

The term “creativity” in the discourse of theories and concepts

Olena Cherednichenko*

PhD in Technical Sciences, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8908-4113>

Abstract. The relevance of the research topic was determined by the need to comprehend the meaning and concept of the term “creativity” and the evolution of its development as a theoretical category. The aim was to examine the aspects of the emergence, meaning, and concept of the term “creativity” and its evolutionary development, taking into account the trends of the modern economy. One of the main methodological principles applied in the study was the principle of interdisciplinarity, which encompassed various theoretical and practical subject areas. The study also employed the method of analytical-synthetic information processing, the dialectical method, as well as the methods of system analysis and logical generalisation. The research was based on theoretical considerations of leading scholars who have studied the outlined issue. Creativity is becoming an increasingly significant factor with a substantial impact on all spheres of activity. The analysis conducted and the evolution of scientific perspectives on this category over different periods have been examined, highlighting discrepancies in its interpretation by various scholars, which account for the diversity of definitions and understandings of the term “creativity.” It has been found that authors of existing theories employ different approaches to its definition and terminology, while the analysis of academic sources indicated the absence of a unified concept and understanding of the essence of creativity and stable notions in this field. When interpreting the concept of “creativity,” its place within an individual’s structure, the level of awareness of its various manifestations, as well as the sources and conditions of its development, are determined differently. Summarising the results of the analysis of different scholarly viewpoints, it can be stated that creativity is closely interconnected with emotional, motivational, intellectual, and activity-related spheres. However, the multidimensional nature of this concept requires further research and refinement of its definition. This article deepened the understanding of the term “creativity” in the context of theoretical discourse, which may be utilised in the teaching of academic disciplines or their components – economics, management, philosophy, sociology, political science, and others

Keywords: creative activity; evolution; post-industrial society; theoretical discourse; creative personality

Received 19.07.2024 Revised 26.10.2024 Accepted 27.11.2024

Suggested Citation:

Cherednichenko, O. (2024). The term “creativity” in the discourse of theories and concepts. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 12(4), 90-103. doi: 10.31548/hspedagog/4.2024.90.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Introduction

Modern society, like the societies of previous eras, requires individuals who think unconventionally, possess creativity, and have a high level of intellectual development. Such individuals are capable of generating, creating, perceiving, and implementing various innovations across all fields of human activity. Creativity, as a theoretical category, has remained at the centre of attention for numerous scholars engaged in the development of fundamental theoretical approaches to its definition and terminology, as well as the study of the nature and essence of the phenomenon of “creativity.” There are numerous theories and concepts regarding the interpretation of this term. A widely accepted definition of “creativity” is the ability to generate new and useful ideas. This definition is particularly supported by G. Dow (2022) and N. Brown *et al.* (2024). However, as interest in this topic grows and research expands, adjustments to this definition continue to emerge.

Scholars such as S. Said-Metwaly *et al.* (2021) analyse examples of creativity in various educational contexts, examining innovative international practices for fostering and developing creativity in learning while offering practical applications for diverse settings. According to H. Tiwen (2023), creativity and original thinking are essential components of academic giftedness in students. B. Rawlings & S. Cutting (2024), by integrating various studies, argue that the relationship between education and creativity is complex and requires careful interpretation. While some research highlights the positive impact of schooling on children’s creative abilities, others, particularly those concerning culturally and educationally diverse populations, demonstrate how school experiences can sometimes hinder creativity. B. Hennessey *et al.* (2020) assert that early research on creativity focused exclusively on internal factors while overlooking the influence of the external environment. This led to the emergence and development of a distinct research direction – the social psychology of creativity, which explores how the social context facilitates (or hinders) the creative process.

C. Tan *et al.* (2021) note that although creativity is primarily conceptualised as the ability to produce original and adaptive outputs, originality alone is insufficient. For a result to be considered creative, it must also be useful and applicable. Empirical data confirm that novelty and utility are key components of creativity. Additionally, researchers have identified a reciprocal relationship between creativity and well-being. While previous studies demonstrated that well-being can enhance creativity, this research provides evidence that the reverse is also true: engaging in creative activities can directly improve subjective well-being, even when controlling for stress levels. This suggests that fostering creativity could be a valuable tool for enhancing overall well-being, with implications for individuals, education, and mental health initiatives.

In contemporary discourse, economic considerations increasingly dominate discussions about the formulation of creativity. K. Kasiyan (2019) argues that as a result, culture and creativity have become subordinated to materialism and profit-driven calculations, leading to a transformation in the philosophy of creativity. Reports by the World Economic Forum (The Future of Jobs Report, 2020; 2023) identify creativity as one of the most crucial skills for employees across all sectors. Scholars have long sought to develop and refine criteria for assessing an individual’s potential for divergent thinking, which serves as the “core” of creativity, enabling the generation of multiple solutions to problems based on the same initial data while producing unexpected conclusions and results. Among the numerous existing theories of the post-industrial society, the concept of the creative economy has become one of the dominant frameworks. The process of globalisation has transformed creativity into a source of competitive advantage and a driving force of progress. Most experts in psychology consider creativity to be the production of something new that is both original and relevant to a specific context.

In today's world, creativity has attracted the interest of economists, as it is closely linked to the search for sources of competitive advantage. However, despite extensive experience, a vast body of academic research, and contributions from leading scholars, many aspects of this subject remain unexplored, necessitating further synthesis, development, and refinement. Since creativity lacks a clear and unambiguous conceptual framework, this results in diverse interpretations and definitions of the term, which may blur its essence. In English, no distinction exists between the terms “creatio” and “creativity”, both of which are translated as “creativity”. However, in modern economic history, they hold distinct meanings. Therefore, clarifying the essence of the term “creativity” becomes crucial for advancing contemporary systematic economic research. The objective of this study was to analyse the origins and evolution of the term “creativity” and to examine its theoretical foundations, essence, and content.

Materials and Methods

One of the fundamental methodological principles used in this study is the principle of interdisciplinarity, which encompasses various theoretical and practical subject areas. Interdisciplinarity serves as a key methodological foundation in numerous contemporary studies, particularly when the research subject is multifaceted and requires epistemological and methodological expansion beyond a single discipline. The study also employed the following methods: the analytical-synthetic method for examining and systematising different scientific theories and concepts; the dialectical method and system analysis for investigating existing theories, studying the system of concepts and propositions; the method of logical generalisation for formulating conclusions and recommendations. Overall, the research was grounded in the theoretical considerations of leading scholars who have explored the given issue.

At the initial stage of the study, an analysis of the primary theories and concepts defining the term “creativity” was conducted. Various sources

of information were utilised, including official reports, academic publications, and books. Next, the relevance of the selected topic was examined. Subsequently, an appropriate list of literary sources was compiled, followed by an analysis and comparison of different scientific theories and concepts. The study also explored the evolutionary changes in the perspectives of leading researchers who have examined this issue. To deepen the analysis and systematise theoretical material related to the concept of “creativity,” the content analysis method of academic publications was applied. This approach enabled the identification and classification of key categories, concepts, and definitions of creativity as presented in the studied literature. Particular attention was given to identifying commonalities and differences in how various scholars interpret creativity, as well as to tracing the evolution of these interpretations over time. The findings from the content analysis were utilised for synthesising and structuring the collected information, ultimately contributing to a comprehensive understanding of creativity as a theoretical category. Finally, using the method of logical generalisation, conclusions were formulated, and prospects for further research were outlined. The informational basis of the study comprised diverse perspectives and interpretations from numerous scholars regarding the essence of “creativity,” with a total of 54 sources referenced.

Results and Discussion

Key historical aspects of the emergence of the term “creativity”

Archaeological excavations in Africa have revealed that the evolution from a sharpened stick to a spear took approximately 1-1.5 million years. Every familiar object is the result of numerous inventions. Creativity is a necessity for survival, as humans have always sought new solutions to various problems. For centuries, the phenomenon of creativity has intrigued psychologists, educators, philosophers, geneticists, writers, poets, actors, and artists. During antiquity, creativity was

regarded as a unique form of existence. According to Plato, “wisdom belongs to the gods, and humans can only be lovers of wisdom – philosophers,” implying that every individual possesses a certain degree of creative potential (Prokopenko, 2018). Plato identified contemplation and imitation as the main sources of creativity. Aristotle, in turn, examined the aesthetic concept of mimesis – the imitation or representation of reality – emphasising not mere copying but rather imaginative reproduction. While Plato believed that inspiration and creative ideas were granted by divine blessing, making humans conduits of the gods, Aristotle argued that inspiration arises from intellectual associations.

In the Middle Ages, the phenomenon of creatio as creativity was perceived as an act of divine will, creating existence from non-existence. Augustine of Hippo asserted that “a created being cannot create” (Williams, 1985). The phrase “creatio ex nihilo” – was used to describe divine creation, meaning that the term “creatio” was already in use. M. Runco and R. Albert (2010) note that during the Renaissance, the focus of knowledge shifted from affirming the divine presence to studying human-made creations. The importance of human creativity became the foundation for the modern meaning of the lexeme create. The Renaissance revived interest in art, literature, philosophy, and science. During the Reformation, creativity extended beyond the arts to science, technology, politics, and economic activities. Philosophers began interpreting creativity as an insightful yet accidental combination of existing elements, closely resembling invention. The Romantics, in contrast, rejected conventional rules in favour of imagination and originality, valuing uniqueness over abstraction and rigidity.

As society evolved, scientific discourse enriched itself with new concepts, expanding existing terminology. The proliferation of linguistic and terminological borrowings in contemporary academic works reflects the evolution of knowledge. The term “creativity” emerged from this intellectual expansion, representing a wide range

of phenomena inherent to human existence. In its broadest sense, creativity denotes the act of creation. For centuries, scholars have explored the nature, origins, and patterns of the creative process. Plato considered inspiration to be divine, whereas Aristotle saw it as the result of human intellectual associations.

In 1393, G. Chaucer used the word “create”, yet the conceptualisation of creativity remained weak (Runco & Albert, 2010). The lexeme “creation”, combining the act of creation with human activity, acquired its modern meaning only in the 18th century. The first significant study of the creative process took place in 1767, when W. Duff (1767) stated that creative genius arises from an innate ability to engage in associative imagination, facilitating the combination and evaluation of ideas and aesthetic qualities. The founder of differential psychology and psychometrics, F. Galton (1869), argued that mental abilities, like physical traits, are hereditary. His work is considered the first major contribution to creativity research, marking the beginning of empirical studies on creativity (Runco, 2004).

H. Bergson distinguished creativity from invention, emphasising the intuitive nature of creative emergence, which originates from the individuality of a unique, holistic, and indivisible creator (Sivers & Buhaiova, 2023). H. Bergson viewed evolution not as a mechanical adaptation to the environment but as a purposeful and creative process. He believed that novelty arises from “creative wings”. Meanwhile, the English psychologist C. Spearman (1904) described creativity as a cognitive force that generates new meaning by modifying existing ideas and forming new connections.

Theoretical approaches to defining the term “creativity”

The term “creativity” was first used by R. Simpson (1922) to describe an individual’s ability to abandon stereotypical thinking (Pavlenko, 2016). However, creativity was fully recognised as an independent concept only in the 1950s

following the publications of J. Guilford (1950), who distinguished between two types of cognitive operations – convergent and divergent thinking (Tkach, 1999). In particular, J. Guilford (1967) highlighted divergent thinking processes as the

foundation of creativity. He argued that creativity is an innate human potential and is genetically determined. He also identified key criteria for creativity, along with hypothetical intellectual abilities that define its level (Table 1).

Table 1. Key criteria for creativity and intellectual abilities that characterise it

Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ability to identify and formulate problems ➤ ability to generate a large number of ideas ➤ originality – the ability to produce distant associations, non-standard responses, and unconventional solutions ➤ semantic flexibility – the ability to identify the key characteristic of an object and suggest new ways to use it ➤ adaptive flexibility – the ability to change forms to discover new features and applications ➤ spontaneous semantic flexibility – the ability to generate various ideas in an unusual situation
Intellectual abilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ speed of thought – the number of different ideas generated per unit of time ➤ cognitive flexibility – the ability to quickly switch between ideas ➤ originality – the ability to generate ideas that differ from common perceptions ➤ curiosity – sensitivity to global problems ➤ hypothesis development ability ➤ irreality – logical independence of a response from a stimulus ➤ fantasy – proposing ideas completely unrelated to reality while maintaining logical connections between stimuli and responses ➤ problem-solving ability – the capacity for systemic analysis and synthesis ➤ ability to refine anything by adding new details

Source: Compiled by the author based on data from J. Guilford (1967)

One of the most well-known founders of creativity theory is the American psychologist E. Torrance, who began studying creativity in 1958 and dedicated his life to this field. He defined creativity as a process, which involves: recognising problems, gaps in knowledge, discrepancies, and disharmony; identifying these problems; searching for solutions, generating hypotheses; testing, modifying, and re-evaluating hypotheses; forming conclusions (Torrance, 1977). Torrance identified four parameters of creativity: fluency, flexibility, originality, and accuracy. According to his “Threshold Theory of Intelligence”, intelligence and creativity form a single factor. This means that low-intelligence individuals cannot be creative, but highly intelligent individuals may still have low creativity. E. Torrance (1977) defined creativity metaphorically: “It means digging deeper, seeing better, fixing mistakes, talking to a cat, diving into the depths, passing through walls, lighting up the sun, building a sandcastle, and

greeting the future.” His conclusions were based on J. Guilford’s theory of divergent thinking. However, critics argue that Torrance’s definition does not distinguish creativity from other types of thinking, making it overly broad.

A. Whitehead (1932) introduced the term “creative ability” while using “creativity” as a universal principle. In his book, he suggested that so-called new ideas are merely combinations of existing ones. He linked creativity to the actualisation of potentiality, arguing that it is a processual phenomenon inherent in all entities: “The process of creativity is a form of unity in the universe.” A. Maslow (1943) defined creativity in terms of freedom, spontaneity, and self-acceptance, which allow individuals to fully realise their potential. He viewed creativity as a universal trait, which most people lose under external influences. While intellectual giftedness is a necessary condition for creativity, it is not sufficient on its own. Personal traits, motivation, and

values are critical in determining creative behaviour. According to Maslow, key characteristics of a creative personality include cognitive abilities and independent thinking.

M. Stein (1953) described creativity as a process of creating something new and valuable, which is accepted by society. He emphasised that creativity does not exist in isolation – it is shaped by social and cultural contexts. Novelty and usefulness are fundamental criteria for assessing creativity, but they depend on cultural influences. Stein also argued that creative individuals both influence and are influenced by culture. The Ukrainian scholar V. Moliako (1989) defined creativity as the ability to reflect a person's deep capacity to make unconventional decisions and create original values. He identified the following characteristics of creativity: originality, heuristic thinking, activity, focus, imagination, clarity, sensitivity. V. Moliako also highlighted that creative individuals are driven by a desire for originality, a tendency to challenge norms, a high level of knowledge, the ability to analyse and compare phenomena, quick learning skills, and systematic, independent work.

According to J. Kao (1996), creativity is: "A holistic process of generating ideas, developing them, and transforming them into value. This process integrates what people call innovation." He noted the synchrony between the art of creating new ideas and the science of bringing them to life. Thus, different researchers take varying approaches to defining creativity. Some believe the term "creative" applies only to rare, specialised abilities. Others argue that creativity is a universal human trait found to some extent in all healthy individuals. Some scholars suggest that every person is a creator. D. Leap (2012) referenced notable thinkers who viewed creativity as intrinsic to human nature – J. Cameron: "Creativity is the natural order of life." P. Johnson: "I believe that creativity is inherent in all of us." Photographer J. Lurie: "Creativity is our birthright. It is as fundamental to being human as walking, talking, and thinking." Thus, creativity remains a multifaceted concept, with definitions ranging from a rare gift to an essential human characteristic.

Comparative analysis of creatio and creativity

The originality and creative freedom of an artist are considered the highest values of individuality. A genius does not follow established rules but creates them. However, while intellectual activity can generate new combinations of existing elements, it cannot produce something fundamentally new. It is important, therefore, not to confuse creativity with creatio. Creatio is an activity aimed at producing various spiritual and material values. Historically, the term "creative abilities" was used, but over time, it was replaced by the English loanword "creativity, creative". Initially, "creation" was associated solely with artistic expression. However, as the term expanded, creativity and art were differentiated – they were no longer seen as mutually inclusive. In the early 20th century, Polish philosopher J. Łukasiewicz and French philosopher H. Bergson explored creativity in science and nature. However, they largely focused on artistic characteristics rather than scientific or natural processes (New World Encyclopedia, n.d.).

Many scholars, including J. Guilford (1975), C. Taylor (1988), J. Kaufman & J. Baer (2012), and others, considered it necessary to distinguish between the categories of creatio and creativity based on the outcome of the activity. Creatio is a process of creative activity aimed at generating an entirely new product or finding an unconventional solution to a problem. However, it does not necessarily imply the existence of a final result (Simonton, 2018). Thus, creatio can be defined as an activity pursued for the sake of the process itself. Creativity, on the other hand, is a process inherently directed towards an outcome. The result of a given activity is a necessary and crucial component of this process. Therefore, creativity is work focused on achieving a result, with the essential goal of producing a specific final product. The word "creativity" is defined in The Great Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian (Busel, 2005) as innovative, creative activity, referencing the definition of "creating". This confirms the idea that the term

was borrowed, as it originally meant “creatio” in Ukrainian. Consequently, the term “creativity” and its modern interpretation must be understood in the context of English-language definitions. However, according to G. Pennycook (2018), the word originates etymologically from the Latin “creare, creatio”, which translates as “to create”.

When studying the etymology of the word “creativity,” many literary sources reference the statements of ancient Greek philosophers, and the evolution of its understanding can be traced from divine creation to human creation. It is a multidimensional concept based on human experience. This is emphasised by Yu. Bazhal *et al.* (2015) who focus on innovative entrepreneurship. L. Fedulova (2017) notes that, while being typologically similar to creatio, creativity has certain specific differences on theoretical-methodological, functional, and practical levels. Depending on the area of application, the term acquires different semantic meanings. Therefore, this concept is not well-established in scientific terminology, and there is no single universally accepted definition of creativity. Scholars researching this issue offer their interpretations of the term, from which a general understanding can be formed. Most Ukrainian scholars define creativity as the realisation of a creative idea in traditional areas of life through non-traditional methods and in an unconventional form. In the *New World Encyclopedia* (n.d.), creativity is defined as a process that involves generating new ideas, new associations between them, and converting them into a product that is novel and original.

The increasing number of studies on this issue indicates that creativity is specific to each field, and its generalised skills or traits do not always reflect such specificity. The term “creativity” unites many artefacts, processes, and people, while the term “creatio” can unite a variety of unrelated cognitive processes across different fields. However, such concepts may be misleading due to a lack of cognitive psychological validity. This influences the understanding and assessment of creativity and, consequently, requires a review of the

results of general creativity tests, which may have led researchers to unacceptable interpretations. J. Baer (2012), in his work, notes that the theory of creativity should consider simpler goals for theory development and should necessarily pay attention to methods of metatheoretical heuristics.

Modern theories and concepts of creativity

An analysis of recent studies on this phenomenon leads to the assumption that there is no definitive answer to the question: what exactly does the term “creativity” mean? Is it a scientific construct? Is the process of creativity independent, or is creativity a sum of other mental processes? In this context, S. Mednick (1962) emphasises that the essence of creativity is the ability to discard stereotypes during mental synthesis and within the associative field. He replaces J. Guilford’s concept of divergence with the actualisation of a distant zone of the semantic environment: “The more distant the elements taken from the problem’s segments, the more creative the process of solving it becomes.” The creative process is seen as the reformatting of associative components into new combinations. The decision made differs from stereotypical ones, and the criterion of creativity in decision-making is the degree of deviation from the existing stereotype. Additionally, the cognitive theory of “innate structures” by J. Fodor (1983) argues that nothing can be created from nothing; rather, a particular problem-solving process is described through the interaction of various other processes, such as thinking, memory, etc.

Thus, studies indicate that creativity does not inherit individual traits. It is argued that external factors play a decisive role in shaping creative abilities, influencing them both positively and negatively. F. Barron & D. Harrington (1981), summarising research on creativity in the 1980s, made the following generalisations about existing knowledge:

- creativity is the ability to adaptively respond to the needs of new approaches, allowing one to recognise novelty, whether the process is conscious or unconscious; it is the ability to

generate non-standard ideas, deviate from traditional thinking, and quickly find solutions to problems;

- the features of the creative process and product are originality, adequacy, validity, and suitability at the moment;

- the creation of a new creative product is highly dependent on the individual creator and their intrinsic motivation;

- creative products exhibit great diversity in their characteristics: new solutions to problems in any sphere of activity, the discovery of physical, chemical, or biological processes, creation of music, paintings, or literary works, new philosophical or religious systems, innovations in law, economics, technology, and unconventional solutions to social issues.

One of the latest modern concepts of creativity is R. Sternberg's "Investment Theory" (1994). He referred to creative individuals as those who can "buy ideas cheaply and sell them dearly." "Buying cheaply" refers to being interested in unknown, unrecognised, or unpopular ideas at the moment. A creative person is able to correctly evaluate their potential, possible demand, and develop these ideas, selling them for a high price. Once success is achieved with one idea, the person moves on to the next. Another issue concerns the source of such ideas. R. Sternberg (1994) viewed a talented person not as one who generates new ideas but as one who can establish meaningful connections, understand the idea itself and its functions in relation to other elements of the existing knowledge space. Creativity thus implies the ability of a person to wisely take risks, fight obstacles, resist the opinions of others, and possess internal motivation and tolerance for uncertainty. According to the "Investment Theory," the development of an individual's creativity is facilitated by certain interconnected components, such as:

- abilities, particularly synthetic (the ability to see problems from a different perspective, divergent thinking), analytical (the ability to analyse and evaluate new ideas), and

practical-contextual (the ability to determine the practical application of abstract ideas);

- thinking;

- personal qualities, the most important of which are the ability to remove obstacles and uncertainty and to take justified risks;

- knowledge, which helps creatively apply theory in practice;

- motivation, which promotes focus on the creative process;

- the surrounding environment, which supports the possibility of discovering and developing creativity.

H. Eysenck (1998) noted that creativity is a component of general intellectual giftedness. In turn, S. Swap (1993) did not consider creativity a talent but viewed it as a purposeful process of developing and expressing entirely new ideas, for which a specific approach is needed that maximises individual giftedness, experience, and qualifications. O. Voitenko (1997) argued that creativity can manifest in various types of activities by the same person. For example, if a scientist does not find their place in science, they may be a talented organiser and educator, or both simultaneously. Creativity is seen as a set of various skills and abilities, which can be expressed to varying degrees in a particular individual. The definition of "creativity" is based on the concept of reevaluation, the essence of which is a change in perspective, attempting to view a situation from another point of view. L. Vygotsky wrote: "It would be a miracle if imagination could create something from nothing or if it had other sources for its creations besides previous experience" (Maksymenko, 2017). Everything new that appears in a person's imagination is formed from elements of the surrounding reality contained in the previous experience they have acquired. Ya. Ponomarev, in considering the essence of creativity as a psychological property, noted that it is intellectual activity and sensitivity to the side effects of one's own actions (Antonova 2012). In other words, a creative person will see by-products, which are the creation of something new, while others may

only see the results of achieving the original goal, without recognising the novelty.

Meanwhile, O. Kulchytska (2002), I. Hrynenko (2008), and others define the essence of creativity as: the ability to generate unusual ideas, depart from standard patterns, and quickly and easily find unconventional solutions to problems; an ability that reflects the personality's property to create new, original values, make non-standard decisions, and avoid stereotypes; the ability to create a new product in any form. Researchers T. Lubart *et al.* (2010) note that the term “creativity” reflects the idea of experimenting with new results. In other words, “creativity is the ability to generate new ideas within a theme. These results must be new in the sense that they should go beyond merely copying what already exists.”

K. Szmidt (2010) viewed the concept of creativity as closely related to the concept of creativity. He considered it the ability of people to generate new, primarily valuable products – working methods, goods, ideas, etc. According to the scholar's definition, creativity is a characteristic of an activity that results in the emergence of a new product. If defined as a characteristic of a person, it refers to inventiveness, producing a variety of ideas, or the ability to come up with many solutions to problems; generating valuable, fundamentally new ideas and concepts. The researcher noted that the term “creativity” refers not to the product of the creative process but only to the person. The researcher identified certain characteristics that form a creative individual: openness and tolerance for ambiguity; a unique vision and perception of the world; no fear of the unknown; independence and courage; spontaneity and expressiveness; a good sense of humour; the ability to focus and be passionate about the task; the ability to integrate opposites.

Creativity within the economic discourse

The current Generation Z not only actively consumes but also produces creativity, monetising it through Instagram and Snapchat. Indeed, 51% of millennials claim that they are more creative

than previous generations. At the same time, the understanding of creativity is focused on the result-oriented activity, which may require not only creative but also routine and tedious work. However, creativity does not divide activity into result-driven or resultless. In today's post-industrial society, there is an active search for sources to form competitive advantages, with creativity gaining increasing significance. This is why numerous debates among scholars continue about the understanding of the term “creativity” as a theoretical category. Contemporary views on creativity are gaining more importance specifically within the economic discourse. In this sense, a creative person is inventive, quick-witted, and pragmatic, while a creative person is a contemplative individual whose activities are primarily based on inspiration, abilities, and so on.

The most popular scientific concept of creativity in literary sources is its manifestation in the creation or implementation of anything new, a particular creative product, a unique combination, that is, something with applied value. The most appropriate formulation in the field of economics is the creation of a new, unique product that can be commercialised with its inherent practical value. Creativity itself does not necessarily carry practical use or convert into a certain product, while creativity, in its modern interpretation, involves creating a directly valuable product or new solution and, importantly, generating added value. This understanding of the term is prevalent in the creative economy and is of particular interest to contemporary researchers in theory and concepts.

The modern content of creativity is determined by the demands of the current stage of civilisational development on human activity. I. Kakko & S. Inkinen (2009) state that the activation of abilities, talents, and knowledge of an individual results in the creation of a creative product with innovative content. Society increasingly understands that creativity directly or indirectly influences the economy, improving performance indicators, stimulating innovations, and contributing to its social and sustainable development.

It is creativity that becomes the foundation for creating economic value. The concept of “creativity” is more often used in economics, distinguishing it from artistic creativity. Therefore, the terminology in this field requires improvement and specification.

Summarising the results of the analysis of the concept of creativity, it is important to note that creativity is currently an interdisciplinary concept, widely represented in philosophy, sociology, political science, psychology, linguistics, pedagogy, economics, etc. In modern science, there is a tendency to analyse creativity within specific fields of study. Therefore, this disrupts the holistic view in terminology. The author of this article agrees with existing concepts that the term “creativity” reflects the general characteristic of an individual, influencing creative productivity in any sphere of activity. The author also believes it necessary, in the current conditions, to emphasise that creativity is aimed at creating a new, unique product with inherent practical value for its subsequent commercialisation. Summarising the results of analysing various scholars’ views, it is important to note that creativity has an integrative nature and is closely related to the intellectual, emotional, motivational, and activity-based spheres of personality.

Conclusions

The emergence of the term “creativity”, its separation from the term “creatio”, and its widespread use as an independent theoretical category are associated with the rapid dynamism, complexity, and unpredictability of events in the modern social and economic environment. Despite the active interest of scholars in this topic, there is no consensus on the clear definition of concepts.

The analysis of scientific sources on this issue shows the absence of a unified concept and understanding of the essence of creativity and stable terms in this field. Some authors emphasise that the term “creativity” can only be applied to specific types of abilities that are rarely encountered, while others believe that the term refers to a general creative ability that all healthy individuals possess to some extent.

Creativity is also often represented as the opposite of everyday life, which implies an unconventional approach. Different approaches are used to interpret the term “creativity”: its place in the structure of personality, the levels of awareness of its manifestations, the sources and conditions for its development are defined in various ways. The term “creativity,” which reflects the general characteristic of an individual influencing creative productivity in modern conditions, necessarily requires emphasis on its focus on creating a completely unique product with inherent practical value for its subsequent commercialisation. Creativity has an integrative nature, closely connected with various spheres of personality, and, in today’s context, acquires particular importance in the development of the economy. However, the presence of different perspectives and reflections on the essence of the concept of “creativity,” both in the past and in the present, requires further research, which will focus on analysing the formation and development of the creative sector of the economy.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Antonova, O.Ye. (2012). [On the problem of defining the essence of the concept of creativity: Problems and searches](#). *New Learning Technologies: Scientific and Methodological Collection*, 71, 8-15.
- [2] Baer, J. (2012). Domain specificity and the limits of creativity theory. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 46(1), 16-29. [doi: 10.1002/jocb.002](#).

- [3] Barron, F., & Harrington, D.M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 439-476. doi: [10.1146/annurev.ps.32.020181.002255](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.32.020181.002255).
- [4] Bazhal, Yu., et al. (2015). *Innovation entrepreneurship: Creativity, commercialisation, ecosystem*. Kyiv: Pulsary.
- [5] Brown, N., Ince, A., & Ramlackhan, K. (2024). *Creativity in education: International perspectives*. London: UCL Press. doi: [10.14324/111.9781800080638](https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781800080638).
- [6] Busel, V. (2005). *Great explanatory dictionary of the modern Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: Perun.
- [7] Dow, G. (2022). [Defining creativity](#). In J.A. Plucker (Ed.), *Creativity and innovation* (2nd ed.) (p. 370). New York: Routledge.
- [8] Duff, W. (1767). *An essay on original genius; and its various modes of exertion in philosophy and the fine arts, particularly in poetry*. London: Edward & Charles Dilly.
- [9] Eysenck, H.J. (1998). *Intelligence: A new look*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- [10] Fedulova, L.I. (2017). [Theoretical constructions of the creative economy](#). *Economic Theory and Law*, 4(31), 48-63.
- [11] Fodor, J.A. (1983). *The modularity of mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [12] Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. London: Macmillan.
- [13] Guilford, J.P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444-454. doi: [10.1037/h0063487](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063487).
- [14] Guilford, J.P. (1967). Creativity: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 1(1), 3-14. doi: [10.1002/j.2162-6057.1967.tb00002.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.1967.tb00002.x).
- [15] Guilford, J.P. (1975). [Creativity: A quarter century of progress](#). In I.A. Taylor & J.W. Getzels (Eds.), *Perspectives in creativity* (pp. 37-59). New York: Routledge.
- [16] Hennessey, B.A., Altringer, B., & Moran, S. (2020). Social psychology of creativity. In *Encyclopedia of creativity, invention, innovation and entrepreneurship* (pp. 2189-2195). Cham: Springer. doi: [10.1007/978-3-319-15347-6_390](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15347-6_390).
- [17] Hrynenko, I.V. (2008). [Pedagogical conditions for the development of creativity in future humanities teachers in the process of professional training](#). (Abstract of a thesis for the degree of PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine).
- [18] Kakko, I., & Inkinen, S. (2009). *Homo creativus: Creativity and serendipity management in third generation science and technology parks*. *Science and Public Policy*, 36(7), 537-548. doi: [10.3152/030234209X465570](https://doi.org/10.3152/030234209X465570).
- [19] Kao, J.J. (1996). *Jamming: The art and discipline of business creativity*. New York: Harper.
- [20] Kasiyan, K. (2019). Art, art education, creative industry: Critique of commodification and fetishism of art aesthetics in Indonesia. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 6(1), article number 1586065. doi: [10.1080/23311983.2019.1586065](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1586065).
- [21] Kaufman, J.C., & Baer, J. (2012). Beyond new and appropriate: Who decides what is creative? *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 83-91. doi: [10.1080/10400419.2012.649237](https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.649237).
- [22] Kulchytska, O.I. (2002). Talent and psychological technologies for its development. In S.O. Sysoieva, O.I. Kulchytska & Y.V. Tsekhmister (Eds.), *Pedagogical technologies: Science to practice. Educational and methodological yearbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-192). Kyiv: VIPOI.
- [23] Leap, D. (2012). *The mystery of human creativity explained*. Retrieved from <https://www.thetrumpet.com/8960-the-mystery-of-human-creativity-explain>.
- [24] Lubart, T., Pacteau, C., Jacquet, A.Y., & Caroff, X. (2010). Children's creative potential: An empirical study of measurement issues. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(4), 388-392. doi: [10.1016/j.lindif.2010.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.02.006).

- [25] Maksymenko, S.D. (2017). [Cultural and historical development theory of L.S. Vyhotskyi](#). *Problems of Modern Psychology*, 36, 7-20.
- [26] Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. doi: [10.1037/h0054346](#).
- [27] Mednick, S. (1962). The associative basis of the creative process. *Psychological Review*, 69(3), 220-232. doi: [10.1037/h0048850](#).
- [28] Moliako, V.O. (1989). [Psychological readiness for creative work](#). Kyiv: Znannia.
- [29] New World Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Info:Main_Page.
- [30] Pavlenko, V.V. (2016). [Creativity: The essence concept](#). *Creative Pedagogy*, 11, 120-131.
- [31] Pennycook, G. (Ed.). (2018). *The new reflectionism in cognitive psychology: Why reason matters* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781315460178](#).
- [32] Prokopenko, V.V. (2018). Good and other ideas of Plato. *The Journal of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Philosophy. Philosophical Peripeteias*, 59, 6-15. doi: [10.26565/2226-0994-2018-59-1](#).
- [33] Rawlings, B.S., & Cutting, S.J. (2024). Linking disparate strands: A critical review of the relationship between creativity and education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36, article number 135. doi: [10.1007/s10648-024-09973-z](#).
- [34] Runco, M.A. (2004). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 657-687. doi: [10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141502](#).
- [35] Runco, M.A., & Albert, R.S. (2010). Creativity research: A historical view. In J.C. Kaufman & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (pp. 3-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/CBO9780511763205.003](#).
- [36] Said-Metwaly, S., Fernández-Castilla, B., Kyndt, E., Van den Noortgate, W., & Barbot, B. (2021). Does the fourth-grade slump in creativity actually exist? A meta-analysis of the development of divergent thinking in school-age children and adolescents. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 275-298. doi: [10.1007/s10648-020-09547-9](#).
- [37] Simonton, D.K. (2018). Defining creativity: Don't we also need to define what is not creative? *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 52(1), 80-90. doi: [10.1002/jocb.137](#).
- [38] Simpson, R.M. (1922). Creative imagination. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 234-243. doi: [10.2307/1414133](#).
- [39] Sivers, V.A., & Buhaiova, O.I. (2023). [Dimensions of human creativity in the context of comparative analysis of the works of M. Heidegger and H. Bergson](#). *Kultura i Suchasnist: Almanakh*, 1, 9-6.
- [40] Spearman, C.E. (1904). ["General intelligence", objectively determined and measured](#). *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201-293.
- [41] Stein, M.I. (1953). Creativity and culture. *The Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 311-322. doi: [10.1080/00223980.1953.9712897](#).
- [42] Sternberg, R.J. (1994). [Thinking styles: Theory and assessment at the interface between intelligence and personality](#). In R.J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Intelligence and personality* (pp. 169-187). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [43] Swap, S.M. (1993). [Developing home-school partnerships: From concepts to practice](#). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- [44] Szmids, K.J. (2010). [ABC of creativity](#). Warsaw: Difin.
- [45] Tan, C.Y., Chuah, C.Q., Lee, S.T., & Tan, C.S. (2021). Being creative makes you happier: The positive effect of creativity on subjective well-being. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(14), article number 7244. doi: [10.3390/ijerph18147244](#).

- [46] Taylor, C.W. (1988). [Various approaches to and definitions of creativity](#). In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives* (pp. 99-121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [47] Tiwen, H. (2023). Methods and means of developing academic talent of students in universities of the PRC. *Professional Education: Methodology, Theory and Technologies*, 9(2), 228-245. doi: [10.31470/2415-3729-2023-18-228-245](https://doi.org/10.31470/2415-3729-2023-18-228-245).
- [48] Tkach, R.V. (1999). [Psychological features of creative activity of an individual](#). Zaporizhzhia: ZDIA.
- [49] Torrance, E.P. (1977). [Creativity in the classroom: What research says to the teacher](#). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- [50] Voitenko, O.V. (1997). Development of creative abilities of schoolchildren in literature lessons. In *Pedagogy and psychology: Collection of scientific works* (pp. 17-21). Kharkiv: KhDPU.
- [51] Whitehead, A.N. (1932). [Adventures of ideas](#). New York: The Free Press.
- [52] Williams, R. (1985). [Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society](#). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [53] World Economic Forum (2020). *The future of jobs report*. Retrieved from https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2020.pdf.
- [54] World Economic Forum (2023). *The future of jobs report*. Retrieved from https://www3.weforum.org/docs/Wef_future_of_Jobs_2023.pdf.

Термін «креативність» у дискурсі теорій і концепцій

Олена Чередніченко

Кандидат технічних наук, доцент

Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України

03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8908-4113>

Анотація. Актуальність теми дослідження визначається необхідністю осмислення значення та поняття терміну «креативність» і еволюції його розвитку як теоретичної категорії. Мета – дослідити аспекти виникнення, значення та поняття терміну «креативність» і еволюції його розвитку з урахуванням тенденцій сучасної економіки. Одним з основних методологічних принципів, використаних у дослідженні, був принцип міждисциплінарності, який містить різноманітні теоретичні та практичні предметні сфери. Також використані: метод аналітико-синтетичної обробки інформації і діалектичний методи, метод системного аналізу і логічного узагальнення. Дослідження базувалося на теоретичних міркуваннях провідних науковців, які займалися розробленням окресленої проблематики. Креативність стає все більш значущим фактором із суттєвим впливом на всі сфери діяльності. Проведено аналіз і розглянуто еволюцію формування наукових поглядів у різні періоди на розуміння цієї категорії, розкрито розбіжності у трактуванні її різними науковцями, які зумовлюють різноманітність тлумачення та визначення поняття терміну «креативність». Виявлено, що автори існуючих теорій використовують різні підходи до визначення й термінології, а аналіз наукових джерел свідчив про відсутність єдиної концепції і розуміння сутності креативності та стійких понять у цій сфері. При трактуванні поняття «креативність» місце її у структурі особистості, в рівні усвідомлення її різноманітних проявів, джерела та умови розвитку визначають по-різному. Підсумовуючи результати аналізу різних точок зору науковців, можна зазначити, що креативність має тісний взаємозв'язок з емоційною, мотиваційною, інтелектуальною та діяльнісною сферами. Однак багатогранність цього поняття потребує подальших досліджень і вдосконалення його визначення. У статті поглиблене розуміння терміну «креативність» у контексті теоретичного дискурсу, що може бути використане при викладанні навчальних дисциплін або їх складових – економіки, менеджменту, філософії, соціології, політології тощо

Ключові слова: творча діяльність; еволюція; постіндустріальне суспільство; теоретичний дискурс; креативна особистість