Psychology. *Rev. Int. Stud.* **2003**, *29*, 249–268. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Smyth, L.; Mavor, K.I.; Platow, M.J.; Grace, D.M.; Reynolds, K.J. Discipline social identification, study norms and learning approach in university students. *Educ. Psychol.* **2015**, *35*, 53–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. McGowan, M.; Shiu, E.; Hassan, L.M. The influence of social identity on value perceptions and intention. *J. Consum. Behav.* **2015**, *16*, 242–253. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Greil, A.; Davidman, L. Religion and identity. In *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*; Beckford, J.A., Demerath, N.J., Eds.; SAGE Publications Ltd.: London, UK, 2007; pp. 549–565. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Hayek, F.A. Freedom, reason, and tradition. *Ethics* **1958**, *68*, 229–245. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

64. Fuligni, A.J.; Flook, L. A social identity approach to ethnic differences in family relationships during adolescence. In *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*; Kail, R.V., Ed.; Elsevier Academic Press: Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2005; Volume 33, pp. 125–152. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Jaspal, R. The construction of ethnic identity: Insights from identity process theory. *Ethnicities* **2012**, *12*, 503–530. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Hamamura, T. Social Identity and Attitudes Toward Cultural Diversity: A Cultural Psychological Analysis. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* **2016**, *48*, 184–194. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Reicher, S. The Context of Social Identity: Domination, Resistance, and Change. *Political Psychol.* **2004**, *25*, 921–945. Available online: <http://www.jstor:stable/3792283> (accessed on 8 December 2020).
68. Artigue, H.; Smith, G. The principal problem with principal components regression. *Cogent Math. Stat.* **2019**, *6*, 1622190. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
69. Jolliffe, I.T.; Cadima, J. Principal component analysis: A review and recent developments. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **2016**, *374*, 20150202. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Liu, X. Cross-Sectional Data. Science Direct. Available online: www.sciencedirect.com/topics/mathematics/cross-sectional-data (accessed on 14 December 2020).
71. Longhi, S.; Nandi, A. *A Practical Guide to Using Panel Data*; SAGE Publications: London, UK, 2015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
72. Pannells, T.; Claxton, A. Happiness, Creative Ideation, and Locus of Control. *Creat. Res. J.* **2008**, *20*, 67–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Peterson, C.; Park, N.; Seligman, M.E.P. Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: The full life versus the empty life. *J. Happiness Stud.* **2005**, *6*, 25–41. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. GEM-Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. GEM 2019/2020 Global Report. Available online: www.gemconsortium:report (accessed on 12 December 2020).
75. Charyton, C.; Hutchison, S.; Snow, L.; Rahman, M.A.; Elliott, J.O. Creativity as an Attribute of Positive Psychology: The Impact of Positive and Negative Affect on the Creative Personality. *J. Creat. Ment. Health* **2009**, *24*, 57–66. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Binnewies, C.; Ohly, S.; Niessen, C. Age and creativity at work: The interplay between job resources, age and idea creativity. *J. Manag. Psychol.* **2008**, *23*, 438–457. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Liu, Z.; Guo, Q.; Sun, P.; Wang, Z.; Wu, R. Does Religion Hinder Creativity? A National Level Study on the Roles of Religiosity and Different Denominations [Original Research]. *Front. Psychol.* **2018**, *9*, 1912. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. World Values Survey. The New 2020 World Cultural Map Has Been Released. Available online: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey:WVSEventsShow.jsp?ID=428> (accessed on 10 December 2020).
79. Parsons, T. *The Structure of Social Action*; Weber. The Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1968; Volume 2, p. 368.
80. Inglehart, R. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*; Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA, 1997.
81. Walters, G.L. Creativity vs. Discipline-A Balance. *Gift. Child Q.* **1968**, *12*, 234–238. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
82. Varnum, M.E.W.; Grossmann, I. Cultural Change: The How and the Why. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **2017**, *12*, 956–972. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
83. Uz, I. The Index of Cultural Tightness and Looseness Among 68 Countries. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* **2015**, *46*, 319–335. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
84. McCarthy, M.; Chen, C.C.; McNamee, R.C. Novelty and usefulness trade-off: Cultural cognitive differences and creative idea evaluation. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* **2018**, *49*, 171–198. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
85. Shao, Y.; Zhang, C.; Zhou, J.; Gu, T.; Yuan, Y. How Does Culture Shape Creativity? A Mini-Review [Review]. *Front. Psychol.* **2019**, *10*, 1219. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
86. Steward, J.H. *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution*; University of Illinois Press: Champaign, IL, USA, 1972.
87. Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*; Sage publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1980.
88. Hofstede, G. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 1991.
89. Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*; Sage publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2001.
90. Hofstede, G.; Hofstede, G.J.; Minkov, M. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. Revised and Expanded*, 3rd ed.; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2010.
91. Schwartz, S.H. Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In *Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series*; APA: Washington, DC, USA, 1994.
92. Lubart, T.I. Creativity Across Cultures. In *Handbook of Creativity*; Sternberg, R.J., Ed.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1998; pp. 339–350. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
93. Vries, H.; Kirsch, C.; Furnham, A. Cultural Differences in Creativity: The Role of Immigration. *Int. J. Talent Dev. Creat.* **2014**, *2*, 41–51.
94. Petrakis, P.E. *The New Political Economy of Greece Up to 2030*; Springer Nature: Basingstoke, UK, 2020.
95. Petrakis, P.E. *The Evolution of the Greek Economy: Past Challenges and Future Approaches*; Springer Nature: Basingstoke, UK, 2020.
96. Petrakis, P.E. *Theoretical Approaches to Economic Growth and Development*; Palgrave MacMillan: London UK, 2020; ISBN 978-3-030-50067-2.

97. Dianeosis. *Research as a Lever for the Development of the Greek Economy*; German Institute for Economic Research DIW Economic: Athens, Greece, 2016; Available online: https://www.dianeosis.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/research_policy_gr_final.pdf (accessed on 8 December 2012). (In Greek)
98. Petrakis, P. *The Greek Economy and the Crisis: Challenges and Responses*; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2011; pp. 1–450. [CrossRef]
99. GSEVEE-The Hellenic Confederation of Professionals. *Craftsmen & Merchants The Self-Employment in Europe and Greece: A Timeless Choice and A Resilient Reality*, Petros Protopapadakis; GSEVEE: Athens, Greece, 2018.
100. GSEVEE-The Hellenic Confederation of Professionals. *Craftsmen & Merchants GSEVEE 2019 Report for Small and Medium Enterprises*; GSEVEE: Athens, Greece, 2019.
101. IOBE-The Foundation for Economic & Industrial Research Annual Entrepreneurship Report 2019–2020: Strong Rise of New Entrepreneurship. Available online: http://iobe.gr/docs/research/RES_02_23122020_REP_GR.pdf (accessed on 16 December 2020).
102. World Bank. Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) Project Reports. Available online: <Info.worldbank:governance/wgi/> (accessed on 10 December 2020).
103. Eckartz, K.; Kirchkamp, O.; Schunk, D. How Do Incentives Affect Creativity? Available online: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2198760> (accessed on 12 December 2012).
104. Erat, S.; Gneezy, U. Incentives for creativity. *Exp. Econ.* **2015**, *19*, 269–280. [CrossRef]
105. Feist, G.J. Creativity and the Big Two model of personality: Plasticity and stability. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **2019**, *27*, 31–35. [CrossRef]
106. Sligte, D.J.; de Dreu, C.K.W.; Nijstad, B.A. Power, stability of power, and creativity. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* **2011**, *47*, 891–897. [CrossRef]
107. Magnusson, D.; Backteman, G. Longitudinal Stability of Person Characteristics: Intelligence and Creativity. *Appl. Psychol. Meas.* **1978**, *2*, 481–490. [CrossRef]
108. Fürst, G. Creativity, learning, intelligence and personality. *Rev. Fr. De Pedagog.* **2016**, *4*, 23–34.
109. Durkheim, E. *The Division of Labor in Society*, 2nd ed.; Lukes, S., Ed.; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2013.
110. Fagan, P.F. Why religion matters even more: The impact of religious practice on social stability. *Backgrounder* **2006**, *1992*, 1–19.