

## CREATION AS A CONDITION FOR PERSONAL EXPRESSION AND INDIVIDUATION

**Irma Lescinskaite**

Klaipeda University, Lithuania

**Abstract.** *The article discusses the basic concepts and theories of creation and creativity. Creativity is not applied to action, but is rather a psychological quality of a person that is manifested through certain abilities. The question is whether creativity is considered to be determined by spontaneous, irrational factors or can be promoted and is a stimulating phenomenon. The concept of Creativity, its features, as well as traits of a creative personality are distinguished. The following articles also discusses principles, prerequisites for creative motivation – when people become most creative. Creativity is universally considered to be a distinctive feature of a matured, multifaceted and self-realizing, and thus individualized personality. Creative abilities, as a transforming force, enhance a person's sense of value, accelerate the individual's self-fulfilment and maturation of personality.*

**Keywords:** *creation, creative motivation, creativity, individuation.*

### Introduction

The article discusses the concept of Creativity. Creation is the activity that denotes its specifics, while creativity is a personal attribute – that is the fundamental difference in the application of the two notions. The problem is how to distinguish creation as a specific feature of activity from the routine non-creative activity. Creation is one of the activities that can be applied in the process of personal individuation. Therefore, the boundary between creation and non-creation is flexible and depends on the specific situation and context. Creativity, on the other hand, is not applied to an activity, but is rather a psychological quality of a person that is manifested through certain abilities.

Creativity is a non-standard problem solving. Creativity is either considered to be something that is determined by spontaneous, irrational factors or can be promoted and is a stimulating phenomenon.

The essence of the article. Two aspects of the problem:

1. Criteria for recognition: how to recognize factors that are important, how to recognize and distinguish between creation and non-creation, and accordingly between a creative and a non-creative individual, as well as features of a creative personality.
2. What promotes the creative environment?

**Research object:** dissemination of creation and creativity.

The **aim** of the article is to reveal the theoretical basis of the analysis of the concept of Creativity. The article presents the concept of Creativity, principles of creative motivation, traits of a Creative personality and features of Creativity, factors that determine Creativity.

The elucidation of the historical development of the concept of “creation” in more general terms requires first of all to note its tendency of “radicalization”. Even though the concept of “creation” was known to the ancient Greeks, it actually appeared with Christianity, in the doctrine of which it acquired a new – strict and precise – meaning and began to signify the appearance of something out of nothing (Tatarkiewicz, 2018). Meanwhile, in the pre-Christian Greek thinking, for example Plato’s dialogue “Timaeus”, the following notion refers to the “creation”, “making” or “forming” of the world out of the pre-existing, that is, eternal and therefore never created materials (Timaeus). The Christian concept of “creation” was followed by in the Middle Ages, but it was “Greekized” in the sense that, although the doctrine of the *ex nihilo* creation of the world was acknowledged, there was no doubt that the world created by God is the only and immovable reality with no alternatives. In the late Middle Ages, however, the following notion was called into question and there appeared an idea that there is an infinite number of “gods”, each of whom creates one’s own universe. It was a preparatory intermediate step in the transition from theocentric to the anthropocentric conception of the world, the manifesto of which is often regarded to be the “Oration on the Dignity of Man” by an Italian philosopher G. Pico della Mirandola. The main idea behind this manifesto of modern humanism is the complete human freedom to choose and create one’s nature (G. Pico della Mirandola, 1984, pp. 122-144, esp. 123-124); this idea was later developed until it finally crystallized into a thought that a human being is the source of not only oneself, but of all reality – its creator. The process of transformation of the idea of the Christian creation out of nothing, the turning points of which are Kant and Nietzsche’s philosophy, has facilitated the crystallization of precisely this – most radical notion of “creation”. The so-called “creativity” has come to be seen as the main and universal feature of human “nature” – to the extent that the very role of the “freely created” nature generally allows to talk about the nature of a person.

The semblance and even absolutization of creation and creativity came at cost: these popular notions became so broad and vague that they lost their clear and precise meanings. The phenomenon of creation and creativity became a field of extensive and multifaceted research – it was explored in various ways by the philosophical and scientific disciplines mentioned above. The following research provided a great deal of knowledge about the phenomenon, but to claim that it has contributed to understating its essence would be too bold – rather the

opposite. This situation is aptly and somewhat ironically described by McGuigan (2016), who claimed that creativity is a very good thing that we all have to strive for, even though we cannot clearly say what it is.

The following can be further proved by a cursory look at the everyday use of the concepts. There are several notions in the Lithuanian language that describe different objects of creative activity and the process itself: “creation” (Lith. “kūryba”), “creativity” (Lith. “kūrybiškumas”), “creative abilities” (Lith. “kūrybingumas”), “creative thinking” (Lith. “kūrybinis mąstymas”). The term “creativity” is proposed to be used to describe a set of qualities that characterize a creative personality; “creative thinking” is used to refer to the process of thinking, its style and nature. There is also a term that denotes creative activity and the totality of creative abilities – that is creation (Lat. “creatura”, Lith. “kreatyvumas”).

Definitions and descriptions of the following concepts provided in scientific literature even more exacerbate and accentuate the existing confusion. Their diversity should not be surprising, as, according to P. Meusburger, there are over a hundred different analyses of creativity in literature. A striking feature of all descriptions of creativity is that they are all too obvious in the sense that they are not too distant from the images of the phenomenon indicated by common sense.

The concept of **Creativity** is often defined as the expression of change and dynamics in an activity and is understood as the ability to generate new ideas, think independently, non-stereotypically, quickly orient in difficult situation, and easily and atypically solve problems. These are the external signs of creativity. Its inner features or determinants include the following attributes of an individual personality: volatility of imagination, speed of thinking, accuracy, flexibility, ingenuity, constructiveness, curiosity, motivational tension, personal need for continuous improvement, and one’s experience, upbringing and self-education.

In a summary of scientific research into creativity, M. Mumford suggested the following definition: “Over the course of the last decade, we seem to have reached a general agreement that creativity involves the production of novel, useful products” (Mumford, 2003, p. 110). According to the definition provided by Torrance (2015), creativity is the “process of becoming sensitive to problems, deficiencies, gaps in knowledge, missing elements, disharmonies, and so on; identifying the difficulty; searching for solutions, making guesses, or formulating hypotheses about the deficiencies: testing and retesting these hypotheses and possibly modifying and retesting them; and finally communicating the results”.

E.P. Torrance (1987), J.P. Guilford (1968), N. Kogan (1990) claim that creativity is the ability to generate ideas that are new and valuable; it is the

tendency towards original modelling, composing, and new way of thinking. New way of thinking can be based on imagination or thinking operations by means of which an original and an unexpected combination is produced. Innovations are created by applying existing knowledge, but they are interconnected, linked, and transferred to new situations in a different way, by including new variables. Usually a person best perceives what is already known and understood and tends to reject new thoughts. Perception is influenced by assessments, feelings, prejudices, motives, and the widely accepted approach. The ability to see what does not fit into the frame of previous perception is more than mere observation. Creative thinking, therefore, is the result of a whole new discovery, creation of a new idea. Psychologist of creativity J.P. Guilford (1968) noted that creativity is the key to the full-fledged education and to solving most important problems of humanity.

In spite of similar ringing declarations, the study of the considerable amount of literature on the problems of creativity makes it increasingly clear that there is a great gap between the abundance of research and the examination of creation and creativity and the level of their cognition. Therefore, it is possible to only partially agree with Kilgour's opinion that to date, the development of creativity has not received sufficient attention (Kilgour, 2006). The author complains about the lack of practical studies that analyse why some people are more creative than others, what are the factors that determine creativity, and what aspects are most important. The problem is much deeper and the following is greatly demonstrated by the confusion and turmoil in the very field of the theories of creativity. At first glance, the variety of theories are to be welcomed, as it is possible to console oneself that various theories highlight different aspects of the phenomenon of creativity as if complementing each other. On the other hand, efforts to put the "puzzle" of these theories together and comprise a holistic, complete, clear and consistent picture of the nature and essence of creativity did not so far produce any results. It is necessary, thus, to agree with Ingeborg Becker-Textor that "countless attempts have been made to define the notion of creativity, but all definitions lack a definitive, comprehensive explanation". The author describes creativity as an ability of a person to objectively and subjectively create new thinking contents for oneself or others (Becker-Textor, 2001, p. 13).

It may be argued that the only common denominator of all definitions of creativity are the same fundamental, but unanswered questions posed by researchers: what is creativity? What makes a person create? Is it an innate trait or formed by the environment? Maybe it is a natural need to express oneself? Why are some people more creative than others? Is creativity innate or can it be cultivated by means of appropriate tools?

Theories of creativity differ in respect of: a) which of the above questions are the focus of attention; b) which methodological approaches to the analysis of creativity and research methods are considered preferable; c) which elements and aspects of the process of creation are considered to be most important.

Scientific literature offers the following theories of creativity: Psychometric theories; Economic theories; Stage and componential process theories; Cognitive theories; Theories based on problem solving and expertise; Evolutionary theories; Typological theories; Systems theories.

According to Mel Phi Delta Kappan (1961), at the heart of the dominant definitions of creativity is the theory of the “four Ps”, which aims to explain the aspects of the phenomenon of creativity: a) creative **p**rocess; b) **p**roduct or result of the following process; c) creative **p**erson; d) **p**lace of creation, that is, the environment and conditions of the creative process.

A focus on “process” is shown in cognitive approaches that try to describe thought mechanisms and techniques for creative thinking.

Theories invoking divergent rather than convergent thinking (Guilford), or those describing the staging of the creative process (Wallas) are primarily theories of creative process. A focus on creative “product” usually appears in attempts to measure creativity (psychometrics) and in creative ideas framed as successful *memes*. The psychometric approach to creativity reveals that it also involves the ability to produce more.

A focus on the nature of the creative “person” considers more general intellectual habits, such as openness, levels of ideation, autonomy, expertise, exploratory behaviour, etc. A focus on “place” considers the circumstances in which creativity flourishes, such as degrees of autonomy, access to resources. Creative lifestyles are usually characterized by nonconforming attitudes and behaviours as well as flexibility (Sternberg Robert J., 2009).

Yet, in the context of all theories, the **componential** theory of creativity is given prominence for its comprehensiveness and influence. According T. Amabile (2013) the following theory is a comprehensive model of social and psychological factors, which defines components specific to creativity. The componential theory distinguishes creative elements and describes the creative process in a similar way as other theories of psychology and creativity, albeit with different emphases and slightly different ways of promoting creativity. All modern scientific theories of creativity define creativity as a combination of novelty and usefulness.

**Theories are mainly focused on the process and mechanisms** that explain how a person generates creative ideas; most of them (but not all) also include motivational elements and skills of a person. Some theories place strong emphasis on the social environment that promotes creativity. The componential theory is distinguished by several features: a) it focuses attention on skills and

motivation, as well as the external social environment; b) it highlights the impact of each component of creativity on a particular stage of the creative process; c) it emphasizes the importance of social environment and its impact on the person engaged in the creative process, in particular on one's intrinsic motivation. Moreover, unlike other theories of creativity based on psychology, componential theory has been broadened to include the role of innovations in the organization of the creative process. Innovations are defined as a successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization. Thereafter, the theory became truly multileveled and explains creativity of an individual, a team and the organization as a whole. It places emphasis on one missing component of an organization – inability to adequately take into account the external factors that promote creativity, such as user preferences and economic fluctuations. So far, this deficiency in the theory has not been remedied, so in its current form it still remains incomplete in this respect and its explanatory power remains limited. Another flaw in the theory is that it does not explain the influence of the physical environment on creativity, which should be taken into account despite the fact that new research reveals that physical environment (for example, aesthetic work environment, when painting and poetry creation activities were compared) has a weaker impact on creativity than the socio-organizational one (Baer, Kaufman, & Gentile, 2004; Cattell, Glascock, & Washburn, 1918; Child & Iwao, 1968).

In so far as this theory describes psychological factors that determine creativity, it identifies psychological components that underpin creativity. The distinction is based on the definition of creativity, whereby creativity is the “production” of new ideas or results in order to achieve a specific purpose. The theory provides four components needed to find a creative response to the emerging problems. Three of them are related to **individual traits**: important skills, psychological process (features) that determine creativity, and intrinsic motivation to perform a task. One component is external – social environment, where a person lives and works. The current version of the theory encompasses organizational creativity and innovation that affect the work environment created by managers.

According to the componential theory, creativity is influenced by three components: **skills** (competence in a given field or area); **processes** of creativity (personality and cognitive processes that stimulate thinking); **motivation** to perform a task (specifically, intrinsic motivation to engage in activities related to interests, pleasures or personal challenges).

The theory emphasizes the need to combine all of the mentioned components: creativity is greatest, when there is a high level of motivation, as well as strong competence in the area where the result is to be achieved, and the ability to think deeply is also of great importance.

Processes that promote and underpin creativity (initially referred to as skills corresponding to creativity) include the cognitive style and personality traits that allow for independent thinking, risk-taking, ability to look at problems from new perspectives, as well as disciplined way of working and ability to generate ideas. The following psychological/cognitive processes open possibilities for using broad, flexible categories to synthesize information and allow to escape from the existing standard “scenarios” of perception and activity. *Personality processes* include self-discipline and tolerance for ambiguity. Motivation to perform a task is perceived as a desire to engage personally in solving an interesting problem with determination to overcome possible obstacles and difficulties.

***The principle behind motivation for creativity is as follows:*** people are most creative when they feel motivated. In particular, not being stimulated by external motives, but above all by the interest, pleasure, satisfaction and challenges that they experience in performing a certain activity. Studies have shown that important extrinsic motives can impair intrinsic motivation, while its presence or absence in a social environment is crucial. The theory also emphasizes the presence or absence of factors that support a particular motivation, which, when disappeared, also disappears.

The external component of creativity is the work and more broadly – the social environment, which embraces all extrinsic motivations and that can often create obstacles to the task at hand. Environmental factors can even block creativity when, for example, new norms and ideas are severely criticized; effort to maintain the status quo causes political problems within the organization; attempts are made to maintain and consolidate a conservative approach. Meanwhile, other external factors can promote creativity, for example: positive challenges at work; work teams of different qualifications, but focused and pursuing common ideas and goals; freedom to carry out work; equally important are managers who encourage the development of new ideas; management that supports innovation and has a clearly formulated vision that stimulates creativity and values creation; mechanisms that help develop new ideas; norms that encourage active sharing of ideas throughout the organization.

All of the abovementioned components influence the process of creation, which in turn is analytically divided into several sub-processes: a) analysis and formulation of problems and aims to be solved, as well as assessment of their nature; b) preparation to solve a problem by accumulating necessary information and improvement of the required skills; c) development of ideas to solve the problem; d) testing or confirmation of the chosen solution and its communication to others. The chain is not robust and rigidly consistent, as sub-processes can occur anywhere within it and are often repeated until a creative result is achieved.

In 1988, Amabile published an extension version of the theory to encompass both creativity and innovation in organizations. The basic model of individual creativity remained the same, but the assumption was added that the same four components influence the creativity of teams working closely together. More importantly, a parallel set of components was proposed for innovation. According to the expanded theory, innovation depends on: a) existing resources to perform a task (analogous to domain-relevant skills at the individual level); b) skills in innovation management (analogous to an individual's creativity-relevant processes); and (c) motivation to innovate (analogous to individual task motivation). These components constitute the work environment impacting individuals and teams.

In 1996, Amabile published a revision of the original model of individual creativity, in a book that included updates by doctoral students and research associates Mary Ann Collins, Regina Conti, Elise Phillips, Martha Picariello, John Ruscio and Dean Whitney. Research conducted in the first decade after the publication of the theory encouraged to significantly modify one of the theory's most basic tenets – the principle of intrinsic motivation. While many extrinsic motivators (dictates, bribes, etc.) in the work environment undermine intrinsic motivation and creativity, some do not, if there are offsetting motives behind them. Such motives might include recognition of their competence and the value of their work, possibility to become more deeply involved in the work that excites them by providing resources to perform it. In such cases, motivation and creativity might actually be enhanced. The following process is termed “Motivational Synergy” (Amabile, 1993). In 2008, along with Jennifer Mueller, Amabile published an additional theory based on new empirical evidence that emotional state can significantly impact individual creativity. The essence of the supplement is that there is a feedback link between the results of an activity and the external environment that affects it: creativity-friendly environment has a positive effect on activity, while the later, in turn influences creativity-relevant processes. This version is considered to be one of the main theories that explains creativity of individuals and organizations.

### **Traits of a creative personality and features of creativity**

Creativity is universally considered to be a distinctive feature of a matured, multifaceted and self-realizing, and thus individualized personality. There is no holistic conception of creativity, as it is constantly being supplemented by new findings. Psychologists examine creativity in various aspects: as a result of an activity (Maslow, 1959; Rogers, 1959), as a process of activity (Stenberg, 1996; Skinner, 1972), as part of intellectual thinking (Guilford, 1950, 1968; Torrance, 1974, 1964), as a personal trait (Davis & Gardner 1999; Amabile, 1990, 1996).



Other authors have associated creativity with invention (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976). Complex models constructed by authors such as K.K. Urban (1990) and R.J. Sternberg (1988) were used to define creativity. Mednick (1964) defined creative thinking as the ability of an individual to create new relationships between original, unrelated or distant elements.

R. May (1959), in terms of creativity, rejects psychoanalytic theories that regard the product of creation as the result of neurosis or an outcome of ego suppression. He distinguished two forms of creativity: pseudo- or escapist creativity, which is manifested in aestheticism, and true creativity, which is defined as a process when something new is born. True creativity is manifested in “being oneself” or “expansion of the human consciousness”. He examined the nature of the creative process and the special relationship of the creator with the world.

Representatives of humanistic psychology have developed the following approach by stating that creativity is the dissemination of personality that is manifested through self-expression and self-actualization. Creativity is considered to be one of the innate needs that is formed in the process of individual development, provided that dissemination of personality occurs after all physiological, security, respect and recognition, as well as cognitive needs are met. A. Maslow (1959) emphasizes the importance of self-expression in the life of a person. C. Rogers (1959) claimed that the ability to create potentially lies in each of us, one just needs to create conditions for it to unfold. Creative personality, the process and result of creation must be explored together. He defined conditions that allow creativity to flourish: psychological security, freedom and responsibility. According to C.R. Rogers (2005), many adults have similar leisure hobbies, clothing, or even eating habits. Only a few have their own style of activity, unique philosophy of life. That is why it is important to explore creativity. Thus, while developing the *humanistic theory of personality*, C.R. Rogers (1969, 2005) states that the constant search for experience is necessary in the ongoing process of personal development. As claimed by the author (2005, 175), experience reflects how internal energy is disseminated, and in many cases the following dissemination is an unstoppable process. “If a person could be fully open to his experience, every stimulus – whether originating within the organism or in the environment – would be freely relayed through the nervous system without being distorted by any defensive mechanism”. Should the stimulus be the “impact of a configuration of form, colour or sound in the environment on the sensory nerves, or a memory trace from the past, or a visceral sensation of fear of pleasure or disgust, the person would be “living” it, would have it completely available to awareness” (C.R. Rogers, 2005, 176). “Thus, one aspect of this process appears to be a movement away from the pole of defensiveness toward the pole of openness to experience.

The individual is becoming more able to listen to himself, to experience what is going on within himself. He is more open to his feelings of fear and discouragement and pain. He is also more open to his feelings of courage, and tenderness, and awe” (ibid). Nothing is “as authoritative as my experience. It is to experience that I must return again and again, to discover a closer approximation to truth as it is in the process of becoming in me”, while “research is the persistent, disciplined effort to make sense and order out of the phenomena of subjective experience” (31). According to C. Rogers, Creativity can be one of the aspects of the unfoldment of experience. This field is very conducive to finding the best ways to reveal the person’s creative abilities.

**Experience** can also unfold as self-reflection in the creative process of painting and art in general. Creative abilities, as a transforming force, enhance a person’s sense of value, accelerate the individual’s self-fulfilment and maturation of personality. It is the course of the process of individualization of a person. Rogers notes that “the individual has within himself the capacity and the tendency, latent if not evident, to move forward toward maturity. In a suitable psychological climate this tendency is released, and becomes actual rather than potential. It shows itself in the tendency to reorganize his personality and his relationship to life in ways which are regarded as more mature. Whether one calls it a growth tendency, a drive toward self-actualization, or a forward-moving directional tendency, it is the mainspring of life. Motivation for change appears. It is the urge which is evident in all organic and human life – to expand, extend, become autonomous, develop, mature – the tendency to express and activate all the capacities of the organism, to the extent that such activation enhances the organism or the self” (Rogers 2005, 40). Creativity, creative practice is the medium, where tendencies of personal growth can be unfolded. It exists in every human being and it is a matter of time and proper conditions for it to come and be released and expressed.

As mentioned, the second is the objectivist view of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. psychological research on creativity, based on the externally observable *behaviour analysis*, which means that its representatives try to describe creative activity that is recognized by the results of the behaviour, that is, products of creation. Authors representing this view tend to define creativity as a personal trait that helps to find new ways of expressing oneself or solving a problem.

According to Benesch (2002, p. 177) there are three strands of the analysis of creativity: creativity that is associated with human experiences, events and overall productivity.

In accordance with the associative thinking model, a creative person draws more easily upon one’s reservoir of associations than a non-creative one, and the following provides an opportunity for a wider and more original creative activity.

However, the following analysis faces significant challenges, the most important of which is that it is not easy to precisely define the criteria for creativity that would allow a reliable distinction between creative and non-creative activities. Research by means of tests designed by E. Torrance and J. Guilford confirm the real existence of this quandary and reveal that each person is more or less creative. J. Hayes (1989) also believes that there are no special cognitive abilities that would distinguish creative people from non-creative.

In order to avoid or rather circumvent this difficulty, attempts are made to analyse creativity from another aspect, *as a process of activity*. Many scholars suggest to examine creativity as a simple problem-solving process, which consists of processes that are characteristic of human thinking: formulation of an idea, search for a solution, enlightenment, and the solution of a problem.

While examining discoveries of scientists and creation of artists, French scholar J. Hadamard (1969) noticed that there are many similarities between them and proposed 4 stages in the process of creative thinking: first stage – emergence of an idea and preparation; second stage – maturation of thoughts; third stage – quick grasp; fourth stage – verification of the solution and presentation of the product. J. Watson (1913) distinguished two processes of creation: 1) primary, which requires inspiration, quick grasp and intuition; 2) secondary, which requires logical efforts, deductive thinking, attempts and mistakes. A. Lukas (1983) distinguished five stages of solving a creative act: 1) accumulation of knowledge and acquisition of skills; 2) gathering of additional information; 3) retreating from the problem (incubation); 4) enlightenment (insight); 5) verification.

Creative process is complex and requires consistency, effort and time. Even though the stages of the process of thinking are the same, creativity requires greater motivation, initiative, courage, spontaneity from a person. The birth of an idea is the result of long subconscious work, conditioned by the conscious activity of the mind. The distinguished stages of creation have no strict boundaries, they can be intertwined and related to one another.

Novelty is identified as one of the key indicators of creativity (Bailin, 2018), as it is easily detected and studied. Result of creation is assessed in accordance with social worth (Weisberg, 1993), aesthetic appeal and relevance (Hayes, 1989), conformity with the context (Gruces & Lockhart, 1990).

Some authors associate creativity with *personality traits*. They argue that creative people are characterized by openness to new experiences, self-confidence, risk-taking, perseverance, belief in the success of goal achievement, desire to realize oneself. Creative behaviour is determined by the interaction of human abilities, knowledge, skills. J.P. Guilford (1968), E.P. Torrance (1974)

and others associate creative thinking with the *ability to solve problems*. E.P. Torrance (1983) indicates a hierarchy of the creative thinking skills.

J.P. Guilford (1950) attempted to find a factor that is described as an ability to discern problems, to see something that does not fit into the frame of previous perceptions. He distinguished two intellectual operations: divergent (holistic, individual, relational) and convergent (logical, coherent) thinking, the integration of which is essential during creative thinking. Along with E. Torrance, he highlighted 4 dimensions of creative abilities:

1. Fluency of thinking, which is indicated by the abundance of ideas, i.e. ability to generate the maximum amount of ideas.
2. Flexibility of thinking, as an ability to quickly change the direction of thoughts, generate a wide range of ideas.
3. Originality, which is characterized by the rarity, unusualness of ideas, i.e. ability to generate non-standard ideas.
4. Elaboration, the indicator of which is the elaboration of ideas, i.e. ability to provide final shape to the products of thinking.

On the basis of the following creative criteria, E.P. Torrance identified 16 opportunities for promoting creativity, including careful listening, observation, and attentive activity (Benesch, 2002, p. 177).

E.P. Torrance (1974) has also created Tests of Creative Thinking: what is the relationship between creativity and intelligence? J.P. Guilford (1950) claimed that divergent thinking is characterized by freedom and fluency of thought, originality, clarity and sensitivity to problems, and is one of intellectual strategies. J.P. Guilford hypothesized that creativity does not correlate with intelligence, even though both are elements of the same cognitive activity. D.W. MacKinnon (1965) indicated the zero correlation between intelligence and creativity, and wrote that high level of intelligence does not guarantee a high level of creativity, although a certain level of intelligence is required for creative abilities to manifest.

Guilford was convinced that creativity is first of all an ability to think and cannot be measured by intelligence tests. Work experience of creators reveal that the formation of a “by-product” is an important condition for a sudden understanding. Derivatives of elements that unexpectedly occur in the subconscious can form an “ancillary product”, which penetrates into the intermediate sphere and by means of understanding goes up to the level of consciousness, and the creator then “sees” the final answer. Thus, creation, creative thinking requires to break away from the problem being solved, i.e. take a break after long conscious searches. The summary of the works of various authors allows to claim that creativity is the predisposition of an individual towards the new, original, innovative composing of something, modelling or thinking by means of thinking operations and imagination.

Personality traits that inspire creativity and reveal its presence are studied extensively. Authors claim that creative people are characterized by openness to new experiences, self-confidence, risk-taking, perseverance, belief in the success of goal achievement, desire to realize oneself. The first step to understanding creativity lies in its definition. Many definitions of creative ideas are comprised of three components (Kaufman & Sternberg, 2010): first, the idea must reflect something different, new, innovative; second, creative idea must be of high quality; and the third, creative ideas must be tailored to a specific task.

The psychometric approach to creativity reveals that creativity also encompasses the ability to produce more. In terms of “place”, focus is placed on circumstances in which creativity flourishes, for example: degree of autonomy, access to resources. Creative lifestyle is usually described as a non-standard approach and behaviour, as well as flexibility (Sternberg & Robert, 2009).

### Conclusions

The summary of the works of various authors allows to claim that creativity is the predisposition of an individual towards the new, original, innovative composing of something, modelling or thinking by means of thinking operations and imagination.

***Creativity depends on many internal and external factors.*** Some of the most important factors of creativity are: Motivation of the creator, Intrinsic motivation, Need for self-expression.

***Creativity promotes innovation*** by supporting individual and organizational skills, necessary to adapt to the pace and nature of change in today’s world, and by acting as a key process in creating new business opportunities, whether in the form of a product, process, system or service. A creative product is not only the result of a creative process, but also the starting point for product innovation; it is the embodiment of creativity and innovation.

***In the contemporary context, Creativity is conceptualized.*** Creativity is one of the main characteristics of a person in modern society. Creativity has traditionally been associated with personal development and the process of individual growth, but lately it has been increasingly related to innovation, authentic leadership and effective management, as well as other phenomena of economic efficiency and public welfare.

On one hand, personal creativity is manifested in a wide variety of activities, not necessarily only artistic; though, it is often associated only with art and its spontaneity, chaos and freedom. On the other hand, creativity is a structured and focused activity.

***Creativity is understood as the ability of an individual to discover something new,*** as the predisposition towards original innovative modelling or

thinking. It is possible to agree, because creativity is often described as the innate human propensity to express oneself, though each person realizes this propensity in a very individual manner.

### References

- Amabile, T.M. (1990). Within You, Without You: The Social Psychology of Creativity, and Beyond. In M.A. Runco & R.S. Albert (Eds.), *Theories of creativity* (pp. 61–91). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Amabile, T.M. (1993). Motivational Synergy: Toward New Conceptualizations of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in the Workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(3), 185-201.
- Amabile, T.M. (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amabile, T.M., Shatzel, E.A., Moneta, G.B., & Kramer, S.J. (2004). Leader Behaviours and the Work Environment for Creativity: Perceived Leader Support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(1), 5-32. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003
- Bailin, S., & Battersby, M. (2018). *Inquiry: a New Paradigm for Critical Thinking*. Ontario: University of Windsor.
- Becker-Textor, I. (2001). *Kurybiskumas vaiku darzelyje: metodiniai nurodymai, kaip ugdyti vaiku intelekta vaiku darzelyje*. Vilnius: Presvika.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. NY: Basic Books.
- Guilford, J.P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063487>
- Guilford, J.P. (1968). *Intelligence, Creativity, and Their Educational Implications*. San Diego, Cal.: Robert R. Knapp Publisher.
- Hadamard, J. (1996). *The Mathematician's Mind. The Psychology of Invention in the Mathematical Field*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hayes, J.R. (1989). Cognitive Processes in Creativity. In J.A. Glover, R.R. Ronning, C.R. Reynolds (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Differences. Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 135-145). NY: Plenum Press.
- Kaufman, J.C., & Sternberg, R.J. (2010). *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kilgour, M. (2006). Improving the Creative Process: Analysis of the Effects of Divergent Thinking Techniques and Domain Specific Knowledge on Creativity. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 7(2), 79-107.
- Kogan, N. (1990). Creativity and Cognitive Style: A Life Span Perspective. In P. Baltes & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Life Span Developmental Psychology: Personality and Socialization*. NY: Academic Press.
- Lukas, A. (1983). *Kurybinis mastymas*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- MacKinnon, D. (1965). Personality and the Realization of Creative Potential. *American Psychologist*, 20(4), 273-281. DOI: 10.1037/h0022403
- Maslow, A.H. (1959). *New Knowledge in Human Values*. NY: Harper.
- Maslow, A.H. (1976). Creativity in Self-Actualizing People. In A. Rothenberg & C.R. Hausman (Eds.), *The Creativity Question* (pp. 86-92). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- May, R. (1959). The Nature of Creativity. *A Review of General Semantics*, 16(3), 261-276.

- McGuigan, J. (2016). *Neoliberal Culture*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mednick, M.T., Mednick, S.A., & Jung, C.C. (1964). Continual Association as a Function of Level of Creativity and Type of Verbal Stimulus. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 511–515. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041086>
- Meusburger, P., Gluckler, J., & Meskioui, M. (2013) *Knowledge and the Economy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mirandola, G. et della (1984). Humanizmo idejos. In B. Genzelis (Ed.), *Filosofijos istorijos chrestomatija. Renesansas* (pp. 122-144). Vilnius: Mintis.
- Mumford, M.D. (2003). Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going? Taking Stock in Creativity Research. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(2-3), 107–120.
- Rogers, R.S. (1959). The Emperor's Displeasure-Amicitiam Renuntiare. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 90(1959), 224-237.
- Rogers, C. R. (1959). A Tentative Scale for the Measurement of Process in Psychotherapy. In E.A. Rubinstein & M.B. Parloff (Eds.), *Research in psychotherapy* (pp. 96–107). American Psychological Association. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/10036-006>
- Rogers, C.R., & Raskin, N.J. (2005). Person-Centred Therapy. In R.J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Current Psychotherapies* (pp. 130–165). UK: Thomson Brooks Cole.
- Rothenberg A., & Hausman, C.R. (1976). *The Creativity Question*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Skinner, B.F. (1955). Freedom and the Control of Men. *The American Scholar*, 25(1), 47-65.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1988). A Three-Facet Model of Creativity. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 125–147). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J., Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T. J., et al. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns. *American Psychologist*, 51(2), 77–101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.2.77>
- Sternberg, R.J. (1999). *Handbook of Creativity*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J., Jarvin L., & Grigorenko, E. (2009). *Teaching for Wisdom, Intelligence, Creativity, and Success*. NY: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2009). The Rainbow and Kaleidoscope Projects: A New Psychological Approach to Undergraduate Admissions. *European Psychologist*, 14(4), 279-287. DOI: [10.1027/1016-9040.14.4.279](https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.14.4.279)
- Tatarkiewicz, W. (2018). *Apie Laime*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras.
- Torrance, E.P. (1987). Research on Creativity Assessment. In S.G. Isaksen (Ed.), *Frontiers of Creativity Research* (pp. 103-109). Buffalo, NY: Bearly.
- Torrance, E.P. (1974). *The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking: Norms-Technical Manual*. Princeton, NJ: Personal Press.
- Urban, K.K. (1990). Recent Trends in Creativity Research and Theory in Western Europe, *European Journal of High Ability*, 1(1), 99-113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0937445900010114>
- Watson, J.B. (1913). Classics in the History of Psychology: Psychology as the Behaviorist Views it. *Psychological Review*, 20, 158-177.
- Weisberg, R.W. (1993). *Creativity: Beyond the Myth of Genius*. NY: W.H. Freeman & Company.