

Creativity and Innovation: Addressing Entrepreneurship Commitments

Priyabrat Dash

***Abstract---** Innovation in products and services is seen by scholars, by specialized media in management, and by some managers as the main currency in modern economies. This is because it allows high average market profits, fame for innovators, or brand growth, for example. Through reality, however, most executives continue to treat creativity on their agendas as a secondary issue. This is due to the fact that experts in the industry cannot evaluate entities within and outside of their businesses. Without effectively addressing this point, innovative products cannot be developed systematically. However, this cycle calls for innovation to be achieved and needs compartmental improvement, but not generally necessary. In this sense, behavioral economics, by providing an approach that is similar to human reality, can contribute sufficiently in the form of an observational marketing tool and thus allow for a better understanding of the human actions in the innovation market process.*

***Keywords---** Behavioral economics, Neuro-economics, Innovation, Creativity.*

I INTRODUCTION

There is no longer the economic world of employment of executives—even advertisers. This means that the core current traditional market techniques are obsolete. Nevertheless, administrators still believe that they use them. Maybe the best reason for doing so is that no better solution seems to exist than the theory of total rationality—but it can also be to the utmost convenience. Furthermore, solutions which are viewed as avant-garde—more results than physiological and behavioral models and theories—are generally seen as a threat to the status. Of example, this raises pessimism about the effectiveness of economic problems.

In economic life, everything has become quicker, more incoherent and particularly complex, and has contributed to a reduced sense of control over economic variables. Today, customers have access to price lists, distribution terms and product features on specialized websites and other buyers' feedback on blogs, not to mention any current real-world issues, when watching their team at a football match; while chatting to their relatives who may live around their country. All that is also just a click away; the customer still looks from his mode smartphone at the planet. In this context it can be inferred that a metric which was historically compatible with the policy of the business runs the risk of no longer relating to the requirements of the customer [1]–[4]. For an article on the significance of self-conceptual consistency in consuming behavior. This also logically means the media campaigns of the business will no doubt have a positive effect on consumer behavior. It is also important to note that, when contemplating the willingness of consumers to take decisions, the implications of the environment sometimes have significant impacts.

This efforts have forced enterprise into a strong talent pull to produce innovative products and services and to introduce them in order to meet this new consumer behavior. Nonetheless, it may be too costly and difficult to recruit

creative practitioners. They are also often already happy as independent specialist or in their ongoing projects in other organizations. The solution available to businesses is therefore the production in-house of these creative experts.

It highlights the great management problem of how these creative talents can be developed. The growth of innovation within the company's workforce may be a reasonable answer to this question. Yet creative talents are not ensured by innovation alone. As later explained, this is one of the factors that drive the development of innovators. Some scholars, such as Professor of Neuro-economics at Emory University Gregory Berns, claim that this may be the largest variable of innovation growth, but certainly doesn't explain it all. There is one element of creativity that has evolved from imagination for many business practitioners, research writers as well as common knowledge. Innovation, though, comes from a lot of effort and dedication for many people.

Therefore, neoclassical business simply disregards creativity's position in innovation. Furthermore, there's no default. No one is sure of anything; without taking many unnecessary risks, marketers are not going along the right path. It's been, at least, so far. Nonetheless, a field of study today provides more convincing theories of production of new products and services than those proposed by mainstream economics (and other areas of science based on human rationality)-behavioral economic ones [5]–[7].

From what has been stated above, a consistent context of our opinion on the relationship between innovation, imagination and (economic) activity is desirable. For a full and recent analysis of literature on the relationships between creativity and innovation, see Anderson, Poto Trifunčnik and Zhou. The literature on these issues in general uses a cycle of creativity and innovation, in which the first is the stage of the development of concept and the second is the stage of their execution. The general assumption is that ingenuity is a requirement for invention.

Actually, it's often very complex to convert creative ideas or creativity into products or innovation, and therefore far from being a sequential process with guaranteed results. Simply put, imagination does not always generate ingenuity. In evaluating the desirable actions of the crucial factors which make creativity turn into innovation, it is our opinion that the behavioral economic approach should (also) be considered. In this sense, they believe that the conduct of creativity must be considered. This is (still) not discussed enough in research to the best of our knowledge.

I.I Conceptual Considerations on Economic Behavior, Creativity and Innovation:

I.I.I Behavioral economics:

Conduct economics is an important tool in the study of economic decision-making. It is not needless to claim that behavioral economics is one of the few analytical tools that have been able to reflect the reality of human actions in the daily life, including in economic decision-making, while buying, trading, bargaining and taking part in government projects.

There is a multidisciplinary research framework for behavioral economy consequently, the name it is assigned does not decide its consistency as a resource. It is necessary to check if the expectations resulting from the problem of the human being are satisfied than a particular "code" which is what the term conduct economy is called? Were people at odds for their best interests? Is it possible to correctly fix the problem? Therefore, this research will not distinguish between behavioral economics, neuro-economics, environmental psychology or anything else. They reflect the same thing from this point of view. Being a psychologist, Daniel Kahneman, is well-known as behavioral economy. Firstly,

the notion that people are moral and usually have strong opinions. Second, feelings such as anxiety, desire, and dislike describe the majority of times that people differ from reason.

Traditionally, Economics conceives a culture of rational unemotional maximizers known as the Homo economics. Almost all behavior observed by social and cognitive psychologists is ignored or omitted from the common economic context [8], [9]. Once defended by a number of reasons, this "competent" economic agent was claimed to be "right;" most argued that the standard model was easier to formalize and more relevant in practice.

Compartmental economics developed from the recognition that neither perspective was right the field of behavioral economics is concerned with the study of how consumers actually determine. Some of the observations into psychology are used in this field in order to forecast the decisions. Chevalier, Filipe and Ramalheiro also shows, by analyzing customer behavior and the anchor effect, that obviously irrelevant knowledge can be used to manipulate individuals in the buying cycle of a good or service and that it could be important at the time of their decision.

The lack of rational decision-making is a major source of conduction economic analysis and was noted by John Maynard Keynes, one of the most important figures in Economics. System 1 is simple and logical and does not apply to what they generally equate with reasoning, though. It is intuitive. System 1 scientists discovered they are related to the oldest parts of the brain, which they share with lizards and dogs. Unit 2 is more self-conscious and deliberate. When solving a measurement problem, people use device 2. Many people tend to use it when choosing which way to go or when researching, for example, law or management. All System 1 and Systems 2 are involved when they wake up. As previously mentioned, System 1 works automatically and usually with a little effort in a comfortable way, involving a fraction of our ability. System 2 ideas are continually produced and perceptions and experiences are converted into opinions and desires which are voluntary. The advantages and disadvantages for each of the two ways of thinking. In many instances device 1 collects information and results using insight and general rules almost quickly. These shortcuts can naturally lead to mistakes.

Too often though, without being guided by thought or reflection, they encourage our instincts or impulses to flood, which leads to bad decisions. Marketers, analysts and executives are expected to know how people act on the economy [4], [6]. In that way, though, behavioral economics will boost these practitioners ' efficiency through making important economic decisions that have to be taken every day. This is because it encourages politicians to take a different view of how people make practical choices-not traditional economic models.

I.I.II Creativity:

Across various branches of economic activities, several examples are creative people who inspire others. No consensus has been found even if they test, analyze and remind these people what they are doing to be so imaginative. Some insights have, however, been obtained by conduction economics that deserve attention in understanding this subject. After all, creativity comes from the brain and is the inventor's raw material; in this invention innovation begins.

The Oxford dictionary describes creativity as "the use of imagination or original ideas to create something," which is a good starting point. In this respect, it is important to define creativity in this context. Glossy ideas are the driving force of innovation, so it is worth exploring how they develop them. they have examined many ways this process works and how it can be aided. The theory is that imagination derives from conscious human interaction. This is an interesting

definition, as it addresses an important point—a deliberate action of the human being. Yet because nothing else is done, it is incomplete simply because of the fact that creativeness is only a conscious act. It is not total.

Although more general than the first, this last concept better illustrates innovation, since it does not exclude the likelihood of decision making processes being included in the creative process. First and foremost, innovation should be recognized as an activity. The more a person tries to learn and practice creative thoughts and actions, the greater the likelihood that these creative thoughts are not, as will be seen later, traditional. The brain and body actually train to expend less time, a process called 'repetition reduction' by neuroscientists [3], [5], [7]. But here they are not referring to focus or a general approach to creative stimulation depending on several factors.

Usually, there are two antagonistic views about creative professionals. The first relates to the lone genius, who has creative insights and solves problems as if by "magic". In this view, only a few extraordinary individuals are capable of developing creative thinking. The second demystifies this assumption by claiming that creativity is a daily or at least frequent result of very repetitive work with little interruption, as if it is some sort of positive dependency and that insight is just the end of the process.

However, they are not thinking here about concentration or about a general approach to artistic enhancement, which relies on several aspects as will be seen. Usually, there are two antagonistic views about creative professionals. The first one concerns the lone genius who, as if by "luck," has imaginative understandings and solves problems. In this viewpoint, only a few exceptional people are able to cultivate creative thinking. Furthermore, inspiration stems from repetitive work, whether regular or at least sometimes, with few interruptions, as though this were a productive dependency and only the end of the process, the second theory demystification.

There is no one who produced a bare piece of paper on which a lifetime is printed. This is a misunderstood and risky term. Currently, neuroscientists learn of the "genomic unconscious," which brings us certain features or behavioral patterns of system 1. This influences our interests, values, and desires, among others, in order to decide between 'fight or flight' and 'possibility or danger' as regards the trade. In the evolution of man as a species, this process was created to resolve not just the biological problems of ecological maintenance (biological homeostasis), but also the organism's maintenance, when socially active [10]. Today, individual results reflect a reflection of humanity's collective attempts to solve problems. Another point to be mentioned is that today's neuroscience uses many tools to develop innovative people through natural and pharmacological stimuli in specific contexts and moments—whatever the area of creativity understanding.

This means that some people are latent enough to develop creative ideas, but they also can be generated by stimulating problems by means of original ideas. The creative person can be influenced by intentional experiences that can generate an improved potential for creative ideas in him / her. Therefore, this process involves both the unconscious (System 1) and the conscious (System 2). The human brain spares time and uses measures to maximize the use of body and brain capital. These brain shortcuts cost us a lot—they make rational decision-making very hard for us.

The rejection of this limited market potential for decision-making was the "cardinal sin" of conventional industry, assuming that innovation is only a machine 2 (conscious) process.

Those who see what nobody else can see are people who offer the consumer the "new." Which, of course, relies on imagination, which depends on the visual perception of three elements: the first being epigenetic; the second being the interpretation of every person's lives; and lastly, the contact with the world.

- Associations for example, they know that the brain is linked, often between things previously unknown. Therefore it is also important to dream or come up with ideas during sleep; this is a time when the unconscious brain will relax and form new, unforeseen associations.
- Incremental and progressive-creativity requires violations of radical new theories, a fresh structure for the question and new directions for its resolution. It is also a hard task, however, to polish and refine ideas, debug and solving problems to make them work.
- Divergent and convergent thought- numerous creative thinking experiments have looked at two different ways of thinking. The emphasis of convergence is a common "right" solution, while the thinking of divergent connection also explores the edges of a question. Although there are examples of problems that need to be solved accurately and convergent, others need a blend of the two techniques of reasoning.
- Pattern Recognition–imagination involves trends and our capacity to see them in particular. In its simplest form they have access to solutions that have worked in the past and that they can use again if they see a pattern they can understand. However, it is sometimes a case of recognizing a similarity between a new problem and what they have previously seen.

Nevertheless, does any innovation (or creative thinking) yield political, technical and financial market results?

I.I.III Innovation:

Innovative practitioners are those who can bring products and services on the market with their innovation. Every new subject is creativity. In 1911, Joseph Schumpeter proclaimed in his book *The Theory of Economic Development* that it was the economic agent, through more productive combinations of manufacturing factors or the action of any invention or technological innovation that brought new products to market. Studies have therefore been especially comprehensive and successful on this subject. Thus, in the words of the father of the study of innovation in economics it seems better to present innovation.

- The introduction of a new good;
- The introduction of a new production method;
- Opening a new market;
- The achievement of a new source of supply of raw materials or semi-manufactured goods;
- The establishment of a new way of organizing an industry.

To Schumpeter, produce requires the synthesis of products and factors that can affect us. In this way, creativity is a catalyst for other products to be created or the same with another process. This requires different materials and forces to be combined. Five potential new combinations exist for this purpose.

- Product - which is the physical product;
- Service - which is services to customers, guarantees, and training of distributors and retailers;
- Delivery - which covers logistics and the channels used to transfer the product to customers.

There are important characteristics of creativity so marketers can better identify them in the market. The innovation produces high growth rates for innovators or businesses with new products or services in sales and income. This is because existing and Modern rivals or even opportunistic money prefer to duplicate these inventions. In other terms, companies that benefit from innovations have a "monopoly advantage in the very short term."

Following an investigation into which creativity is, where it exists and the implications for an organization and the economy, it is time to explore who produces innovation, i.e. innovators. The neuro-economist Gregory Bern's sets out a new definition for an innovator: an innovator is someone who does what nobody else is doing.

II DISCUSSION

Social intelligence:

They are social beings as men. It makes social communication's enormous potential an important tool for an innovator's arguments. It is precisely this variable that causes the individual to associate with a specific group (e.g. relatives, soccer team, religion, etc.). Thus, things like identity, love and life, social instinct and language, self-awareness and morality are important in order for the product to become a breakthrough and the target for potential customers.

Many scientists approach this topic with particular care about the power of social knowledge. In the area of self-help (amongst many bestsellers), though, there is no comparable treatment in certain literature. This is a recurrent problem in this type of literature and can lead to significant losses for professionals who want to use this type of device. Neuroscience is now contributing significantly to this area because it has improved the ability to understand how the brain makes decisions in the social context.

Upon seeing the world differently and doing what needs to be done, the innovator spreads his ideas in society, generating genuine foibles within customers. This can be achieved by social intelligence, which can be summed up as the ability to remain in the minds of people. Recent neuroscience experiments have shown which brain circuits have functions like understanding what others think, empathy, fairness and social identity.

They can sell or distribute an idea two ways. The first concerns the description of new things: for young adults with a still-developing brain (the quest for uniqueness) it fits well. The second addresses the likelihood of recognition, which works effectively with people with developed brains. Of course, cultural patterns influence such contexts, but only to a certain extent, because the physiological factors of brain evolution are strong enough to ensure the action of individuals in the face of these stimuli into their unconscious.

III CONCLUSION

This strange new world-which is so diverse, competitive and experienced-offers many possibilities for creative people, as inventions are continually created and require distinct products and services to be routinely produced. Innovative analysis can only be successfully explored through the understanding and use of decision-making processes. It's a human capacity to invent. Therefore it is wise and more similar to how people conduct themselves in their daily lives to focus their research on individual variables.

The raw material of innovation is imagination. Creative people can see ideas that can be seen by nobody else. But for ordinary practitioners, creating is not straightforward. Creative people may be a threat for the company's status quo; and innovation depends on how well a professional links and influence his social groups. Modern neuroscience provides a

profound understanding of the decision-making process of professional innovators. Such practitioners are thus able to deal with and control the anxiety as they pose their ideas and experience the consequences of trying to change in an atmosphere that is social; they are also very knowledgeable in society, allowing them to incorporate more common ideas (possibly threatening), including the possibility of making good use of them

The creative potential is a thinking capability. This can also be taught through the method of duplication reduction, through which neural groups specialize in certain tasks (or information), as with any other scientific discipline. A system 2 phase is now automated, and thus is therefore part of system 1 of decision-making. Taking into account the potential of behavioral economy as an analytical tool, an overall improvement of the analytical basis for carrying out a survey could be considered in order to understand people's economic behavior. An innovative understanding of product and services creativity can allow advertisers and other business management experts to see how different actions can effectively turn creative ideas into marketable products and how customers respond to these products and services as they engage on the sale.

REFERENCE

- [1] A. D. Minghat and R. M. Yasin, "A sustainable framework for Technical and Vocational education in Malaysia," in *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2010.
- [2] C. Estay, F. Durrieu, and M. Akhter, "Entrepreneurship: From motivation to start-up," *J. Int. Entrep.*, 2013.
- [3] J. M. Comeche and J. Loras, "The influence of variables of attitude on collective entrepreneurship," *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.*, 2010.
- [4] V. Johansen, "Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial activity," *Int. J. Entrep. Small Bus.*, 2010.
- [5] N. Crilly, "'Fixation' and 'the pivot': Balancing persistence with flexibility in design and entrepreneurship," *Int. J. Des. Creat. Innov.*, 2018.
- [6] J. Overall, "A conceptual framework of innovation and performance: The importance of leadership, relationship quality, and knowledge management," *Acad. Entrep. J.*, 2015.
- [7] A. García-Tabuenca, J. L. Crespo-Espert, and J. R. Cuadrado-Roura, "Entrepreneurship, creative industries and regional dynamics in Spain," *Annals of Regional Science*. 2011.
- [8] R. M. Yasin, A. D. Minghat, and S. Rahman, "Sustainable Development Elements in the Vocational-Subjects Coursework of the Malaysian Secondary-School Curriculum," *Res. J. Appl. Sci.*, 2013.
- [9] A. Saxena and R. Jagota, "Could sociocracy be the way to MSME governance?," *Indian J. Corp. Gov.*, 2016.
- [10] H. Sarooghi, D. Libaers, and A. Burkemper, "Examining the relationship between creativity and innovation: A meta-analysis of organizational, cultural, and environmental factors," *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 2015.