MANAGEMENT

Kateryna Barkova, PhD in Management, Associate Professor
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics
Kharkiv, Ukraine

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-650-8-29

CREATIVE COLLABORATION IN REMOTE TEAMS: TOOLS, RITUALS, AND BEHAVIORAL BARRIERS

Creative collaboration in remote teams is often described as a simple tradeoff: less in-person energy but more flexibility and access to distributed expertise. In practice, it is more accurate to treat remote creativity as a sociotechnical capability that must be deliberately designed. Creativity at work depends on domain expertise, creative-thinking skills, and motivation, all shaped by the surrounding environment [1]. When teams go remote, that environment changes: spontaneous exchanges are rarer, context becomes unevenly distributed, and coordination is mediated by tools that can either expand or restrict how people think together. Remote teams may execute efficiently, yet still struggle to generate and integrate novel ideas, especially at early stages when the problem is ambiguous and the best path forward is unclear.

A useful way to understand what "goes wrong" is to look at communication processes rather than platforms. Remote teams constantly switch between sharing information so that people can think independently and reaching shared meaning so that they can decide and coordinate. Media synchronicity theory describes this as the difference between conveyance and convergence [3]. Creative work needs both: teams need time to absorb information, incubate ideas, and explore alternatives (conveyance), and they also need moments of alignment where they combine perspectives, resolve ambiguity, and commit to a direction (convergence). Problems arise when remote teams try to compress both processes into the same synchronous video meeting. Real-time discussion can force people to process, evaluate, and socially perform at the same time, which encourages quick agreement and reduces the cognitive space needed for exploration. This matters because controlled evidence suggests that videoconferencing, compared to in-person interaction, can curb creative idea generation by narrowing

attention and reducing the breadth of search that supports originality [6]. Remote teams can still use video effectively, but it tends to work best for convergence – clarifying meaning, negotiating tradeoffs, and integrating contributions – while divergence benefits from more asynchronous, artifact-based approaches that let people think before they speak [3; 6]. In practical terms, teams can improve creativity by adopting "solo-first" ideation: individuals generate ideas privately and submit them into a shared template, then the team meets briefly to cluster, combine, and strengthen options rather than to create everything live.

Distance also creates a less visible but equally powerful barrier: the mutual knowledge problem [4]. In dispersed collaboration, people often do not share the same situational awareness – what constraints exist, what decisions were made, what tradeoffs were considered, or what others have already learned. Teams then misinterpret silence as agreement, underestimate confusion, duplicate work, or reject ideas late because "hidden constraints" appear after investment has already been made [4]. Creativity suffers because creative solutions usually require recombining partial insights across people and functions; if those insights are not mutually visible, recombination becomes slower and more fragile. This is why remote collaboration improves when teams treat context as a deliverable: lightweight decision records, short problem-framing notes, visible assumptions, and shared artifacts that preserve the "why" behind choices. In remote settings, what remains only in someone's head or in a transient chat thread effectively does not exist for the team. Over time, the consistent use of such artifacts also supports team cognition and faster coordination, because people learn where to look for the "source of truth" and which signals matter most.

Rituals – recurring practices that create rhythm - become the bridge between tools and behavior. Remote teams cannot rely on proximity to keep everyone aligned, so they need predictable moments for framing, ideation, critique, and decision-making. Psychological safety is especially important here, because creativity requires interpersonal risk: proposing an unusual idea, questioning an assumption, admitting uncertainty, or disagreeing with someone higher-status [2]. Without safety, remote teams may appear calm and efficient while becoming less inventive, because fewer people speak candidly and the group converges prematurely on familiar solutions. Small, repeatable rituals can support safety: brief check-ins that normalize uncertainty, structured dissent moments that make disagreement legitimate rather than personal, and feedback routines that focus on improving the work rather than judging the person [2]. These

rituals also reduce the social cost of experimentation, making it more likely that teams will run small tests and learn quickly instead of debating hypotheticals. When psychological safety is strong, remote teams can treat mistakes and surprising results as information rather than as blame, which increases learning and creative adaptability.

Behavioral barriers often intensify in remote collaboration because cues are reduced and repair is slower. Conflict can escalate when messages are ambiguous and delayed, because people fill informational gaps with negative interpretations, especially under time pressure [5]. When remote teams lack clear norms for responsiveness, escalation, and media switching (for example, when to move from chat to a short call), misalignment can harden into relational tension that blocks creative exchange. A second barrier is the gradual drift of accountability and participation: if contribution is less visible, creative tasks can fall disproportionately on a small subset of the team, while others become passive observers. Over time, this reduces idea variety and ownership, which are both crucial to creative collaboration. The remedy is not surveillance, but clarity and visibility: explicit ownership for experiments, small deliverables that make progress observable, and artifact-centered collaboration that shows what has been tried and what has been learned. Leaders also shape participation through meeting design—for example, ensuring asynchronous input is collected before discussions, rotating facilitation roles, and explicitly inviting quieter members to contribute in ways that match their strengths.

At a broader level, research suggests a structural risk: remote collaboration may fuse fewer breakthrough ideas at scale, which implies that teams become less likely to generate disruptive combinations of knowledge and more likely to focus on later-stage, incremental development [7]. This pattern can emerge when organizations optimize remote work primarily for speed and throughput, unintentionally discouraging the exploration and cross-boundary recombination that breakthrough innovation requires. One practical implication is that teams should intentionally create “recombination time”: moments dedicated to reframing problems, connecting insights across functions, and challenging assumptions before the team locks into execution. In remote settings, these moments must be planned rather than hoped for, because the default flow of digital work can easily become reactive and fragmented. Even a short monthly “problem reset” session - reviewing what is known, what has changed, and what assumptions may be wrong - can help teams remain conceptually flexible.

Putting these pieces together, remote creative collaboration becomes more reliable when teams design their operating system around three principles. First, match collaboration mode to creative stage: use asynchronous, structured artifact capture to protect divergence, then use focused synchronous sessions to converge on meaning and decisions [3; 6]. Second, reduce mutual knowledge gaps by making context durable – record decisions, assumptions, constraints, and lessons learned in places where others can find and interpret them [4]. Third, treat psychological safety and conflict management as creativity infrastructure: build norms and rituals that encourage questions, dissent, and learning, and create repair paths for misunderstanding before conflict becomes personal [2; 5]. When these elements are present, remote teams can preserve the benefits of distributed expertise and flexibility while rebuilding the conditions that support originality, integration, and sustained innovation [1; 7].

References:

1. Amabile T. M., Pratt M. G. The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 2016. Vol. 36. Pp. 157–183.
2. Edmondson A. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1999. Vol. 44. No. 2. Pp. 350–383.
3. Dennis A. R., Fuller R. M., Valacich J. S. Media, tasks, and communication processes: a theory of media synchronicity. *MIS Quarterly*. 2008. Vol. 32. No. 3. Pp. 575–600.
4. Cramton C. D. The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. *Organization Science*. 2001. Vol. 12. No. 3. Pp. 346–371.
5. Hinds P. J., Bailey D. E. Out of sight, out of sync: understanding conflict in distributed teams. *Organization Science*. 2003. Vol. 14. No. 6. Pp. 615–632.
6. Brucks M. S., Levav J. Virtual communication curbs creative idea generation. *Nature.* 2022. Vol. 605. No. 7908. Pp. 108–112.
7. Lin Y., Frey C. B., Wu L. Remote collaboration fuses fewer breakthrough ideas. *Nature.* 2023. Vol. 623. No. 7989. Pp. 987–991.