Section: Problems in management's methodology and practice

Shubina Ivanna

Assistant Professor, Liberal Arts Department, General Education

American University of the Middle East

Egaila, Kuwait

Kulakli Atik

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, MIS Department,

American University of the Middle East

Egaila, Kuwait

FROM CREATIVE ABILITIES TO CREATIVE PERSONALITY: CONTEMPORARY DEBATES

Creativity has been a subject of interest among scientists and practitioners from different fields. Psychologists created theoretical background for creativity, developing difference models and classifications in an attempt to establish the relation between creativity and psychological variables. This paper provides an overview of important discoveries related to creativity from a psychological perspective.

Creativity used to be related to human ability to produce ideas, to find original and unusual solutions, and to use non-traditional non-stereotypical schemes of thinking. Creativity can be considered as a basic human trait or as an ability to cope with difficulties, puzzles, and challenges in one's life, and as such, it is related to psychological and social adaptation (da Costa et. al., 2015), as well as a process, product, or person's attribute and as a context that enables creativity to develop and persist (Baer, 2010).

Creativity can also be defined as the development of influential, unconventional, and useful ideas (Runco, 2004). According to Cropley (2001),

creativity has three crucial aspects: novelty, effectiveness, and ethicality. Some sources describe creativity as psychological process and as a life attitude (Дерманова & Крылов, 2004).

One of the most urgent and significant questions for psychologists, teachers, and managers concerns the relationship between creativity and intelligence. As a result of contemporary sources analysis, it is possible to underline at least three main approaches examining the relationships between creativity and intelligence:

1. Ability to be creative is independent factor unrelated to intelligence (Taylor, 1985). If IQ is higher than 120, creativeness became an independent variable, suggesting that there are no creative people with low IQ, but it is possible to find intellectual person with low creativeness.

2. High level of intellectual development assumes high level of creativeness and vice versa (Eysenck, 1993). Intellectual talent is considered as necessary but insufficient condition for creativity. Motivation, personal values, and personality features, such as cognitive talent, sensitivity to problems, independence in uncertain and difficult situations, play the main role in creativeness determination.

3. Creative abilities do not exist (Weksler, Gerbert et al., in Ильин, 2009). It has been proven that to discover some basic scientific laws, it is enough to apply usual cognitive processes, transformed in some specific way. The process of solving creative tasks is described as interaction among other cognitive processes.

Modern theories of creativity base their assumptions on the fact that this phenomenon is complex and has many different aspects, and combination of many elements is necessary for its development (Simonton, 2000). Several studies have identified features of creative personality:

• Esthetic sensitivity, including esthetic empathy, sense of shape and style and

perfectionism (Барышева, Жигалов, 2006).

- Self-confidence, arrogance, not acceptance of social limitations, tendency for risk, resistance to interference from the environment and different conflicts (Sternberg & Lubart, 1996).

- Awareness, responsibility, perseverance, sense of duty, high control of behavior and emotions, entrepreneurship, risky behavior, determination, social courage, internal locus of control, and intellectual liability (Суслова, 1991).

Another study (Марищук, Пыжьянова, 2007), proved relationships between divergent thinking and radicalism, domination, sensitivity, and nonconformity. Other research has indicated clear correlation of creativity with extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and conscientiousness (Hulsheger et al., 2009).

Motivation is strictly related to enhance individual's creative potential. Few studies demonstrated, that intrinsic motivation may reinforce creativity, while extrinsic motivation may inhibit it (Шубіна, 2013, 2012). Individuals, who perceive a reward as a "bonus" used to be more intrinsically motivated and more creative. For instance, low-skill students demonstrated higher creativity when expecting evaluation in comparison with high-skill students (Hennesey, 2001). When students perceived an academic committee as a possibility for receiving confirmation of their capabilities or recognition from respected experts, creativity was reinforced (Amabile, 2013).

Feedback that students receive from their educators with its motivational aspect considered as important barrier for enhancing creativity (Shubina & Kulakli, 2018a, 2018 b). Comparison to achievements of others and based on its evaluation or judgement may cause negative feeling, what decreases students desire and capabilities for creative thinking (Runco, 2004). Additionally, studies conducted by cognitive psychologists proved negative impact of extrinsic motivation (i.e.

expected reward or evaluation) on creativity among adults (Deci & Ryan, 1980).

The technology today have been seen in different forms such as multi-media, social networking, telecommunication, mobile applications, etc (Seker & Kulakli, 2016; Kulakli & Mahony, 2014). Technology has significant effects and impacts on idea generation, concept development, processes, methods, approaches, practices in all disciplines mostly in teaching and learning era (Kulakli & Birgun, 2011).

Advancement of new technology and common tools provides convenient content deliveries among user groups and individuals. Learning become more interactive, cooperative, collaborative, socially-connected, and continuous based. It includes all earning initiatives such as in-campus, physical classroom based, on training (in office), virtual classroom, online interactive (e-learning), game-based, as well as with forums (Shubina & Kulakli, 2018a, 2018b). Modern technology provides different creativity tools to individuals from basic skills of computer literacy to advanced level of programming, modelling, analyzing, etc. Visual content creation, artificial intelligence, big data analysis and repositories provide huge amount of information to be used in academic and personal research purposes (Kulakli, 2005). Moreover, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) provides better solutions in creative human behavior that as a result of discovery and acquire of new knowledge and innovative outcomes (Kulakli et al. 2015).

Although many theoretical and empirical studies were conducted on creativity and other related subjects, the development of technology and science requires research in some specific fields that focus on motivating individuals to be creative, applying modern technology to develop creativity, enhancing creativity during educational process, applying psychological knowledge in stimulating of creativity, and utilizing special psycho-social conditions of personality in developing creativity (Шубіна, 2011, 2009).

References

1. Amabile, T. (2013). Componential theory of creativity. In E. Kessler (Ed.), Encyclopedia of management theory (pp. 135-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

2. Baer, J. (2010). Is creativity domain specific? In J. Kaufman, & R. Sternberg (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of creativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 321–341.

3. Cropley, A. J. (2001). Creativity in education and learning: A guide for teachers and educators. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

4. da Costa S., Paez, D., Sanchez, F., Garaigordobil, M., Gondim, S. (2015). Personal factors of creativity: A second order meta-analysis. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 31, 165–173.

5. Deci, E., & Ryan, R. M. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (pp. 39-80). New York: Academic.

6. Eysenck, H.J. (1995). Genius: The natural history of creativity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

7. Hülsheger, U., Anderson, N., Salgado, J. (2009). Selecting for innovation: What's good for job performance doesn't need to be good for innovative performance. 14th Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology Santiago, 13-16 May.

8. Kulakli, A. (2005). Yeni ürün geliştirme sürecinde bilgi paylaşımının önemi ve bir uygulama. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi, 4(8), 99-114.

9. Kulakli, A., and Birgun, S. (2011). Müşteri merkezli operasyonel bilgi yönetimi için veri yönetiminin ölçülmesi. ITU Dergisi/b, 2(1).

10. Kulakli, A. and Mahony, S. (2014). Knowledge creation and sharing with

Web 2.0 tools for teaching and learning roles in so-called University 2.0. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150, 648-657.

11. Kulakli, A., Kulakli, A., Aslan, S. (2015) Isletmelerde bilgi teknolojilerindeki gelismelerin isletme ve yonetim fonksiyonlari uzerine etkileri. Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4 (1), 1-16. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/bujss/issue/3859/51587

12. Runco, M. A. (2004), Creativity. Annual Review of Psychology, I, 657-687.

13. Seker, S. E., and Kulakli, A. (2016). Macroeconomic ICT Facts and Mobile Telecom Operators via Social Networks and Web Pages. Journal of Economics Business and Management, 4(2), 99-103.

14. Shubina, I. and Kulakli, A. (2018b). Creativity and pervasive learning in contemporary educational paradigm. Prepared for publishing manuscript.

15. Shubina, I. and Kulakli, A. (2018a). Critical thinking and creativity in relation with educational technologies and knowledge generation. Submitted for publishing manuscript.

16. Simonton D. K. (2000). Creativity: Cognitive, personal, developmental and social aspects. American Psychologist, 55, 151–158.

17. Sternberg, T. Tardif (eds.) The nature of creativity. Cambridge.

18. Айзенк Г., Кэмин Л. (2002) Природа интеллекта – битва за разум. – М.

19. Барышева Т. А., Жигалов Ю. А. (2006) Психолого-педагогические основы развития креативности. – СПб.

20. Дерманова И. Б., Крылова М. А. (2004). Креативность, личностные особенности и стратегии совладания старших школьников. Ананьевские чтения: Материалы научно-практической конференции. СПб., 384–386.

21. Ильин, Е. П. (2009) Психология творчества, креативности, одаренности. Серия: Мастера психологии. СПб: Питер, 434.

22. Марищук В. Л., Пыжьянова Е. В. (2007) О применении системного

подхода в изучении дивергентного мышления. Ананьевские чтения, Материалы научно-практической конференции. Спб., 35-36.

23. Роджерс К. (1994) К теории творчества: Взгляд на психотерапию. Становление человека. М., 74-79.

24. Суслова Т. С. (1991) Некоторые особенности креативных личностей. Системное исследование индивидуальности. Пермь, 149.

25. Шубіна І. (2013) Метод проекту і компетенції студентів у процесі навчання в польських вищих навчальних закладах. Проблеми сучасної педагогічної освіти. Серія: Педагогіка та Психологія. 41 (3), 591-596.

26. Шубина И. (2012) Результаты обучения и способы их оценивания в высшей школе. Збірник наукових праць Військового інституту Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. К.: ВІКНУ, 35, 243-250

27. Шубіна І. (2011) Навчання методом проекту в польських вищих навчальних закладах та компетенції студентів. Гуманізація навчально-виховного процесу. Науково-методичний збірник (спецвипуск 7). Частина ІІ, Словянськ: СДПУ, 190-198.

28. Шубіна І. (2009) Особливості використання методу проекту у вищій школі. Збірник наукових праць Військового інституту Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. К.: ВІКНУ, 22, 291-298.