

Embracing Multicultural Tensions: How Team Members' Multicultural Paradox Mindsets Foster Team Information Elaboration and Creativity

Pier Vittorio Mannucci

Bocconi University

Christina E. Shalley

Scheller College of Business

Georgia Institute of Technology

Abstract

We explore why teams with the same level of cultural diversity can differ in their level of creativity. To this end, we introduce the concept of paradox mindsets to research on multicultural teams. We argue that team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset are accepting of and energized by intercultural tensions, both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground. Their presence thus enables multicultural teams to embrace these tensions and leverage their cultural diversity toward team creativity. Specifically, we hypothesize that teams with members that have a high multicultural paradox mindset are more creative because these members promote information elaboration at the team level, which in turn fosters creativity. We test our hypotheses in a study of 217 individuals randomly assigned to 63 culturally diverse teams. Results provide support for our overarching theory.

Keywords: Multicultural teams, creativity, paradoxes, multicultural mindsets, information elaboration.

Pre-print version

Final version here: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0749597822000802>

1. Introduction

Creative teams are increasingly multicultural as a result of the ever-growing global labor pool and connectivity (Maddux, Lu, Affinito, & Galinsky, 2020; Mell, Jang, & Chai, 2021). Multicultural teams represent a specific type of diverse team characterized by the presence of members who collectively represent two or more national cultures (Earley & Gibson, 2002). National culture affects individuals' values, assumptions, traditions, and deeply held beliefs (Earley & Gibson 2002; Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Yong, Mannucci, & Lander, 2020). As a consequence, cultural diversity is an extreme case of deep level diversity, entailing differences in values, beliefs, and shared mental models (Marquis & Battilana, 2009).

These differences mean that multicultural teams have to face many competing demands, with even the meaning of what creativity is varying deeply across cultures (Loewenstein & Mueller, 2016; Yong et al., 2020). Having diverse values and worldviews is the source of the divergent thinking advantage that multicultural teams can provide (Jang, 2017; Stahl, Maznevski, Voigt, & Jonsen, 2010). However, they also can become cultural barriers that impair creative collaboration and the process of convergence by fostering interpersonal conflict and a lack of understanding (Chua, Morris, & Mor, 2012; Chua & Jin, 2020; Paletz, Miron-Spektor, & Lin, 2014; Tröster & van Knippenberg, 2012).

Moreover, members of multicultural teams might have different ideas on how to best manage intercultural relationships: they can either minimize cultural differences or carefully consider and emphasize them (see Rattan & Ambady, 2013, for a review). On the one hand, team members can adopt a "culture blind" approach that downplays cultural differences and motivates team members to move beyond their parochial interests (Apfelbaum, Norton, & Sommers, 2012; Buchan et al., 2011). On the other hand, teams can take an alternative approach, seeing cultural

differences as something that should be emphasized and celebrated. Not only could individual members struggle in choosing between one approach or the other, but different team members might adopt different approaches, hence creating tensions between the team members. While the “culture blind” approach increases the ability to find a common ground, in fact, it comes with the risk of minimizing or even ignoring diverse perspectives and views, which can result in lower levels of information sharing and even feeling threatened (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). The “celebration” approach avoids cultural insensitivity (Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Gibson, 2002) and thus encourages the voicing of diverse opinions and views. However, it also risks increasing conflict by emphasizing differences rather than commonalities. Effective cross-cultural creative collaboration is thus premised on team members’ ability to effectively manage these paradoxes (i.e., these persistent contradictions between interdependent elements – Putnam, Fairhurst, & Banghart, 2016; Schad et al., 2016) in order to avoid escalating conflict and detonating “cultural landmines” (Meyer, 2014).

In this paper, we bridge research on multicultural teams and paradox theory (Lewis, 2000; Miron-Spektor et al., 2018; Miron-Spektor & Paletz, 2020; Smith & Lewis, 2011) to propose that, in order to successfully manage these tensions and be creative, multicultural teams need members who have a high multicultural paradox mindset. Building on Miron-Spektor and colleagues (2018), we define a multicultural paradox mindset as the degree to which one is accepting of and energized by intercultural tensions, both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground. Members with a high multicultural paradox mindset are able to reconcile and embrace the apparently contradictory demands within multicultural teams.

We hypothesize that the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset will positively affect team creativity by enabling the team to effectively engage with the

knowledge sharing and elaboration processes that are key to diverse teams' creativity (Hoever, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Barkema, 2012; Hoever, Zhou & van Knippenberg, 2018; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Specifically, we hypothesize that teams that include members with a high multicultural paradox mindset will experience enhanced information elaboration, which in turn will result in higher team creativity. We argue that while cultural diversity in general would grant a certain potential for divergence, the presence of members with a high multicultural paradox mindset is needed in order to ensure that multicultural teams are comfortable with intercultural tensions and can actively engage with divergent sharing processes, while at the same time engaging in the elaboration and integration processes that enable the team to develop a highly creative idea. We test and find support for our hypotheses in a study of 217 individuals randomly assigned to 63 teams with an equal level of cultural diversity¹.

This study stands to make three main contributions. First, we introduce the concept of paradox mindsets (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018) to research on multicultural teams. In doing so, we contribute to this research by illuminating how the presence of team members with a multicultural paradox mindset allows the successful leveraging of cultural differences towards better information elaboration and creative pursuits. We shift the focus from teams' cultural diversity and team members' multicultural experiences toward their multicultural mindsets. Specifically, we focus on team members' beliefs and practices about cultural diversity and on how they can engender different approaches to intercultural interactions. Moreover, by looking at multicultural teams, our study also speaks to research on paradox across different cultures (Keller, Loewenstein & Yan, 2017; Mafico et al., 2021) by showing how certain individuals

¹ Our theory focuses on multicultural teams (i.e., teams where cultural diversity is high). We discuss the implications of this boundary in the Discussion section.

might be better able to cope with the tensions inherent in cross-cultural interactions, and how they can put this ability to the service of the team.

Our focus on paradox mindsets also contributes to the small yet vibrant stream of research that has explored the relationship between paradox and creativity at the team level (e.g., Miron-Spektor & Paletz, 2020; Miron-Spektor et al., 2022; Shao, Nijstand & Tauber, 2019). In particular, by adopting a compositional approach (Miron-Spektor, Erez & Naveh, 2011; Perry-Smith & Shalley, 2014) and focusing on culturally diverse teams, we show how a single team member with a high paradox mindset can be enough to provide elaboration and creative benefits, and how these benefits are not premised on this team member occupying a leadership position.

Finally, we contribute to the research on multiculturalism and creativity by corroborating recent findings that have bridged research on individual characteristics with research on multicultural teams (Jang, 2017). We move away from focusing on how the level of cultural diversity affects teams' creativity to exploring why teams with the same level of multiculturalism differ in their ability to be creative. We also extend extant findings by showing that having multicultural individuals in the team might not be enough if some of these multicultural individuals do not possess a multicultural paradox mindset. More broadly, our results suggest that it is important to consider team members' mindsets and attitudes towards multiculturalism, rather than just their previous multicultural experiences.

2. Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 Tensions in Multicultural Teams

Multicultural teams represent a specific type of diverse team that has become increasingly common in today's globalized business environments (Hinds, Liu, & Lyon, 2011; Jang, 2017). They are characterized by the presence of members who collectively represent two

or more national cultures (Earley & Gibson, 2002). National culture affects individuals' values, assumptions, self-views, and deeply held beliefs (Gelfand et al., 2007; Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Cultural diversity thus represents a case of deep level diversity entailing differences in values and shared frameworks or mental models (Marquis & Battilana, 2009). As a consequence, multicultural teams often struggle to find a common ground while also keeping intact the individual uniqueness that is the reason for their existence. Cross-cultural scholars have argued that the presence of multiculturals (i.e., individuals who have knowledge and experience with multiple cultures) can be beneficial for finding a common ground within multicultural teams because they can act as brokers (Di Marco, Taylor, & Alin, 2010; Hong, 2010), facilitating understanding among team members.

Individuals with the same level of multicultural experience, however, can have very different approaches to cultural diversity. Consider the following examples: Kim Jong-un, the dictator of North Korea, is a multicultural individual, having studied in Bern at an international English school. However, he maintains his country in a state of isolation, shunning every attempt at intercultural collaboration. Óscar Arias, former president of Costa Rica, also has a multicultural background, having studied in the UK, but he has always strongly supported intercultural cooperation. His efforts to end the Central American crisis in the 1970s earned him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1987. Consistent with these two examples, research has shown that individuals with similar multicultural experiences might approach intercultural interactions and manage intercultural conflict very differently because of their individual differences (Chua & Jin, 2020).

Differences in team members' beliefs and approaches to cultural diversity, however, can be a source of tension for multicultural teams. Research in fact suggests that there are two opposite approaches that individuals can adopt while dealing with cultural diversity². On the one hand, individuals can adopt a "culture-blind" approach, which downplays cultural differences in order to motivate cooperation beyond parochial interests, emphasizing commonalities rather than differences (Buchan et al., 2011; Park & Judd, 2005). This mindset should increase the ability to find a common ground but comes with the risk of being culturally insensitive by ignoring team members' diverse cultural values and mental models. Not attending to or disrespecting team members' values and preferences might result in team members perceiving low psychological safety and support (Hajro, Gibson, & Pudelko, 2017; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). On the other hand, individuals can adopt an approach that sees cultural differences as something that should be emphasized and celebrated. This approach is likely to avoid cultural insensitivity and involuntarily offending others' traditions and values (Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Gibson, 2002; Ely & Thomas, 2001). At the same time, however, it risks further impairing convergent processes by emphasizing differences rather than commonalities.

This intercultural tension can be experienced by individual members, but is likely to manifest itself more strongly at the collective level. Given that both approaches have pros and cons and are interdependent, the presence of multiple approaches to dealing with cultural diversity is likely to create a paradox at the team level. Not only are individuals from different cultures more or less likely to adopt one approach over the other (Rattan & Ambady, 2013), but they also differ on the best way to approach the emergent tension deriving from these

² While more often applied to mixed-race groups (see Rattan & Ambady, 2013, for a review), these approaches are highly relevant for multicultural teams, complementing and extending the research stream that has focused on multiculturals.

differences. For example, while Western cultures tend to approach tensions by adopting an either/or approach, trying to convince other members to move towards their position, East Asian cultures prefer to take a middle ground approach (Leung et al., 2018; Peng & Nisbett, 1999).

2.2. Multicultural Teams' Tensions and Creativity

Multicultural teams whose goal is to come up with novel and useful ideas are likely to experience these tensions even more strongly. First, the difference in values and worldviews leads to differences in their understanding of what creativity is (Loewenstein & Mueller, 2016; Miron-Spektor & Paletz, *forthcoming*). Specifically, individuals from different cultures vary in the breadth of their definition of what is creative and, more importantly, in the degree to which they weight novelty and usefulness: while certain cultures value novelty and disregard usefulness, others do the opposite (Adair & Xiong, 2018; Loewenstein & Mueller, 2016).

Moreover, the tension deriving from the different approaches to cultural diversity maps onto a tension between the group processes that are at the heart of team creativity – divergence and convergence (Harvey, 2013; Miron-Spektor & Erez, 2017). On the one hand, the “culture blind” approach should increase the ability to find a common ground and to build on each other’s ideas, thus fostering convergent processes (Harvey, 2013; Lingo & O’Mahony, 2010; Mannucci & Perry-Smith, 2022). However, the low psychological safety and support engendered by this approach (Hajro et al., 2017; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008) can cause team members to disengage from divergent processes such as idea and information sharing (Harrison & Rouse, 2014; Madjar, Oldham, & Pratt, 2002; Parke & Seo, 2017), thus hampering or even eliminating the “diversity advantage” provided by intercultural teams.

On the other hand, adopting an approach that emphasizes differences should lead to increased self-expression and the voicing of ideas within the team (Ely & Thomas, 2001), which

in turn will result in higher idea and information sharing (Cable, 2018; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006), but can also hinder convergence. While diverse values and worldviews foster divergent processes (Jang, 2017; Stahl et al., 2010), in fact, they can also act as barriers that stifle communication and collaboration by increasing misunderstandings and interpersonal conflict (Backmann et al., 2020; Chua & Jin, 2020; Chua, Roth, & Lemoine, 2015; Jang, 2017; Meyer, 2014). This lack of shared understanding, in turn, hampers the convergent processes that are necessary to achieve team creativity (Biscaro & Comacchio, 2018; Harvey, 2013, 2014; Lingo & O'Mahony, 2010).

Overall, this evidence suggests that effectively approaching these tensions is the main challenge facing multicultural teams, and the key to unlocking their creative potential. Many people see tensions as dilemmas whose resolution requires tradeoffs between incompatible demands (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018; Sundaramurthy & Lewis, 2003). However, others embrace tensions as natural and persistent and are even energized by them. These individuals possess what is known as a paradox mindset (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018; Smith & Lewis, 2011; Smith & Tushman, 2005). In the context of cross-cultural collaboration, having a multicultural paradox mindset entails accepting and being energized by intercultural tensions, both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground, without choosing one over the other.

We propose that, in order to be creative, multicultural teams need the presence of team members who possess a high multicultural paradox mindset. Team members with high levels of this mindset will be able to effectively juggle between the need for emphasizing and valuing cultural differences and the need to find a common ground between seemingly incompatible values and beliefs. Having a high multicultural paradox mindset will enable them to embrace the

multiplicity of viewpoints and see ways to integrate the different values and perspectives, being both sensitive and insensitive to cultural differences.

The presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset should foster the team's information elaboration (Van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Information elaboration is a team process that captures both the sharing of diverse ideas, information and viewpoints (divergence) and the extent to which members link and integrate them into one solution (convergence – Hoever et al., 2012, 2018). Its core rationale is that sharing and discussing members' unique ideas and information yields more novel and useful solutions only to the extent that they are effectively integrated, and vice-versa (Hoever et al., 2018). Members with a high multicultural paradox mindset are able to not only effectively bridge cultural gaps, promoting integration and convergence, but also to create a safe environment for every culture and to encourage intercultural dialogue, thus promoting idea sharing and divergence. They prompt the team to identify and appreciate the synergies between their different viewpoints, rather than their incompatibilities. In so doing, they can help other team members' feel more at ease with cultural differences, thus making it easier for them to use others' perspectives and identify commonalities (see Gebert, Boerner, & Kearney, 2010). Teams that include members with a high multicultural paradox mindset will thus be able to flexibly maneuver between divergent and convergent processes, without sacrificing one for the other, and effectively engaging in information elaboration. As a consequence, they will thus enjoy higher creativity. Consistently, evidence shows that embracing the tensions of the creative process is necessary in order to foster a team's ability to come up with creative solutions (Harvey & Mueller, 2021; Miron-Spektor & Erez, 2017; Shalley & Gilson, 2017).

On the contrary, teams who do not include members with a high multicultural paradox mindset will incur the convergence problems described in extant diversity research (Harvey, 2013), thus hampering the team's ability to act as an "information processor" (Van Knippenberg et al., 2004) and make full use of its cultural diversity towards creative pursuits.

Overall, these arguments suggest that in multicultural teams the presence of members with a high multicultural paradox mindset will foster creativity by enhancing information elaboration. Thus, we predict:

H1: The presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset is positively related to a multicultural team's creativity.

H2: Information elaboration mediates the positive relationship between the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset and a multicultural team's creativity, in such a way that the presence of these members fosters information elaboration and, thus, creativity.

3. Methods

3.1 Sample and Procedure

Our sample consisted of 217 participants ($M_{\text{age}} = 32.35$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 10.98$; 65.44% females) from an active participant pool at a behavioral laboratory at a large university in Europe. Participants received compensation equivalent to approximately \$12.50 per hour in return for their participation in a 60-minute study. Participants signed up for a timeslot in which they were assigned to a team. In total, we collected data on 63 teams, of which 35 were three-member teams and 28 were four-member teams. The differences were due to the availability of participants across the timeslots. The datasets (both individual and team level) used in this

manuscript can be found online at:

https://osf.io/qnxyj/?view_only=80bc1q2ud34rkq786qneq4gxzjydw813zvycpmlcelnx

Participants were randomly assigned to teams following one criterion rooted in our theoretical focus (see footnote 1): that each team had the same level of cultural diversity. In order to account for potential similarities across cultures, we assigned participants to country clusters, following the taxonomy of Ronen and Shenkar (2013), and we used clusters, rather than countries, to create the teams. This approach enables us to avoid two common problems in multicultural teams' research. On the one hand, simply operationalizing diversity as being from a different nationality comes with the risk of overlooking similarities across cultures: a diverse team with two members from Spain and two from France is not the same as a team with two members from Spain and two from China. On the other hand, focusing on cultural distance (Kogut & Singh, 1988) reflects a positivist approach that has been criticized by cross-cultural scholars for its "illusion" of capturing objective and immutable differences between countries (Shenkar, 2001; Shenkar, Lui, & Yehekel, 2008). The country clusters approach is more consistent with our theorizing, as it considers cross-cultural interactions to be mutable and continuously reconstructed through interaction and interpretation. We provide more details on the theoretical underpinnings of this approach in the Appendix.

We assigned two team members from the Anglo cluster (the most frequent in our sample) to each four-member team, and one member from the Anglo cluster to each three-member team. The remaining two team members came from two different country clusters in both configurations. This procedure allowed us to maintain an almost identical level of cultural diversity across teams despite the differences in team size: the Blau (1977) index was equal to 0.63 for the four-member teams, and to 0.67 for the three-member teams.

Approximately one week before the team task, participants completed a survey that included our multicultural paradox mindset measure and other measures that we used to compute our control variables. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, participants were unable to physically come to the behavioral laboratory, so the team task was conducted online. At their allocated time slot, participants connected to Zoom using a link that was unique to each team. Participants were required to keep their camera on at all times in order to ensure that the interaction resembled as much as possible a physical one. The Laboratory manager provided the task instructions and kept monitoring the online interaction for the duration of the task for each team, keeping her camera closed. All items are reported in the Appendix.

The task involved responding to a problem presented to the Human Resource (HR) Director of a large steel company. Each team was told that they were being consulted by the HR Director to solve a problem that had arisen in the company. The team received a memo describing the problem, as well as information on the role of the HR Director and a brief description of the company. The problem involved a manager who had allowed one of her best employees, Janet, to have flexible work hours to care for her elderly mother. Essentially, Janet would work in the office from 9 to 3 and then bring work home to complete in the evening. The arrangement has worked well: Janet has effectively worked from home and is consistently the most productive and reliable employee. However, now other employees have asked for a similar arrangement. This manager did not want to allow some of the other employees to do this since they did not perform as well, and some of them required more supervision while working in the office to keep them on task (see Shalley, 1991, 1995 for a similar task)³.

³ The full text of the problem is available from the authors upon request.

We found this task to be particularly well suited for a study focusing on culturally diverse teams because of the deep cross-cultural differences in terms of views on work-life balance and remote work (Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000), how to care for family members (Hofstede & Mikov, 2010), valuing the elderly (Awad et al., 2018), and overall HR policies and practices (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999; Schneider, Schneider, & Barsoux, 2003). Team members can decide to share their cultural norms and values on these issues, or choose not to disclose them, thus engendering one of the tensions that is at the heart of how to deal with cultural diversity and intercultural relations.

Teams had up to 30 minutes to complete the task ($M_{\text{time spent}} = 28.76$, $SD_{\text{time spent}} = 2.40$). All teams were told that they should try to come up with creative solutions to the problem and then select the idea that they deemed most creative for submission to the HR Director, while also providing extra details. Creative solutions were defined as those that are both novel and useful (Amabile, 1982; Shalley & Breidenthal, 2021). As an extra incentive, we offered a cash prize (\$125 to each team) to the three teams that submitted the most creative ideas. After completing the task, team members were debriefed about the purpose of the study.

3.2 Variables and Measures

3.2.1 Creativity. There are different ways to evaluate creativity when multiple ideas are generated: for example, one can average the level of creativity across all ideas or focus on the one idea selected by the participants (Reiter-Palmon, Forthmann, & Barbot, 2019). We decided to focus on the idea participants selected for two reasons. First, given our focus on both divergent and convergent processes, we followed the paradigm applied in extant work that has looked at both processes (e.g., Mannucci & Perry-Smith, 2022). This paradigm has been to have participants select one idea and develop it, and then have raters assess the creativity of the

selected idea. Second, we thought that this was most similar to what a team in an organization would actually do (Harvey & Kou, 2013). The creativity (i.e., novelty and usefulness) of the selected solution was independently rated by three raters familiar with the task and our definition of creativity. The r_{wg} interrater agreement was equal to 0.91: we thus took the average of the three raters to measure creativity.

3.2.2 Information elaboration. We video-recorded teams and had three other coders blind to the hypotheses rate teams' information elaboration (see Hoever et al., 2012, and Parke et al., 2022, for a similar approach). In particular, we adopted Parke and colleagues' (2022) approach and asked coders to rate (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) each team on four items, which we report in the Appendix. These items have been previously validated as a measure of information elaboration (Parke et al., 2022), and they also reflect the tension between divergent and convergent processes that is at the heart of our theorizing. The r_{wg} interrater agreement was equal to 0.70 for the three coders, thus we used the average of their ratings to measure information elaboration ($\alpha = 0.96$).

3.2.3 Presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset. We adapted the paradox mindset nine-item scale from Miron-Spektor and colleagues (2018) to measure each team member's multicultural paradox mindset. Exemplary items included "When I consider conflicting cultural perspectives, I gain a better understanding of an issue" and "I feel energized when I manage to address contradictory demands in intercultural interactions" (rated 1-7, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree – $\alpha = 0.81$). The full list of adapted items is reported in the Appendix.

We tested for discriminant and convergent validity of our multicultural paradox mindset scale on 494 individuals recruited on Prolific Academic. We excluded 23 participants who failed

one of our two attention checks (Huang, Liu, & Bowling, 2015). Our final sample of 471 participants consisted of 244 males, 218 females, and 9 nonbinary individuals who had an average age of 26.92 years ($SD = 8.30$) and represented 51 different nationalities, with South Africa (21.75%) and Portugal (14.29%) being the most represented. 36 participants were bicultural.

To assess the validity of our scale, we conducted CFAs involving our scale with scales of other related constructs and performed paired χ^2 difference tests. Specifically, we considered intercultural experience (both depth and breadth – Godart, Maddux, Shipilov, & Galinsky, 2015)⁴, global identity (Buchan et al., 2011), cultural metacognition, and cultural cognition (Ang et al., 2007). Correlations and results from these comparisons are reported in Table 1. All comparisons indicated that the model fit was best when two separate factors emerged, confirming the convergent and divergent validity of our multicultural paradox mindset scale⁵. More details on our validation study are reported in the Appendix.

 Insert Table 1 about here

We then followed a two-step procedure to identify the presence/absence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset in each team. First, we computed the number of participants whose score on the scale was one standard deviation above the mean – that is, who exceeded the 20% distribution cutoff point on the scale (see Miron-Spektor et al., 2011, for

⁴ Since depth and breadth are highly correlated ($r=0.55$ in Godart et al. [2015]’s sample, $r=0.82$ in our sample), we treated them as two observed variables loading on the same latent factor “intercultural experience.”

⁵ The correlation between our multicultural paradox mindset measure and the traditional paradox mindset scale was high ($r=0.72$). This is consistent with our theorizing that multicultural paradox mindset is a specific type of paradox mindset. People scoring highly in one are very likely – but not necessarily going – to score highly on the other one.

a similar approach). This operation resulted in a total of 30 team members who exceeded the threshold. We also conducted a sensitivity test by repeating our analyses using the top 30% as the cutoff point: results were virtually identical to those reported below and are available from the authors upon request.

Second, we measured the presence of *team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset* in a team as a binary variable that took the value of 1 when a team member with a high multicultural paradox mindset was present, and 0 when it was absent ⁶.

3.2.4 Control variables. We included three control variables to account for factors that could affect the teams' creative process and intercultural interactions. First, we controlled for *gender diversity*, because gender has been shown to shape intercultural interactions and creative processes (Chua & Jin, 2020; Goncalo, Chatman, Duguid, & Kennedy, 2015), as well as how individuals deal with tensions (Zheng, Kark, & Meister, 2018). We computed gender diversity as the proportion of women in each team.

We also controlled for two variables relating to team members' cultural background that could shape both their multicultural paradoxical mindset and teams' creative processes. First, we controlled for the proportion of *team members who lived abroad*, since this can affect both creativity and attitudes towards other cultures (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009), and thus how people think about cultural tensions. We asked respondents to report whether they had previously lived abroad (1 = yes, 0 = no), and controlled for the ratio between the number of team members who had this experience and the total team size. Second, we controlled for the proportion of team members who came from a country high in cultural tightness. Individuals from tight cultures

⁶ The 30 participants who exceeded the threshold were distributed across 25 teams. Of these 25 teams, only four teams had more than one member with a high multicultural paradox mindset, with all the others having one. This distribution supported our choice of focusing on the presence/absence of team members with a multicultural paradox mindset, rather than on the number in a team. We thank two anonymous reviewers for pointing us in this direction.

have in fact been shown to have deeply ingrained norms of coordination and cooperation (Roos, Gelfand, Nau, & Lun, 2015). As a consequence, they are reluctant to accept different values and perspectives and they are less willing to spend the time and effort needed to meaningfully engage in cross-cultural interactions (Chen & Li, 2005), particularly when they involve creative pursuits (Chua et al., 2015). Moreover, individuals from tight cultures have been shown to differ from individuals from loose cultures both in their levels of paradox mindset and in their ability to benefit from them, particularly when creativity is the goal (Keller et al., 2017; Leung et al., 2018). We computed the proportion of tight members following a two-step procedure similar to the one described above for our independent variable. First, we computed cultural tightness scores for each team member based on their country, using the cultural tightness scores reported in Gelfand and colleagues (2011 – see Chua et al., 2015, for a similar approach). Second, we created a binary variable measuring whether the individual came from a tight country. This variable took the value of 1 when the cultural tightness score of the country was higher than 6.5 (the average value reported by Gelfand and colleagues, 2011), and 0 when it was lower⁷. We then used this variable to compute the proportion of *tight team members* in each team, measured as the ratio between the number of tight members and the total team size⁸.

4. Results

Table 2 presents the correlations and descriptive statistics for each variable included in the analysis. Table 3 presents the results of the regression analyses.

⁷ We also tried running our analyses with a different specification of this variable, computed not as the total number of members high in cultural tightness in the team but as the number of members who were (a) high in cultural tightness and (b) did not have a multicultural paradox mindset. Results were identical to those reported below.

⁸ We also tried running our analyses using counts, rather than proportions, to compute all of our control variables. Results were identical to those reported below, but with worse model fits and variance inflation factors (see Appendix).

Insert Table 2 and Table 3 about here

We checked for multicollinearity by computing variance inflation factors (VIF) for the full model for both information elaboration (Model 2) and creativity (Model 4). The VIF for the full model was 1.03 for both information elaboration and creativity. Moreover, the VIF scores for the variables were all below the value of 5 that is considered problematic by conventional standards (Studenmund, 2001), suggesting that multicollinearity was not an issue.

Model 2 shows that the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset has a positive and significant effect on information elaboration ($\beta = 0.26, p = .048$). Model 4 shows that the same is true for creativity, with the coefficient for presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset being positive and significant ($\beta = 0.32, p = .007$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported⁹.

We tested Hypothesis 2 by using nonparametric bootstrapping mediation analyses (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Specifically, we used the PROCESS Macro, Model 4 (Hayes, 2017) with 10,000 bootstraps. The results from the indirect effect analyses yielded support for our mediation model, showing that the presence of a team member with a high multicultural paradox mindset had a positive indirect effect on team creativity via information elaboration ($B = 0.22, SE = 0.11; 95\% \text{ confidence interval (CI) } [0.019, 0.465]$)¹⁰.

4.1 Robustness Checks and Exploratory Analyses

⁹ We ran both Model 2 and Model 4 without including any controls. The effect of the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset was still positive for both information elaboration ($\beta = 0.26, p = .043$) and creativity ($\beta = 0.25, p = .045$).

¹⁰ We ran this model including the same controls reported in Table 2 as covariates. Running the same bootstrapped model without including any control variables yielded virtually identical results (indirect effect: $B=0.22, SE=0.11, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.023, 0.450]$).

While our focus was on the consequences of having team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset, we wanted to ensure that individuals' country background did not shape their paradox mindset. This check was particularly important given our random assignment procedure in creating the teams, in that cultural background could act as an unobserved variable shaping our independent variable. We thus used our individual-level data to see whether in our sample belonging to a specific country cluster shaped the multicultural paradox mindset score. We ran an OLS model with binaries for each country cluster as the predictor, with the African cluster as the reference category. We found that none of our clusters significantly predicted a multicultural paradox mindset ($N=230$, $R^2 = 0.050$). We also ran the same analyses using planned contrasts (Winer, Brown & Michels, 1991) and found the same result. We can thus conclude that, at least in our sample, having a low vs. high multicultural paradox mindset is not dependent on one's country of origin.

We also tested whether the effect of the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset has diminishing returns as the number of these team members increases. We thus re-ran our Model 4 using a count measure of our independent variable. We found that the effect of having one member with a high multicultural paradox mindset on creativity was positive and significant ($\beta = 0.37$, $p = .007$), whereas the effect of having two or three members was non-significant. Given the low number of teams ($n=4$) with more than one member with a high multicultural paradox mindset, however, the conclusions that could be drawn from this analysis were limited. We thus re-ran it using the operationalization of the variable with a top 30% cutoff point, which yielded 16 teams with no member with a high multicultural paradox mindset, 29 teams with one member, 12 with two members, and 6 with three members. Results showed that having one ($\beta = 0.37$, $p = .009$) or two members ($\beta = 0.45$, p

= .001) had positive effects on creativity, while having three members did not provide any additional creative boost ($p = .660$).

We explored whether and how our independent variable affected two alternative measures of the outcome of team creative processes: idea generation and idea elaboration (Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017). Full results for these analyses are not reported due to space constraints but are available from the researchers upon request. We measured idea generation as the number of ideas generated by the team ($M = 10.40$, $SD = 3.54$), and idea elaboration through the consensual assessment technique (Amabile, 1982). We used the same three raters we used to assess creativity to assess the elaboration of the selected idea on a 9-point scale (see Harvey, 2013). We provided raters with the definition of idea elaboration (i.e., developing an idea by incorporating additional details and information), and with the following scale anchors: 1 = “no elaboration”, 3 = “minimal elaboration, few extra details provided”; 5 = “fairly detailed elaboration”; 7 = “moderately detailed elaboration”; 9 = “highly-detailed elaboration; the solution could be implemented based on the description”. The r_{wg} interrater agreement was equal to 0.93: we thus took the average of the three raters as our measure of idea elaboration ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 1.36$)

We ran our main Model 4 using the total number of ideas generated by the team as the dependent variable ($M = 10.40$, $SD = 3.54$). In this case, using OLS was not appropriate since the number of ideas is a non-negative integer, the use of linear regression would result in inconsistent, inefficient, and biased estimators. We thus used a Poisson regression, which is more appropriate in the presence of count data. We found that the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset did not have any effect on the number of ideas generated ($B = -0.79$, $p = .334$). We then ran our Model 4 using the rated measure of idea elaboration as a

dependent variable. We found that the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset has a positive and significant effect on idea elaboration ($\beta = 0.27, p = .034$). Overall, these findings suggest that the creative advantage of having a member with a multicultural paradox mindset lies not in a boost of the number of ideas generated, but in the quality and level of elaboration when discussing all the ideas and selecting one idea to further develop. This finding is consistent with our theorizing that information elaboration benefits diverse teams by fostering their ability to effectively use their diversity towards higher levels of creativity.

5. Discussion

Our goal was to understand if people's attitudes and mental frameworks toward intercultural interactions could affect multicultural teams' ability to be creative. We show that team creativity benefits from having members with a high multicultural paradox mindset – that is, who are able to go beyond an “either/or” approach to managing intercultural tensions by embracing these tensions by both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground. Specifically, when at least one team member possesses a high multicultural paradox mindset this fosters the team's information elaboration and, consequently, the team's creativity.

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

Our first contribution is the introduction of the concept of paradox mindset (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018) to research on multicultural teams. Prior research on how culturally diverse teams can harness their diversity towards creativity has mostly focused on team members' experiences (e.g., Jang, 2017), without accounting for differences in the way they frame and make sense of multiculturalism. We show that creativity in multicultural teams can be affected

not only by what people have done (i.e., their past intercultural experiences), but also by how people *think* (i.e., their multicultural paradox mindsets).

We illuminate how team members' mental frames toward multiculturalism shape their cross-cultural interactions, allowing their teams to effectively manage the tensions inherent to culturally diverse teams working toward creative pursuits. Our findings corroborate the idea that multicultural interactions are complex, and that harnessing their strength requires the presence of someone who is comfortable with and energized by their multifaceted nature. Multicultural teams have to balance different tensions: they have different values and beliefs that can both foster and hamper team processes; they also differ in their approaches to intercultural interactions; and, when creativity is the goal, they will likely also have different definitions and ideas about what creativity is. Having one or more team members with a multicultural paradox mindset can help the team to reconcile these apparently incompatible elements, identifying synergies rather than incompatibilities and thus fostering information elaboration. Mexican director Alejandro Gonzalez Iñárritu is a good example of a team member with a multicultural paradox mindset. He is described by his collaborators as extremely attentive towards intercultural differences and sensitive of others' cultural values. At the same time, he identifies his work as "world cinema", and says he is energized and inspired by working with multicultural teams, with his movies reflecting the cultural commonalities of his crew as much as their differences (Shaw, 2013). This enabled him to bring towards creative excellence (e.g., Debruge, 2014; McCarthy, 2014) the culturally diverse team working on the movie *Birdman*, which included two Argentinean screenwriters, one Mexican cinematographer, two American editors, and one Israeli producer.

By introducing the notion of a paradox mindset to multicultural teams' research, we also contribute to recent scholarship on paradox and national culture (Keller et al., 2017; Leung et al., 2018; Mafico et al., 2021). We show how certain individuals might be better able to cope with the tensions inherent in cross-cultural interactions, and how they can put this ability to the service of the team. Moreover, our exploratory analyses on the differences across clusters in having a multicultural paradox mindset suggests that all cultures are equally able to develop this type of mindset. While these findings partially challenge extant research, we believe that the difference might lie in the fact that we focused on a specific type of paradox mindset rather than on paradox mindsets more broadly. As the challenges of multicultural teams are the same across many countries (Meyer, 2014), it could be that, while countries differ in their willingness to engage with tensions and approach tensions more broadly, they do not differ in their need for, and ability to, balance the tensions of multicultural interactions.

Second, we show that the positive effect of individuals' paradox mindsets also transfers to the team level, thus contributing to research that has explored the relationship between paradox and creativity at the team level (e.g., Gebert et al., 2010; Miron-Spektor & Erez, 2017; Miron-Spektor & Paletz, 2020; Miron-Spektor et al., 2022; Shao et al., 2019; Zhang, Zhang, & Law, *forthcoming*). By pinpointing information elaboration as an underlying mechanism in the relationship between a multicultural paradox mindset and team creativity, we unlock one reason why having members with this type of mindset is so critical for fostering creativity in multicultural teams. Moreover, by focusing on diverse teams, we corroborate the work of Miron-Spektor and colleagues (2022) that has shown that the benefit of paradox frames on teams' elaboration and creativity is accrued only when epistemic motivation is high. Diverse teams have been shown to be higher in epistemic motivation than homogeneous teams (Phillips & Loyd,

2006), which explains why they reap the benefits of having members with a high multicultural paradox mindset. We also extend Miron-Spektor and colleagues' (2022) work in three ways. First, we focus on a specific type of team, multicultural ones, that face extra tensions on top of those faced by all teams whose goal is generating novel and useful ideas. These tensions are specific to intercultural interactions and can engender problems that are more difficult to solve given the particularly sensitive nature of cultural differences (Meyer, 2014). Second, our studies differ in subtle yet relevant ways in the nature of the independent variable and mediator. While Miron-Spektor and colleagues (2022) focus on a specific type of elaboration (i.e., idea elaboration) targeted at addressing novelty and usefulness demands, we focus on the broader construct of information elaboration – a team process that is central to creativity, but also to team functioning more broadly. Moreover, they focus on paradoxical frames, a construct that captures only the cognitive component of dealing with tensions, whereas paradox mindset captures also the emotional component (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018). Finally, and more relevant from a practical standpoint, we show that it is not necessary that the whole team adopts a paradox mindset in order to foster information elaboration and creativity, since the presence of one team member with a high paradox mindset can suffice. This finding is consistent with research that has focused on leaders' paradox mindsets (e.g., Shao et al., 2019; Zhang, Zhang, & Law, *forthcoming*), but extends it by showing that the creative benefits of having a member with a high paradox mindset are not premised on this member occupying a leadership position.

We also contribute to research on multiculturals and creativity by adding to a recent line of inquiry that has bridged research on individual characteristics with research on multicultural teams (e.g., Jang, 2017). We join these studies in moving away from focusing on the direct effect of cultural diversity to explore why, given the same level of multiculturalism, some teams

flourish while others fail in their creative pursuits. In other words, our theory and findings are specific to teams with high cultural diversity, rather than focusing on how these teams differ from those that have low levels of cultural diversity.

We also extend extant findings (Jang, 2017) by showing that having multicultural individuals in the team might not be enough if these multicultural individuals do not possess a high multicultural paradox mindset. Specifically, creativity in a multicultural team requires the ability to consider the apparently opposite needs of intercultural interaction as complementary – an ability that is not necessarily ensured by living or working abroad. For example, individuals without experience abroad might still have a high multicultural paradox mindset because they live in a multicultural hub, such as London or Hong Kong, or because they work for a multinational company. At the same time, individuals who have lived for a long time in a foreign country might be very good at collaborating with a specific culture, but not possess the paradox mindset required to deal with multiple cultures simultaneously. Furthermore, some individuals may live abroad but not necessarily make an effort to truly understand this new culture or embrace the differences that exist from their own culture (Chua et al., 2015). More broadly, our results suggest that it is important to consider team members' mindsets and attitudes towards multiculturalism, rather than just their previous multicultural experiences.

We also contribute to the literature on cultural diversity by using a country cluster (Ronen & Shenkar, 2013; Shenkar, 2001) approach to grouping individuals by different levels of cultural diversity in order to account for potential similarities across cultures. Compared to other approaches, such as the cultural distance often used in extant research, this approach has the advantage of allowing to simultaneously account for the similarities between countries and for the mutability and continuous reconstruction of cross-cultural interactions (Flipo, Mannucci, &

Yong, *forthcoming*). In so doing, it provides a more effective alternative to construct multicultural teams, as well as to assess their cultural diversity.

Finally, our application of a paradox mindset to multicultural contexts could be extended also to research on racial diversity. This research has so far operated under the assumption that colorblind and multicultural ideologies are alternatives to each other (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Conceptually, they indeed seem at odds, with one valuing group memberships and the other minimizing or ignoring them. However, evidence suggests that they can coexist, perhaps to a greater degree among majority group members than among minority group members (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2011; Verkuyten, 2005). Applying the notion of paradox mindset to examining racial or ethnic differences in a team could be a fruitful avenue for future research.

5.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Notwithstanding these contributions, this study comes with limitations. First, we examined team creativity in a sample composed of participants at a university's behavioral laboratory, collaborating in a "one-shot" interaction with no consequences on their career prospects. Thus, our findings may not generalize to work teams in organizations. For example, work teams in organizations are characterized by the presence of power dynamics – something that has been theorized to affect a team's ability to think paradoxically (Berti & Simpson, 2021). Moreover, many of the participants were students at this university, so they may already be predisposed to appreciate multiculturalism or feel more comfortable in multicultural settings. However, there are reasons to believe that the dynamics observed in these multicultural teams are not specific to these participants but also should apply to work teams. Specifically, our participants represented a more diverse group than the average laboratory pool: they in fact had an age range of 18 to 68 years old and included many members of the local community, without

ties to the university. Moreover, we increased the stakes for the participants by offering a cash reward for the three highest performing teams. Overall, we believe that the advantages offered by the random assignment and the similarly high level of cultural diversity in our study outweigh the potential generalizability issues. That said, we cannot rule out that the results would play out differently with other task structures and settings. Future research could attempt to replicate these findings in organizational contexts, for example, through the use of field experiments. Also, future research could examine whether the level of perceived, rather than actual, cultural diversity in the team moderates the effects that we have found.

A second limitation of our study lies in the fact that, while we focused on information elaboration as the underlying mechanism between having members with a high multicultural paradox mindset and team creativity, other mediating mechanisms might simultaneously be at play. For example, the presence of team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset could help others' intercultural dialogue and thus foster perspective taking – something that has been associated with greater creativity in diverse teams (Hoever et al., 2012). Future research could explore this and other alternative mechanisms to identify other ways that the presence of an individual with a multicultural paradox mindset facilitates team creativity.

A third limitation lies in the fact that our theorizing was agnostic regarding the presence of more than one member with a multicultural paradox mindset. Moreover, we had only four teams that had more than one member with this type of mindset. Having a multicultural paradox mindset was in fact a relatively rare event in our data (30 participants out of 217, 13.82%). When we used a different cutoff range, however, we were able to gain more teams and empirically explore this question. We found that, while having one or two members with a high multicultural paradoxical mindset provided a boost in creativity compared to having none, having more than

one or two did not result in an increase in creativity. This finding provides support for our theorizing that the sheer presence of even just one team member with this relatively rare mindset is enough to activate the information elaboration advantages we described. However, these results also open up the possibility that the number of members with a high multicultural paradox mindset has diminishing creative returns. Future research could explore this issue by focusing on larger teams with a larger number of members with a high multicultural paradox mindset.

Fourth, in this study we had teams with identically high levels of cultural diversity. While we see this as a strength of our design, this feature of our study does not allow us to make inferences concerning how our focal relationships would play out in teams where cultural diversity is lower, and there are more members from the same culture. Prior work on faultlines (i.e., subgroups or coalitions that emerge naturally in a team) suggests that within a team different pairs or groups of members from the same culture may have a stronger bond with each other (Gratton, Voigt, Erickson, 2007). While extant research has typically focused on other variables such as gender, age, or functional background, it is possible that faultlines also emerge around culture. Gratton and colleagues' (2007) work indicates that the behavior of the team leader is key in order to help teams to effectively navigate faultlines: it could thus be that, within teams that are lower in cultural diversity, the presence of a member with a high multicultural paradox mindset is conducive to creativity only if this member is also the team leader.

Finally, while our focus was on the *consequences* of having team members with a high multicultural paradox mindset, exploring the *antecedents* of this type of mindset seems a promising and fruitful avenue for future research.

5.3 Practical Implications

Our work also has implications for managers and practitioners. While we know that cultural diversity can stimulate team creativity, we also know that it can lead to process losses and coordination problems. Our findings pinpoint the necessity for organizations to go beyond stressing the value of cultural diversity, and to train team members to embrace the tensions inherent in multicultural interactions by both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground. This is no easy task, but we know that mindsets in general, and paradox mindsets in particular, can be trained (Dweck, 2008; Miron-Spektor et al., 2018). Receiving this type of training can help teams to accrue more benefits from their cultural diversity while possibly only having moderate levels of conflict. This would allow them to share their diverse perspectives and effectively integrate them without getting entrenched in the interpersonal conflict that often is present in multicultural teams (Paletz et al., 2014).

Another related factor that managers should consider stressing with their employees is how to attend to cultural differences that might exist in a team without hampering the open sharing of different perspectives. For example, in certain cultures it is considered inappropriate to directly say no to another person, while in other cultures it is commonly done. If these differences are present in the team, it would be important to have team members trying to be more culturally sensitive to the fact that some members may not agree with what is being said even if they will not openly disagree with it. Similarly, someone from a culture that more directly expresses disagreement may want to think about how they should go about doing this without alienating or making other members feel uncomfortable, but also without taking away the benefits of candid criticism. This balancing act requires trying to figure out ways to navigate these tensions without sacrificing one element for the other. Our findings suggest that appointing

a team facilitator might be highly relevant to ensure a respectful, yet vibrant discussion while generating creative ideas in multicultural teams.

Finally, managers should carefully map out and identify employees with a high multicultural paradox mindset and include them in teams high in cultural diversity whenever possible. Their presence is in fact likely to facilitate team functioning and coordination without hampering the advantages deriving from the diversity of perspectives, values, and ways of thinking that can reside within the team. However, if team members are all low on multicultural paradoxical mindsets, this could lead to a wasted opportunity to harness the value of diversity by not being able to integrate diverse viewpoints and perspectives. As such, when composing culturally diverse work teams, managers should be mindful of each team member's level of multicultural paradox mindset.

5.4 Conclusion

By applying the notion of paradox mindset to research on multicultural teams and creativity, we were able to explore why teams with the same level of multiculturalism differ in their ability to be creative. We found that having multicultural members in a team may not be enough if no team member has a high multicultural paradox mindset. Conversely, when a team has at least one member with a high multicultural paradox mindset, it enjoys improved information elaboration, which in turn results in higher levels of creativity.

References

Adair, W. L., & Xiong, T. X. (2018). How Chinese and Caucasian Canadians conceptualize creativity: The mediating role of uncertainty avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(2), 223-238.

- Amabile, T. M. (1982). Social psychology of creativity: A consensual assessment technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(5), 997-1013.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K., Templer, K., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organizational Review*, 3(3), 335-371.
- Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(3), 205-209.
- Awad, E., Dsouza, S., Kim, R., Schulz, J., Henrich, J., Shariff, A., Bonnefon, J.F., & Rahwan, I. (2018). The moral machine experiment. *Nature*, 563(7729), 59-64.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., & Sinha, J. B. (1999). Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(4), 501-526.
- Backmann, J., Kanitz, R., Tian, A. W., Hoffmann, P., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Cultural gap bridging in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(8), 1283-1311.
- Berti, M., & Simpson, A. V. (2021). The dark side of organizational paradoxes: The dynamics of disempowerment. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(2), 252-274.
- Biscaro, C., & Comacchio, A. (2018). Knowledge creation across worldviews: How metaphors impact and orient group creativity. *Organization Science*, 29(1), 58-79.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). A macrosociological theory of social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 26-54.
- Buchan, N., Brewer, M., Grimaldo, G., Wilson, R., Fatas, E., & Roddy, M. (2011). Global social identity and global cooperation. *Psychological Science*, 22(6), 821-828.
- Cable, D.M. (2018). *Alive at work: The neuroscience of helping your people love what they do*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Chen, X. P., & Li, S. (2005). Cross-national differences in cooperative decision-making in mixed-motive business contexts: The mediating effect of vertical and horizontal individualism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(6), 622-636.

- Chua, R., & Jin, M (2020). Across the great divides: Gender dynamics influence how intercultural conflict helps or hurts creative collaboration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(3), 903-934.
- Chua, R., Morris, M., & Mor, S. (2012). Collaborating across cultures: Cultural metacognition and affect based trust in creative collaborations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118 (2), 116-131.
- Chua, R. Y., Roth, Y., & Lemoine, J. F. (2015). The impact of culture on creativity: How cultural tightness and cultural distance affect global innovation crowdsourcing work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(2), 189-227.
- Debruge, P. (2014). Film Review: 'Birdman or (The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance)'. *Variety*, August 27th.
- Di Marco, M. K., Taylor, J. E., & Alin, P. (2010). Emergence and role of cultural boundary spanners in global engineering project networks. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 26(3), 123-132.
- Dweck, C. S. (2008). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.
- Earley, P. C., & Gibson, C. B. (2002). *Multinational work teams: A new perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Flipo, C., Mannucci, P. V., & Yong, K. (forthcoming). The impact of cultural tightness on the relationship between structural holes, tie strength, and creativity. *Journal of International Business Studies*.
- Gebert, D., Boerner, S., & Kearney, E. (2010). Fostering team innovation: Why is it important to combine opposing action strategies? *Organization Science*, 21(3), 593–608.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479-514.

- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Aycan, Z. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100-1104.
- Goncalo, J.A., Chatman, J. A., Duguid, M.M., & Kennedy, J.A. (2015). Creativity from constraint? How the political correctness norm influences creativity in mixed sex work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(1), 1-30.
- Godart, F. C., Maddux, W. W., Shipilov, A. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Fashion with a foreign flair: Professional experiences abroad facilitate the creative innovations of organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 195-220.
- Gratton, L., Voigt, A., & Erickson, T. J. (2007). Bridging faultlines in diverse teams. *Sloan Management Review*, 48(4), 22.
- Hajro, A., Gibson, C. B., & Pudelko, M. (2017). Knowledge exchange processes in multicultural teams: Linking organizational diversity climates to teams' effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 345-372.
- Hargadon, A. B., & Bechky, B. A. (2006). When collections of creatives become creative collectives: A field study of problem solving at work. *Organization Science*, 17(4), 484-500.
- Harrison, S. H., & Rouse, E. D. (2014). Let's dance! Elastic coordination in creative group work: A qualitative study of modern dancers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1256-1283.
- Harvey, S. (2013). A different perspective: The multiple effects of deep level diversity on group creativity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 822-832.
- Harvey, S. (2014). Creative synthesis: Exploring the process of extraordinary group creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 324-343.
- Harvey, S., & Kou, C. Y. (2013). Collective engagement in creative tasks: The role of evaluation in the creative process in groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(3), 346-386.
- Harvey, S., & Mueller, J. S. (2021). Staying alive: Toward a diverging consensus model of overcoming a bias against novelty in groups. *Organization Science*, 32(2), 293-314.

- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.
- Hinds, P., Liu, L., & Lyon, J. (2011). Putting the global in global work: An intercultural lens on the practice of cross-national collaboration. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 135-188.
- Hoever, I.J., van Knippenberg, D., van Ginkel, W. P., & Barkema, H.G. (2012). Fostering team creativity: perspective taking as key to unlocking diversity's potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(5), 982-996.
- Hoever, I. J., Zhou, J., & van Knippenberg, D. (2018). Different strokes for different teams: The contingent effects of positive and negative feedback on the creativity of informationally homogeneous and diverse teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2159-2181.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). Long-versus short-term orientation: new perspectives. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 16(4), 493-504.
- Hong, H. J. (2010). Bicultural competence and its impact on team effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10(1), 93-120.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(2), 143-156.
- Huang, J. L., Liu, M., & Bowling, N. A. (2015). Insufficient effort responding: Examining an insidious confound in survey data. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 828-845.
- Jang, S. (2017). Cultural brokerage and creative performance in multicultural teams. *Organization Science*, 28(6), 993-1009.
- Keller, J., Loewenstein, J. & Yan, J. (2017). Culture, conditions, and paradoxical frames. *Organization Studies*, 38 (3-4), 539-560.
- Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411-432.

- Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 760-776.
- Leung, A. K. Y., Liou, S., Miron-Spektor, E., Koh, B., Chan, D., Eisenberg, R., & Schneider, I. (2018). Middle ground approach to paradox: Within-and between-culture examination of the creative benefits of paradoxical frames. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(3), 443-464.
- Lingo, E. L., & O'Mahony, S. (2010). Nexus work: Brokerage on creative projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 47-81.
- Loewenstein, J., & Mueller, J. (2016). Implicit theories of creative ideas: How culture guides creativity assessments. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2(4), 320-348.
- Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural borders and mental barriers: the relationship between living abroad and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1047.
- Maddux, W. W., Lu, J. G., Affinito, S. J., & Galinsky, A. D. (2020). Multicultural experiences: a systematic review and new theoretical framework. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(2), 345-376.
- Madjar, N., Oldham, G. R., & Pratt, M. G. (2002). There's no place like home? The contributions of work and nonwork creativity support to employees' creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 757-767.
- Mafico, N., Krzeminska, A., Hartel, C., & Keller, J. (2021). The mirroring of intercultural and hybridity experience: A study of African immigrant social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 36(3).
- Mannucci, P. V., & Perry-Smith, J. E. (2022). "Who are you going to call?" Network activation in creative idea generation and elaboration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(4), 1192-1217.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.

- Marquis, C. & Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 283-302.
- McCarthy, T. (2014). 'Birdman': Venice Review. *The Hollywood Reporter*, August 27th.
- Mell, J. N., Jang, S., & Chai, S. (2021). Bridging temporal divides: Temporal brokerage in global teams and its impact on individual performance. *Organization Science*, 32(3), 731-751.
- Meyer, E. (2014). Navigating the cultural minefield. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(5), 119-123.
- Miron-Spektor, E., Emich, K. J., Argote, L., & Smith, W. K. (2022). Conceiving opposites together: Cultivating paradoxical frames and epistemic motivation fosters team creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 171, 104-153.
- Miron-Spektor, E., & Erez, M. (2017). Looking at creativity through a paradox lens. In W. K. Smith, P. Jarzabkowski, M. W. Lewis, & A. Langley (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*, 434-451. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miron-Spektor, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2011). The effect of conformist and attentive-to-detail members on team innovation: Reconciling the innovation paradox. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4), 740-760.
- Miron-Spektor, Gino, F., & Argote, L. (2011). Paradoxical frames and creative sparks: Enhancing individual creativity through conflict and integration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116(2), 229–240.
- Miron-Spektor, E., Ingram, A., Keller, J., Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2018). Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1), 26-45.
- Miron-Spektor, E., & Paletz, S. B. (2020). Collective paradoxical frames. In L. Argote, J.M. Levine (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Group and Organizational Learning*, 429-447. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miron-Spektor, E., & Paletz, S. B. (forthcoming). Culture and creativity in organizations: New directions and discoveries. In *The Oxford Handbook of Culture and Organizations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Paletz, S. B., Miron-Spektor, E., & Lin, C. C. (2014). A cultural lens on interpersonal conflict and creativity in multicultural environments. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 8(2), 237-252.
- Park, B., & Judd, C.M. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within the social cognition perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(2), 108-130.
- Parke, M. R., & Seo, M. G. (2017). The role of affect climate in organizational effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(2), 334-360.
- Parke, M. R., Seo, M. G., Hu, X., & Jin, S. (2022). The creative and cross-functional benefits of wearing hearts on sleeves: Authentic affect climate, information elaboration, and team creativity. *Organization Science*, 33(3), 600-623.
- Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. E. (1999). Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist*, 54(9), 741-754.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 53-79.
- Perry-Smith, J.E., & Shalley, C.E. (2014). A social composition view of team creativity: The role of member nationality heterogeneous ties outside the team. *Organization Science*, 25(5), 1434-1452.
- Phillips, K.W. & Loyd, D.L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 143-160.
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 444-446.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(4), 717-731.

- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlemann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(4), 615-630.
- Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 65-171.
- Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(1), 12-21.
- Reiter-Palmon, R., Forthmann, B., & Barbot, B. (2019). Scoring divergent thinking tests: A review and systematic framework. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 13(2), 144-152.
- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (2013). Mapping world cultures: Cluster formation, sources and implications. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 44(9), 867-897.
- Roos, P., Gelfand, M., Nau, D., & Lun, J. (2015). Societal threat and cultural variation in the strength of social norms: An evolutionary basis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129, 14-23.
- Schad, J., Lewis, M. W., Raisch, S., & Smith, W. K. (2016). Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 5-64.
- Schneider, S. C., Schneider, S. C., & Barsoux, J. L. (2003). *Managing across cultures*. Pearson Education.
- Shalley, C. E. (1991). Effects of productivity goals, creativity goals, and personal discretion on individual creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 179-185.
- Shalley, C. E. (1995). Effects of coaction, expected evaluation, and goal setting on creativity and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 483-503.
- Shalley, C.E., & Breidenthal, A.P. (2021). Conducting rigorous research on individual creativity. In J. Zhou & E.D. Rouse (Eds), *Handbook of Research on Creativity and Innovation*, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing (pp. 12-27).

- Shalley, C.E., & Gilson, L.L. (2017). Creativity and the management of technology: Balancing creativity and standardization. *Production and Operations Management*, 26, 605-616.
- Shao, Y., Nijstad, B. A., & Tauber, S. (2019). Creativity under workload pressure and integrative complexity: The double-edged sword of paradoxical leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 155, 7–19.
- Shaw, D. (2013). *The three amigos: The transnational filmmaking of Guillermo del Toro, Alejandro González Iñárritu, and Alfonso Cuarón*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 519-535.
- Shenkar, O., Luo, Y., & Yehekel, O. (2008). From “distance” to “friction”: Substituting metaphors and redirecting intercultural research. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 905-923.
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381-403.
- Smith, W.K., & Tushman, M.L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model of managing innovation streams. *Organization Science*, 16, 522-536.
- Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4), 690-709.
- Studenmund, A. H. (2001). *Using econometrics: A practical guide*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman. Inc.
- Sundoramurthy, C., & Lewis, M.W. (2003). Control and collaboration: Paradoxes of governance. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 397-415.
- Tröster, C., & van Knippenberg, D. (2012). Leader openness, nationality dissimilarity, and voice in multinational management teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43, 591–613.

- Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: an integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1008-1022.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 121–138.
- Winer, B. J., Brown, D. R., & Michels, K. M. (1991). *Statistical principles in empirical design*. New York: McGraw.
- Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-US comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1), 113-123.
- Yong, K., Mannucci, P.V., & Lander, M.W. (2020). Fostering creativity across countries: The moderating effect of cultural bundles on creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 157, 1-45.
- Zhang M.J., Zhang, Y., & Law, K.S. (forthcoming) Paradoxical leadership and innovation in work teams: The multilevel mediating role of ambidexterity and leader vision as boundary conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Zheng, W., Kark, R., & Meister, A. L. (2018). Paradox versus dilemma mindset: A theory of how women leaders navigate the tensions between agency and communion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 584-596.

Table 1
Convergent and Divergent Validity Analyses for the Multicultural Paradox Mindset Scale ^a

Construct	Definition	Items	χ^2	dfs	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	α	r with MPM
Multicultural paradox mindset	The degree to which one is accepting of and energized by intercultural tensions, both emphasizing cultural differences and finding common ground.		49.20	20	0.97	0.98	0.05	0.03	0.86	
Intercultural experience	Experience in living abroad.	2	(A)	48	0.60	0.71	0.03	0.03		
			(B)	46	0.98	0.99	0.16	0.11		
			688.12							
			69.86							
Depth of intercultural experience	Number of years lived abroad (Godart et al., 2015)	1								0.11*
Breadth of intercultural experience	Number of foreign countries the individual has lived in (Godart et al., 2015)	1								0.11*
Global identity	The degree to which an individual identifies with the world at large (Buchan et al., 2011)	3	(A)	48	0.53	0.66	0.19	0.13	0.89	0.24**
			(B)	46	0.98	0.99	0.04	0.03		
			876.46							
			83.57							
Cultural metacognition	It reflects mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge, including knowledge of and control over individual thought processes relating to culture (Ang et al., 2007).	4	(A)	59	0.66	0.74	0.15	0.11	0.84	0.41**
			(B)	57	0.97	0.98	0.05	0.04		
			689.25							
			113.18							
Cultural cognition	It reflects individuals' knowledge of the norms, practices and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences	6	(A)	84	0.56	0.65	0.15	0.14	0.83	0.29**
			(B)	82	0.96	0.97	0.05	0.04		
			1041.14							
			166.41							

N=471

^a: CFA model comparison for discriminant validation: A=one factor, B=two factors; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2
Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics ^a

Variable	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Creativity	3.78	0.89	1.00					
2. Presence of team members with MPM	0.40	0.49	0.25	1.00				
3. Information elaboration	4.45	1.01	0.51	0.26	1.00			
4. Gender diversity	0.65	0.29	0.29	- 0.09	0.02	1.00		
5. Team members who lived abroad	0.75	0.19	- 0.18	0.12	0.03	0.08	1.00	
6. Culturally tight members	0.80	0.20	- 0.21	0.03	0.09	- 0.12	- 0.08	1.00

^a: All values greater than |.24| are significant at $p < .05$; MPM= multicultural paradox mindset

Table 3
 OLS Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Information Elaboration and Creativity ^a

Variable	Model 1 Information elaboration	Model 2 Information elaboration	Model 3 Creativity	Model 4 Creativity	Model 5 Creativity
Gender diversity	0.027	0.052	0.289 *	0.320 **	0.295 **
Members who lived abroad	0.039	0.006	- 0.213 †	- 0.254 *	- 0.257 *
Culturally tight members	0.096	0.089	- 0.190	- 0.198 †	- 0.241 *
Presence of team members with high MPM		0.258 *		0.318 **	0.194 †
Information elaboration					0.481 **
R ²	0.010	0.075	0.162	0.261	0.474
Δ R ²		0.065 *		0.099 **	0.213 **

^a: Standardized coefficients; MPM = multicultural paradox mindset

† $p < .10$

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$