
THE RELATIONSHIP CREATIVITY – CREATIVENESS AS A COMPLEX OBJECT OF RESEARCH STUDIES

Antoniya Krasteva“St. Cyril and St. Methodius” University of Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria, a_krasteva@mail.bg

Abstract: The article analyses the relationship creativity – creativeness. These two concepts in specialized scientific studies either complement one another or are accepted as synonyms in accordance to the author’s stand. That is why our efforts are aiming to distinguish the ideas and stands of separate specialists, which discuss these concepts. The research conception is based on the understanding that it is essential for a complete personality to possess specific knowledge, skills, beliefs, attitudes, values as well as motivation do develop their creativity. The emphasis is placed on clarifying the separate elements of the two concepts in Bulgaria as well as in the Western European and the Russian literature. In this discourse three basic kinds of opinions concerning the relationship between the concepts creativity and creativeness can be outlined, namely: creativity is perceived as a synonym of the concept creativeness; the differentiation between the concepts creativity and creativeness is provisory and lastly, there exists a content difference between the concepts creativity and creativeness. These opinions are substantiated with certain ideas of prominent specialists in the field of philosophy, pedagogy, psychology, etc. Separate In order to achieve a clearer explanation of the relationship between the concepts creativity – creativeness various trends and schools have also been studied, which supplements the analysis, such as the intuitive trend, the rational trend, including the abstractionism, associationism, behaviorism, gestalt psychology as well as the nativism and sociological trends.

Keywords: creativity, creativeness, schools and approaches of research

The substantial influence of the globalization processes, the development of the information and communication technologies on the human activities result in the use of the concepts **creativity** and **creativity** on a large scale and the expansion of their range. **The creativity** and **the creativeness** are defined as exceptionally important phenomena, as key factors for the cognitive and emotional development of personality. These two concepts are too complicated to define and are not synonymous in their essence. This peculiarity arouses the necessity and triggers the interest of a number of researchers from various scientific fields to clarify their essence, manifestation and development.

The clarification of the separate elements of the relationship **creativity** – **creativity** is the object of research work of specialist such as philosophers, pedagogues, psychologists, sociologists, philologists, etc. The representatives of each one of the listed sciences study from various positions the multilayered essence of the concepts, give light from their angle the specific scientific aspects, thus giving their contribution to the extension of the knowledge of the phenomenon creativity.

In the **Western European literature** and speech practices the concept **creativity** is more prevalent (the creativity is a central issue in the works of D. Guilford, D. Renzulli, A. Maslow, E. Fromm, E. Torrance, M. Henry, W. Russell, E. De Bono and others) and it is defined as “the ability to create, to invent, to devise connected with the potential and the open-mindedness to reveal and register situations which the normal mode of thinking is unable to distinguish and control” [13, <http://lerobert.demarque.com/en/us/dictionnaire-en-ligne>].

In **Russian literature** the more prevalent and wide-spread is the concept **creativity**. The analysis of the research works of L. Vigotsky, F. Batyushkov, S. Rubinstein, Y. Ponomaryov, V. Krutetsky, L. Matyushkin and others shows that in the “commonly adopted meaning creativeness is a provisory term which denotes a psychic act, manifested in the embodiment, reproduction or the combination of data in our consciousness in a (relatively new form, in the sphere of the abstract thinking, of the artistic and the practical activities (creativity scientific, creativeness poetic, musical, creativeness in arts, creativeness of the administrator, of the military commander, etc..” [1, p. 11], it is perceived as “the activity which breeds something qualitatively new that has never existed before” [11, p. 1063], as “the mechanism of the development” [7, p. 9].

In the scientific research works of Bulgarian authors **creativity** is accepted as “a process of subjective activity which transforms the available material objects and values, which re-creates the existing and simultaneously creates new, original, having distinct social significance things, including the elaboration of artistic products and the artistic subject” [2, p. 62], as “the supreme, most active form of human activity, aiming at the transformation of reality and the creation of new, original products in the sphere of the material and spiritual production...” [3, p. 582].

The term **creativity**, which established itself in Bulgaria at the end of the 20th century due to the research quests in the psychological and pedagogical sciences, is strengthening its position and to a great extent “displacing” the term **creativity**. The reasons for this are not based on its negation, it is rather for utilitarian reasons – the term creativity is sufficiently operational, it has been subjected to experimental researches, it is entering more and more convincingly into the practical life of people (for instance through the tests for creativity skills).

The term creativity has a foreign stem and its derivatives – creative and creatively – sometimes cause negative attitude. There is a word in the Bulgarian language – tvorchestvo (creativity) and its derivatives (adjective and noun). At first glance the two words might be interpreted as synonymous, i.e. words that differ from each other in no aspect. The use of the foreign word is often accepted as an excessively ostentatious way to show erudition, or what is worse – as an expression of poor respect to our mother tongue by the speaker or the writer.

The prominent Russian linguist L. V. Shcherba proves that there are no two absolute synonyms in the vocabulary of a language. [12, p. 113-29]. Taking as a ground his supposition, we focus our attention on the definition of the concept creativity as “a process of human activity which creates qualitatively new material and spiritual values” [10, p. 601].

This definition combines the spiritual, the cultural, the moral, as well as the material, everyday values. It is shared by many authors who believe that there is no such human activity that excludes the need of creativity.

In scientific literature there are **three main kinds of conceptions** concerning the relationship between the concepts **creativity** and **creativity**:

- According to the **first one, creativity is perceived as a synonym of the concept creativity**. It is defined as “a synonym of the term ‘creativity’, which is used more often in our language”, the individual or the collective) ability to create new things, which possess high public value and usefulness and serve the public progress. It concerns the individual prerequisites for achievement, which are characterized by the specific quality of the psychic processes, more specifically the cognitive, the emotional, the volitional and the inciting, as well as the ones with rich imagination [9, p. 242-243]. Thus interpreted, the creativity is the idea, the inspiration, the attitude to create. Sustaining this stand, G. Piriyov uses the terms “creativity” and “creativity” as synonymous.

- According to the **second one, the differentiation between the concepts creativity and creativity is provisory**. The justifications for sustaining this opinion are as follows: the concepts creativity and creativity have wide cognitive range. It is considered that both concepts have one and same content, as well as the same volume, however, the slight nuance between them is that when we speak about creativity, we always think about a certain development of creativity, maybe also about the quality of the personality which reflects both the common and the specific abilities.

L. Desev outlines the wide and the narrow meaning of the word creativity. According to him: “Human creativity in the wide meaning of the word is the most active form of ‘unstimulated activity’ (D. B. Bogoyavlenska), aiming to change the reality and to create new, original products in the spheres of the material and spiritual production with emphasized social significance of people and the society” [9, p. 58]. On the other hand: “Creativity in the narrow meaning of the word is treated as ability (“creativity”) as an attitude or as a process:

- ✓ *ability* of the subject to imagine and create new things, to fancy and to combine, to define and generate original ideas, to transform and apply them in a ingenious way;

- ✓ *attitude* with two separate meanings (of the term) – first, the relationship between chaos and order, between consciousness and subconsciousness, between fantasy and reality, between creativity and activity, between the inner world of a person and the outside world, unlimited in time and space, between life and immortality, and second, the purposefulness of personality toward useful activities, toward creating, toward “idea gaming”, toward flexible and innovative thinking and behavior, neophilia, feeling of fulfillment and satisfaction from one’s excellent achievements and crave for cultivation and mental stimulation of the human and the humankind.

- ✓ *process* – the line of development and manifestation of creativity, stages and periods through which an artistic personality passes, incessant and persistent word of a person, breeding and generating original ideas, making appropriate decisions, continuously making alterations or changes and improving the creations” (also there p. 59-60).

In his works L. Desev discusses the concepts creativity and creativity. The author described creativity as “...the supreme manifestation of the mind and the ‘ultimate’ function of personality and labor activity, without which it is impossible to discover (unknown) relations and human happiness” [3, p. 582-583]. He defines **creativity** as “a system of constructive abilities, a combination of mental and personal qualities which favour the formation of

new ideas and the revealing of important relations between objects, phenomena, of new approaches to solving tasks and issues from theory and practice; predisposition or innate tendency to creativity which potentially exists in each normal human being of any age. The concept creativity characterizes the creative, constructive or the innovative side of human personality” [3, p. 246-247]. For him creativity is “the main innate specific feature (potential) of every artistic personality” [4, p. 78]. Creativity has been studied as a phenomenon which “emerges at certain circumstances, passes through an exterior (anonymous) stage and manifests itself in and through creative activity, becomes real (crystallizes) in a certain result or product. In the wide meaning of the word it is synonymous to creativeness and means the psychic foundation of the complete system of creativeness, including the specific characteristics of the creative personality, their capabilities (potential, abilities), needs and motivation for creative activity. In its narrow sense “creativity” is the potential for creativeness, liberal and uncontrolled attitude (set – remark L. D.) and the characterization of the personality”.

According to **the third one, there is a content difference between the concepts creativity and creativeness.** The representatives of this opinion discuss creativity as a disposition for creativeness, a precondition, a quality of intellect. In the majority of the scientific research works **creativity** (from Latin – creation – creation, construction) is defined as *a process of psychic new formation, as one of the ultimate cognitive functions which includes the discovery of new ideas and concepts, of new associations of already existing ideas and conceptions.* **Creativeness** is perceived in a more specific and more precise meaning as creativity which has been realized to some extent and direction, i.e. as a functional manifestation of creativity. The view of Y. Rasheva-Merdzhanova is very indicative in this respect because she studies creativeness as a realization of creativity, as its fulfillment with a view to certain tasks in the process of specifically defined and purposefully oriented activity leading to the respective result or product [8, p. 22]. In accordance with the above-mentioned and discussed author opinions, this stand is also supported by the present research work, namely – **creativity is perceived in its more specific and more precise meaning as creativeness which has been realized to a certain extent and certain direction, i.e. as a manifestation of creativity.** The difference between them is corresponding to the one, which is displayed between “*essence*” and “*phenomenon* in the philosophical sense”.

Motivation and initiative of the subject of the creative personality are in the basis of **creativity** and **creativity**. Creative abilities are connected with the constructive origin in humans which needs to be identified, to be developed and its manifestations in every activity and ages need to be encouraged.

The necessity of a deep rationalization of creativity as a complicated object of research work, L. Desev emphasizes, who studies creativeness as “a complicated **synergically systematic object of research work**” [4, p. 43] and acknowledges that it is “an evolving system - process” where the central position belongs to the creative personality – the subject of creative work. He pays special attention to the fact that “the creative personality is qualified as a strong personality (both terms are often used as synonyms) and as a constructive microcosm – ‘a unit’ of creative nature”. In his “Psychology of creativeness” L. Desev defends convincingly the opinion that “sheer creativeness is a self-organized system” [also there, p. 45] whose functioning is based on “the operation of the principle of self-determinism” [also there, p. 43].

Despite the short-term development of the studies of creativity there might already be outlined several **main trends and schools:**

1) **The intuitive trend** – the idea of intuition is placed in the basis of the explanation of personality, as well as the development of creative processes.

2) **The rational trend** – it encompasses several different views which can be consolidated only arbitrary with the common term of rationalism. Among them the following theoretical trends deserve our exclusive attention:

- **Abstractionism** – the preference exclusively or predominantly is given to the fixing of the form which reflects the analysis and the synthesis of the objects and presents subjective ideas or inner experiences;

- **Associationism** – creativity is studied as the ability of mind to achieve new, original creations through various combinations of associations;

- **Behaviorism** – the person solves complicated tasks through the method trial-mistake. The strong position of the method of problem-solving is explained with the fact that it brings success and therefore satisfaction;

- **Gestalt psychology** – its representatives confirm and further develop the method of problem-solving also introduce a new principle that explains the process of solving problems. It is the

principle of the sudden insight and finding the solution (*Insight, Einstellung*). Thus it is emphasized that such insight emerges in the human consciousness, which gives a completely new way of understanding the presented data, of the problem.

3) **Nativism** – it claims that inheritance has a crucial role. The biological views which attribute an exaggerated significance of the biological factors are in close relation to this stand. Richard Mueller –Frauenfeld described creativity as a manifestation of basic instincts of inheritant character, which cannot be affected by the influence of the environment.

4) sociological trend – underlines the crucial role of the influence of the social and economic environment on the chance of realization and development of creative abilities. Among all the factors of the environment it is behavior which has the crucial role.

We can differentiate provisionally **three approaches to creativity studies**:

- **Cognitive approach** –D. Guilford, E. Torrance, E. De Bono, M. Rohrbach, A. Rotenberg, R. May, S. Mednik, V. Dunchev, M. Holodniya, etc.;
- **Personality approach** – C. Taylor, A. Row, E. Maslow, K. Rogers, L. Shavinina, etc.;
- **Synthetic approach** –, P. Rushton, D. Renzulli, D. Feldhusen, R. Sternberg, K. Heller, D. Bogoyavlenskaya, E. Yakovleva, etc.

In the contemporary stage of the creativity studies the generalizing approach is predominant where the position of creativity are accepted as *integrative characteristics of personality, entirely and in progress* and within whose frames the intellectual, personal and social factors are acknowledged to be equally significant for the development of the creative thinking.

The proliferation of various aspects and approaches, studying creativity, results into the establishment of diverse variable discourses. A wide range of interdisciplinary links function in each separate discourse that further provoke the development of creative thinking and require an adequate study.

The creativity research works are based on different theoretical conceptions and hence different phenomena may become the main object of attention – the personality, the process, the result. G. Allport, E. Maslow, K. Rodgers define creativity as a lifestyle, as self-realization, as self-actualization. On the other hand, D. Guilford perceives creativity as a combination of intellectual and non-intellectual personal traits which are the fundamental of high creative productivity.

Studying creativity as a complex system, D. Maccinnion distinguishes between its main components: creative personality, creative process, creative product and creative situation or creative environment. According to him a thorough study and understanding of creativity is impossible without a profound theoretical elucidation of each one of these four aspects.

The reasons for the emergence of creativity in a person are attributed to different factors: the sublimation of the libido (S. Freud), the disruption of balance and dissatisfaction (Schein), the strive for the new and for the high quality (Maddie), satisfaction from the process of creation (Crutchfield).

In **humanitarian psychology** creativity is tolerated in all fields of the human life, in the process of different activities. By setting in order the main five groups of human inner needs (physiological, out of security, out of love and affection, of respect and self-respect and out of self-actualization) in the order of a hierarchy system, E. Maslow assigns the last one the pinnacle of the pyramid. The need to create has the position of an ultimate need, it is a part of the most significant needs for our growth – the need for self-actualization. The prominent American psychologist differentiates two kinds of creativity: raw, primary, deep – it “results from the unconscious, which is a source of new discoveries, of a new reality of ideas, diverging from what already exists” [6, p. 84] and secondary creativity, which helps non-creative people be able to create and make discoveries while working together with other people, “standing on the shoulders of our ancestors”, being accurate, attentive, etc. [also there, p. 84-85]. According to the author “creativity virtually is an aspect of everyone’s behavior” [also there, p. 79] – perceptual, emotional, volitional, cognitive, expressive, etc.

In **conclusion** it might be stated that the study of the concepts “creativity” and “creativity” has subjective meaning which is closely related to the personal attitude and the liberal and unencumbered flow of ideas, pictures and emotions. Notwithstanding that fact, the creative/ constructive action needs the emerging ideas and thoughts to be rearranged in new, alternative to the previously arranged and established frames. The creative/ constructive action has its result – product, material, service or mental structure. In order to comparable with the criteria for creativity/ creativeness this result needs to be different from similar previous structures.

REFERENCES

- [1] Batyushkov, F. Quotes by Ponomarev, Ya. A. Psychology of Creativity [Psihologiya tvorchestva] . M., 1976.
- [2] Girginov, G. Science and Creativeness. S., 1975.
- [3] Desev, L. Dictionary of Psychology. S., 2003
- [4] Desev, L., S. Brick, N. Desev. Psychology of Creativeness. Theoretical Problems, Empiric Research, Creative Tasks. S., Paradigma, 2011.
- [5] Krasteva, A. Critical Thinking. Professional Pedagogical Training for Student Education. “St. Cyril and St. Methodius” University publishing company, V. Tarnovo, 2012.
- [6] Maslow, A. G. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. M., Smysl, 1999.
- [7] Ponomarev, Ya. A. Psychology of Creativity [Psihologiya tvorchestva] . M., 1976.
- [8] Rasheva-Merdzhanova, Ya. Complex Tests for Creativity and Creative Abilities in the Context of Career Success. Biznessekretar, 2007, 2.
- [9] Dictionary of Psychology. Science and Art. S., 1989.
- [10] Philosophical Dictionary. S. 1985.
- [11] Philosophical Encyclopedia Dictionary (Filosofskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar FES). M., Nauka, 2001.
- [12] Shcherba, L. V. Selected Works in Russian (Izbranye raboty po ruskomu yazyiku) M., Uchpedgiz, 1957, p. 113 – 129.
- [13] The Petit Robert Dictionare. <http://lerobert.demarque.com/en/us/dictionnaire-en-ligne/>

