

# Theoretical Frameworks and Models for Effective Dyadic Collaboration in Creative Knowledge Work

## 1. Introduction

Effective dyadic (two-person) collaboration in creative or complex knowledge work has been the subject of increasing research attention, with a focus on understanding the psychological and cognitive mechanisms that underpin successful partnerships. Several established theoretical frameworks and models have emerged, emphasizing complementary psychological roles, cognitive functions, and the dynamics of interpersonal interaction. Key models include the opportunity–ability–motivation framework for expertise use (Hong & Gajendran, 2018), dyadic intellectual capital architecture (Wang & Tarn, 2018), and neural synchrony models that highlight the importance of interpersonal brain synchronization for creativity (Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Mayseless et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024). Empirical studies have shown that cooperation, psychological closeness, and complementary expertise can significantly enhance creative performance in dyads (Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Ling et al., 2023; Toader, 2020; Lu et al., 2022; Mayseless et al., 2019). Other frameworks, such as transactive memory systems and distributed cognition, further explain how dyads leverage shared knowledge and cognitive diversity to solve complex problems (Hong & Gajendran, 2018; Fischer et al., 2002; Pan et al., 2015). Despite these advances, the literature also notes limitations, such as the potential for social or cognitive conflict and the need for effective communication and trust (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010; Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Hawlina et al., 2019). Overall, the research suggests that effective dyadic collaboration is best supported by models that account for both individual differences and the emergent properties of the dyadic relationship.

## 2. Methods

A comprehensive literature review was conducted by searching over 170 million research papers in Consensus, including sources such as Semantic Scholar and PubMed. A total of 1,029 papers were identified, 788 were screened, 461 were deemed eligible, and the top 50 most relevant papers were included in this review.

### Search Strategy



**FIGURE 1** Flow diagram of the literature search and selection process.

Eight unique search strategies were used, focusing on dyadic collaboration, complementary cognitive roles, and psychological models in creative knowledge work.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Core Theoretical Frameworks and Models

Several frameworks have been established to explain effective dyadic collaboration in creative knowledge work:

- **Opportunity–Ability–Motivation (OAM) Framework:** This model posits that dyadic expertise use is driven by the opportunity (perceived value of partner's expertise), ability (tie strength), and motivation (psychological empowerment) (Hong & Gajendran, 2018).
- **Dyadic Intellectual Capital (DIC) Architecture:** This framework identifies knowledge interdependency, expertise similarity, collaborative routines, and mutual trust as key factors for effective interdisciplinary dyadic learning (Wang & Tarn, 2018).
- **Transactive Memory Systems (TMS):** TMS describes how dyads develop shared systems for encoding, storing, and retrieving knowledge, facilitating complementary cognitive roles (Pan et al., 2015).
- **Neural Synchrony Models:** Studies using fNIRS hyperscanning have shown that interpersonal brain synchronization (IBS) in regions such as the prefrontal cortex and temporo-parietal junction is associated with higher creativity and cooperation in dyads (Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Mayseless et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024).

#### 3.2. Complementary Psychological Roles and Cognitive Functions

- **Complementarity in Expertise and Cognitive Styles:** Dyads with dissimilar problem models or complementary expertise tend to achieve more comprehensive problem definitions and higher creative performance (Toader, 2020; Wang & Tarn, 2018; Sun et al., 2021).
- **Role Differentiation and Psychological Closeness:** Psychological closeness and trust between dyad members enhance knowledge elaboration and creativity, especially when tacit knowledge is shared (Ling et al., 2023; Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Hawlina et al., 2019).
- **Perspective-Taking and Diversity:** High levels of perspective-taking and cultural self-efficacy in dyads facilitate creativity, particularly in diverse or multicultural pairs (Camargo et al., 2020; Hawlina et al., 2019).

#### 3.3. Mechanisms and Processes

- **Interpersonal Dynamics:** High-quality dyadic relationships (e.g., trust, respect, mutual obligation) foster a creative team environment and improve performance, especially in complex and interdependent tasks (Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010; Fischer et al., 2002).
- **Nonverbal Synchrony and Communication:** Nonverbal synchrony and effective communication patterns are predictive of higher creativity in dyads (Won et al., 2014; Mateescu & Kauffeld, 2024; Fischer et al., 2002).
- **Digital and Virtual Collaboration:** The use of interactive external representations and virtual collaboration tools can enhance mental model convergence and solution quality in dyads (Mateescu & Kauffeld, 2024; Fischer et al., 2002; Muehlfeld et al., 2025).

### 3.4. Limitations and Critiques

- **Potential for Conflict:** Dyadic collaboration can be hindered by social or cognitive conflict, especially when there is a lack of trust or role clarity (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010; Hawlina et al., 2019; Hemmert & Hovav, 2024).
- **Boundary Conditions:** The effectiveness of dyadic models may depend on factors such as task complexity, cultural context, and the nature of the knowledge being shared (Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Moirano et al., 2020; Venkataramani & Tang, 2023).

#### Key Papers

Paper	Framework/Model	Methodology	Key Findings	Context
(Hong & Gajendran, 2018)	OAM Framework	Survey, 2-wave dataset	Opportunity, ability, and motivation jointly predict dyadic expertise use	Organizational teams
(Wang & Tarn, 2018)	DIC Architecture	Survey, interviews	Knowledge interdependency and trust drive exploratory learning in dyads	Interdisciplinary workplace dyads
(Lu et al., 2018)	Neural Synchrony	fNIRS hyperscanning	Cooperation increases creativity and brain synchronization in dyads	Creative problem-solving
(Xue et al., 2018)	Neural Synchrony	fNIRS hyperscanning	Less-creative dyads can outperform via cooperation and brain synchrony	Creative tasks
(Pan et al., 2015)	Transactive Memory Systems	Field study	Social networking support enhances dyadic knowledge exchange	Virtual communities

**FIGURE 2** Comparison of key studies on dyadic collaboration frameworks and models.

## Top Contributors







Type	Name	Papers
Author	Kelong Lu	(Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2020)
Author	N. Hao	(Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2020)
Author	Hua Xue	(Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018)
Journal	<i>NeuroImage</i>	(Xue et al., 2018; Mayseless et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024)
Journal	<i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>	(Ling et al., 2023; Hong & Gajendran, 2018; Dong et al., 2017)
Journal	<i>Thinking Skills and Creativity</i>	(Moirano et al., 2020; Camargo et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2023)

**FIGURE 3** Authors & journals that appeared most frequently in the included papers.

## 4. Discussion

The research on dyadic collaboration in creative knowledge work demonstrates a robust and growing body of evidence supporting the importance of complementary psychological roles and cognitive functions. High-quality empirical studies, including those using advanced neuroimaging techniques, provide strong support for models emphasizing cooperation, trust, and cognitive diversity (Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Hong & Gajendran, 2018; Wang & Tarn, 2018; Pan et al., 2015). The OAM framework and DIC architecture are particularly well-supported, offering actionable insights for both researchers and practitioners. However, the literature also highlights the need for careful management of potential conflicts and the importance of contextual factors such as task complexity and cultural diversity (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010; Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Hawlina et al., 2019; Moirano et al., 2020). While the evidence for the benefits of dyadic collaboration is strong, some claims—such as the universal superiority of dyads over individuals or larger teams—are less well-supported and may depend on specific boundary conditions (Glăveanu et al., 2019; Meyer & Plucker, 2022). Overall, the research underscores the value of integrating psychological, cognitive, and social perspectives to fully understand and optimize dyadic collaboration in creative work.

## Claims and Evidence Table

Claim	Evidence Strength	Reasoning	Papers
Complementary psychological roles and cognitive functions enhance dyadic creativity	 Strong	Multiple high-quality studies show that cooperation, trust, and complementary expertise drive creative performance in dyads	(Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Ling et al., 2023; Toader, 2020; Hong & Gajendran, 2018; Wang & Tarn, 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Pan et al., 2015)
Interpersonal brain synchronization is a neural marker of effective dyadic collaboration	 Strong	fNIRS studies consistently link IBS in key brain regions to higher creativity and cooperation	(Lu et al., 2018; Xue et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Mayseless et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2020)
High-quality dyadic relationships foster creative team environments and performance	 Strong	Empirical studies show trust, respect, and mutual obligation are critical for creativity in complex tasks	(Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010; Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017; Fischer et al., 2002; Hawlina et al., 2019)
Perspective-taking and cultural self-efficacy facilitate creativity in diverse dyads	 Moderate	Studies show that these factors help overcome barriers and leverage diversity for creative outcomes	(Camargo et al., 2020; Hawlina et al., 2019; Tadmor et al., 2012)
Dyadic collaboration is always superior to individual or group work for creativity	 Weak	Evidence is mixed; some studies show benefits, others find no difference or context-dependent effects	(Glăveanu et al., 2019; Meyer & Plucker, 2022; Torrance, 1970)
Digital tools and virtual collaboration always improve dyadic creative performance	 Weak	Some studies show benefits, but effects depend on tool design, task, and user proficiency	(Muehlfeld et al., 2025; Mateescu & Kauffeld, 2024; Fischer et al., 2002)

**FIGURE 4** Key claims and support evidence identified in these papers.

## 5. Conclusion

In summary, established theoretical frameworks and models for effective dyadic collaboration in creative knowledge work emphasize the importance of complementary psychological roles, cognitive diversity, trust, and interpersonal synchrony. While the evidence base is strong for several core models, further research is needed to address contextual nuances and optimize dyadic collaboration across diverse settings.

## 5.1. Research Gaps

Despite significant advances, gaps remain in understanding how specific contextual factors (e.g., culture, task type, digital environments) moderate the effectiveness of dyadic collaboration models. There is also a need for more longitudinal and cross-disciplinary studies to validate and refine existing frameworks.

### Research Gaps Matrix

Topic/Model	Empirical Studies	Neuroimaging Studies	Virtual/Tech-Enabled	Multicultural Context	Longitudinal Studies
OAM Framework	3	GAP	GAP	GAP	GAP
Dyadic Intellectual Capital	2	GAP	GAP	1	GAP
Neural Synchrony Models	GAP	5	1	GAP	GAP
Transactive Memory Systems	2	GAP	2	GAP	GAP
Perspective-Taking/Cultural Efficacy	1	GAP	GAP	2	GAP

**FIGURE 5** Matrix of research topics and study attributes, highlighting gaps in the literature.

## 5.2. Open Research Questions

Future research should explore how these frameworks operate in digital and multicultural contexts, and investigate the long-term development of complementary roles in dyads.

Question	Why
How do digital collaboration tools influence the development of complementary cognitive roles in dyadic creative work?	Digital tools are increasingly used in knowledge work, but their impact on dyadic role differentiation and creativity is not well understood.
What are the long-term effects of repeated dyadic collaboration on psychological role complementarity and creative performance?	Most studies are cross-sectional; longitudinal research could reveal how roles and effectiveness evolve over time.
How do cultural differences moderate the effectiveness of established dyadic collaboration models?	Understanding cultural influences is crucial for applying these models in global and diverse work environments.

**FIGURE 6** Open research questions for future studies on dyadic collaboration.

In conclusion, while robust models exist for effective dyadic collaboration in creative knowledge work, ongoing research is needed to address contextual factors and further refine these frameworks for diverse and evolving work environments.

*These papers were sourced and synthesized using Consensus, an AI-powered search engine for research. Try it at <https://consensus.app>*

## References

- Lu, K., Xue, H., Nozawa, T., & Hao, N. (2018). Cooperation Makes a Group be More Creative.. *Cerebral cortex*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy215>
- Xue, H., Lu, K., & Hao, N. (2018). Cooperation makes two less-creative individuals turn into a highly-creative pair. *NeuroImage*, 172, 527-537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.02.007>
- Ling, C., He, W., Gong, Y., Liu, W., & Cho, V. (2023). Does receiving knowledge catalyze creativity? A dyadic-level contingency model of knowledge type and psychological closeness on knowledge elaboration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2741>
- Fliaster, A., & Schloderer, F. (2010). Dyadic ties among employees: Empirical analysis of creative performance and efficiency. *Human Relations*, 63, 1513 - 1540. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710361988>
- Muehlfeld, K., Loderer, A., Semrau, T., & Wilken, R. (2025). Foreign Language Use, Virtuality, and the Creative Performance of Dyadic Teams. *Management International Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-024-00557-1>
- Mateescu, M., & Kauffeld, S. (2024). Interactive external representations for knowledge-building processes and performance in dyads: An experimental study. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100519>
- Toader, A. (2020). Processes of knowledge recombination in two-person teams: resource pool and resource integration. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30, 566 - 580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1858807>
- Won, A., Bailenson, J., Stathatos, S., & Dai, W. (2014). Automatically Detected Nonverbal Behavior Predicts Creativity in Collaborating Dyads. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 38, 389-408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10919-014-0186-0>

- Hong, W., & Gajendran, R. (2018). Explaining dyadic expertise use in knowledge work teams: An opportunity–ability–motivation perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 796-811. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.2286>
- Bornay-Barrachina, M., & Herrero, I. (2017). Team Creative Environment as a Mediator Between CWX and R&D Team Performance and Moderating Boundary Conditions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33, 311 - 323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9495-8>
- Wang, J., & Tarn, D. (2018). Are two heads better than one? Intellectual capital, learning and knowledge sharing in a dyadic interdisciplinary relationship. *J. Knowl. Manag.*, 22, 1379-1407. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2017-0145>
- Lu, K., Gao, Z., Wang, X., Qiao, X., He, Y., Zhang, Y., & Hao, N. (2022). The hyper-brain neural couplings distinguishing high-creative group dynamics: an fNIRS hyperscanning study.. *Cerebral cortex*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhac161>
- Glăveanu, V., Gillespie, A., & Karwowski, M. (2019). Are people working together inclined towards practicality? A process analysis of creative ideation in individuals and dyads.. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ACA0000171>
- Torrance, E. (1970). Influence of Dyadic Interaction on Creative Functioning. *Psychological Reports*, 26, 391 - 394. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1970.26.2.391>
- Tadmor, C., Satterstrom, P., Jang, S., & Polzer, J. (2012). Beyond Individual Creativity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43, 384 - 392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111435259>
- Fischer, F., Bruhn, J., Gräsel, C., & Mandl, H. (2002). Fostering collaborative knowledge construction with visualization tools. *Learning and Instruction*, 12, 213-232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(01\)00005-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(01)00005-6)
- Dong, Y., Bartol, K., Zhang, Z., & Li, C. (2017). Enhancing employee creativity via individual skill development and team knowledge sharing: Influences of dual-focused transformational leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38, 439-458. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.2134>
- Moirano, R., Sánchez, M., & Štěpánek, L. (2020). Creative interdisciplinary collaboration: A systematic literature review. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 35, 100626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2019.100626>
- Meyer, M., & Plucker, J. (2022). Creativity in Groups. *Creativity and Innovation Theory, Research, and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003233923-17>
- Camargo, A., Çelik, P., & Storme, M. (2020). Cultural self-efficacy increases creativity in bicultural dyads: Evidence from two dyadic divergent thinking tasks. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 38, 100725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100725>
- Hawlina, H., Gillespie, A., & Zittoun, T. (2019). Difficult Differences: A Socio-cultural Analysis of How Diversity Can Enable and Inhibit Creativity. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 53, 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOCB.182>
- Mayseless, N., Hawthorne, G., & Reiss, A. (2019). Real-life creative problem solving in teams: fNIRS based hyperscanning study. *NeuroImage*, 203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116161>
- Zhang, M., Yin, Z., Zhang, X., Zhang, H., Bao, M., & Xuan, B. (2024). Neural mechanisms distinguishing two types of cooperative problem-solving approaches: An fNIRS hyperscanning study. *NeuroImage*, 291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2024.120587>
- Yin, J., Pan, Y., Zhang, Y., Hu, Y., & Luo, J. (2023). Distinct inter-brain synchronization patterns during group creativity under threats in cooperative and competitive contexts. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101366>



Lu, K., Teng, J., & Hao, N. (2020). Gender of partner affects the interaction pattern during group creative idea generation. *Experimental Brain Research*, 238, 1157 - 1168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-020-05799-7>

Hemmert, M., & Hovav, A. (2024). Dancing with strangers: a dyadic view of university-industry research collaborations. *Industry and Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2024.2432628>

Pan, Y., Xu, Y., Wang, X., Zhang, C., Ling, H., & Lin, J. (2015). Integrating social networking support for dyadic knowledge exchange: A study in a virtual community of practice. *Inf. Manag.*, 52, 61-70.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.10.001>

Venkataramani, V., & Tang, C. (2023). When Does External Knowledge Benefit Team Creativity? The Role of Internal Team Network Structure and Task Complexity. *Organization Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2023.1661>

Sun, B., Xiao, W., Lin, S., Shao, Y., Li, W., & Zhang, W. (2021). Cooperation with partners of differing social experience: An fNIRS-based hyperscanning study. *Brain and Cognition*, 154.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2021.105803>