DOI 10.5281/zenodo.16942693

UDC 378.4:159.954

CHAPTER 2.
DEVELOPING CREATIVITY IN UNIVERSITIES: CONCEPT AND RESERACH PERSPECTIVES

Daiva GRAKAUSKAITĖ-KARKOCKIENĖ
Assoc. prof. Social sciences (Psychology) Vytautas Magnus University, Education Academy, (K. Donelaičio g. 58, Kaunas LT-44248, Lithuania);
Mykolas Romeris University, Faculty of Human and Social Studies,
(LT-08303, Ateities g. 20, Vilnius, LT-08303, Lithuania)
daiva.karkockiene@vdu.lt
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7524-7057

Abstract. This article analyzes theoretical paradigms of creativity by reviewing the shifts in the concept and understanding of creativity observed since the first creativity studies in 1950. The aim of this paper is to theoretically analyze creativity paradigms and provide conclusions and recommendations for educators and researchers regarding opportunities for creativity development in universities. The insights presented in the article can be useful for educators, researchers, and practitioners in educational institutions who are responsible for education policy. The article also presents research on the possibilities of developing university students' creativity in the study proces. Based on research results provided by various authors, ideas on how to implement the concept of creative teaching/learning when working with students are discussed. Obstacles that prevent creative teaching are thoroughly examined, such as: student resistance to unusual methods that require personal responsibility and more effort; insufficient familiarity of faculty with creativity theories and methods; lack of financial, material, and human resources; absence of a suitable environment/space; prevalence of traditional teaching methods; inflexibility of achievement assessment systems and their sole focus on knowledge acquisition; and a lack of interdisciplinary collaboration. Additionally, factors that could aid in creative student learning are identified. The most helpful factors include: adjusting knowledge assessment methodologies, updating curricula and applied methods, investing in faculty professional development, and seeking financial opportunities.

Keywords: creativity, developing creativity, university students, academic process.

Introduction. Fostering creativity is relevant at various stages of human development – from childhood to old age. Individuals capable of thinking and acting creatively not only experience greater success in their work and studies but also achieve better self-realization, lead more meaningful lives, and feel greater satisfaction.

More than half a century ago, C. R. Rogers (*Rogers, C.R., 2005*) asserted that the societal demand for creative individuals was so profound that it was imperative to investigate the origins of the creative process, and particularly the conditions, approaches, and methods conducive to fostering a thinking personality. According to the author, it is paradoxical that many, even those who have graduated from higher education, remain stereotypically thinking conformists, incapable of generating new ideas, making original decisions, or thinking innovatively. He observed that creativity across various domains has been stifled within society: the education system is designed to cultivate conformist, stereotypical thinking; people typically spend their leisure time passively; scientists primarily develop technologies rather than fruitful hypotheses or theories; in the industrial sector, creative proposals are often actively avoided; and even within families—food, clothing, books read, and even thoughts are frequently conformist and stereotypical.

The demand for creative individuals is felt in diverse fields, including art, education, and business. However, one of the most crucial areas largely determining the future of a nation is education in its broadest sense – from preschoolers to students and, later, employees. Therefore, it is essential that education specialists (lecturers, teachers, administrators) are thoroughly familiar with theories of creativity psychology and the results of scientific research. This is vital not only for educators to acquire knowledge but also to create favourable conditions for the creativity of both teachers and learners to flourish.

Ensuring conditions and a favourable environment for creativity depends on the educator's personality, their attitude towards creativity, and their knowledge and ability to apply specific methods. It has long been observed that many people are creative, but their creativity can be suppressed if they are not treated appropriately (*Torrance, 1974; Alencar, 1996; Dadelo, S., 2025*). Conversely, creativity only unfolds when knowledge is gained and suitable conditions are provided for its specific development An issue of fostering creativity is particularly relevant in universities when teaching students. It often happens that formal classes and theoretical lectures lead to boredom, making any discussion of creativity impossible

My extensive experience teaching at university shows that students very often find themselves in a formal learning environment, studying in a traditional way, mostly absorbing only theoretical knowledge. When encountering different teaching methods, they are initially surprised, perhaps sometimes finding it harder to engage, but by the end of the course, they evaluate it as a useful learning method for acquiring both knowledge and practical skills, as well as for their personal development (*Hussain, M. Z., & Adeoye, A., 2015; Alencar, E. M. L. S., & Fleith, D. de S., 2015; Zeppegno, P. et al., 2016*). It is also crucial not only to create a favourable environment for creativity to flourish but also to ensure that both lecturers and students, when teaching and learning in a creative environment, can feel the difference of such learning from traditional methods (*Muñoz-Salinas, Y. et al., 2025*). It is extremely important that the "learning" participants themselves recognize and acknowledge their own creativity. Only by realizing and identifying their creative "part" of the personality will it be possible to nurture it. Furthermore, this experience and the resulting motivation will encourage creative action not only during learning but also in everyday life (broadening horizons, noticing manifestations of creativity in the environment and in others, performing various tasks, etc.). This should be the goal – if we aim to nurture young people into individuals upon whom the future of society will depend, we must invest in their proper education.

Therefore, the *problem* is that while the need for fostering creativity in universities is increasingly recognized and understood, there are still not many concrete methods for how it can be developed when teaching students. *The objectives* of this article are: 1) to discuss the transformation of creativity's definition; 2) to review research on creativity development in higher education institutions.

1. The transformation of creativity's definition.

Creativity is one of the most pressing, yet also one of the most complex, problems in psychology. However, the concept of creativity in scientific psychological literature has continuously evolved, been refined, and new characteristics of this complex construct have been sought. This is precisely why there is no single, unified understanding of creativity, as each definition reveals different aspects describing it.

This is due to the fact that the construct of creativity is complex, both in its nature and in its modes of expression. Although, numerous studies on various aspects of creativity have been conducted since J. P. Guilford's initial research in 1950 (*Guilford J. P., 1950*), the problem of creativity and the diversity of its themes still raise more questions than answers**.** J. P. Guilford (*Guilford J. P., 1950*) first introduced the notion of *divergent thinking* in his work. Divergent thinking means a particular type of thinking accounting for the emergence of a wide variety of original ideas; more specifically, it means thinking in many directions, proceeding from particular things to general ones. Divergent thinking is considered by many scholars to be a vital and most important creative skill able to bring into effect both creatively problem solving power and creative behaviour (*Alabbasi, A. M. A. et. al., 2021***)**.

J. P. Guilford (*Guilford, 1950*) stands as a foundational pioneer in the study of divergent thinking. Interestingly, despite being the first to articulate the concept of divergent thinking, he didn't create a single, widely recognized test or test battery. Instead, he developed numerous individual tasks designed to measure various facets of divergent thinking.

Among his most well-known divergent thinking tasks are:

1. Alternate Uses Task / Alternative Uses Test
2. Problem Finding tasks
3. Consequences Task
4. Figural tasks, which involve drawing or conceiving various images from provided elements.

Guilford first introduced the concept of divergent thinking in the 1950s, with his research and the development of these tasks actively continuing throughout the 1950s and up to 1967. Therefore, there isn't one singular "Guilford test," but rather a collection of specific tasks that measure divergent thinking in line with his developed theory of Intellectual structure.

One of Guilford's most notable successors was E. P. Torrance (*Torrance E. P.,1974*), who elaborated the concept of creativity advanced by J. P. Guilford (*Guilford J. P., 1950*) and developed widely used creativity tests (Torrance Tests of Creative

Thinking, TTCT) for researching divergent thinking. Four parameters of divergent thinking are distinguished: thinking fluency; thinking originality (the most important parameter of divergent thinking); thinking flexibility; thinking elaboration (Table 1).

Table 1. Components of Divergent Thinking

Component	Description
Fluency	The ability to generate as many ideas as possible within a certain time frame.
Originality	Rarely expressed original ideas (for example, after testing 100 subjects, only 1-3 subjects express the same ideas).
Flexibility	The ability to articulate a wide variety of ideas from different categories about the same phenomenon within a certain time, to view it from various aspects.
Elaboration	The ability to detail one's creation or work.

It's important to emphasize that this author was not only a theorist but also a practitioner. Torrance's goal was to create a creativity model that was not primarily scientifically differentiated and structured (like Guilford's *Structure of Intellect model*) but rather as comprehensive and practically effective as possible, along with a research methodology. He also wrote extensively about practical opportunities for fostering creativity in schools and conducted longitudinal studies (from childhood to adulthood) on the expression of creativity.

Summarizing E. P. Torrance's (*Torrance E. P., 1974*) contributions to the field of creativity psychology, it can be stated that he is most valued for:

1. Developing and validating widely used tests of creative thinking, which are still in use today.

2. Substantiating and expanding Guilford's idea that creative thinking abilities are fundamentally different from abilities measured by intelligence tests.

3. Proving that intelligence tests alone are insufficient for identifying gifted individuals, emphasizing the necessity of using creativity tests for a more accurate diagnosis of future achievements and successful activity.

4. Identifying methods for presenting task instructions that can help avoid the "downturn" in creativity observed in fourth-grade students.

5. Highlighting the influence of teachers and leaders in fostering creativity, placing particular importance on elementary school teachers, as adult creative achievements largely depend on their professional preparation and choice of teaching methods.

6. Establishing through research that a childhood desire to pursue a certain profession (or a "love" for some activity) and a persistent pursuit of that choice are linked to creative achievements in adulthood.

7. Asserting that creativity can be developed using various creativity development techniques, and he himself created them (*Sheehy N. et al., 2002*).

However, Torrance's greatest contribution is arguably that his tests are still among the most frequently used worldwide because more suitable tests for cognitive thinking simply haven't been developed. It's also significant that longitudinal studies with children have shown that these tests can predict creative achievements in adulthood (*Abdulla, A. M., & Cramond, B., 2017).*

Summarizing the works of different authors, it can be stated that two basic approaches prevail in the understanding of creativity – cognitive and personality. This is what is reflected in the research of many authors. Cognitive creativity research focuses on divergent thinking, imagination, problem solving, subconscious and similar problem analysis. A review and analysis of the work of various authors, it is possible to distinguish four basic areas of research in cognitive creativity: 1. Creativity as the ability to solve problems. 2. Creativity, as the ability to link distant concepts. 3. Imagination, as the most prominent phenomenon of creativity. 4. Divergent thinking, as a synonym for creativity.

Training of Creativity, Training of creativity means here the fostering of human potentialities and the elaboration of inborn abilities. Both goals may be achieved by securing adequate training conditions and by using special training programmes. To foster creativity, it's crucial to identify and define its cultivable components.

Table 2 presents the components of creativity that can be developed (cognitive, attitudinal, emotional-motivational, and interpersonal relationship components) (*Plucker J. A. & Runco M. A., 1999*). When designing creativity development

programs, applying creativity fostering methods, and conducting research, it's crucial to identify and understand precisely which components you intend to cultivate and by what means. Otherwise, studies claiming to investigate creativity "in general" may prove to be of little value (*Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė D., 2006*). .

Table 2. The components of creativity which could be trained (*D. Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė D., 2006; 2025*)

Components of Creativity	Authors	Examples of What is Developed
❑ **Cognitive**	Guilford, 1950 Torrance, 1974	➢ Divergent thinking, Imagination ➢ Problem solving ➢ Metacognitive abilities ➢ Idea Generation and Evaluation
❑ **Attitudes to creativity**	Rogers (2005) Csikszentmihalyi (2016)	➢ Positive view to own creativity ➢ A positive attitude towards creativity in general ➢ Imagination and Visualization ➢ Knowledge and Expertise
❑ **Emotional-motivational**	Amabile (1996) Csikszentmihalyi (2016)	➢ Safety, ➢ Confidence ➢ Self-realization ➢ Intrinsic motivation ➢ Extrinsic motivation ➢ Flow
❑ **Interpersonal Relationships**	Rogers (2005) Amabile (1996)	➢ Trust ➢ Empathy ➢ Respect ➢ Cooperation ➢ Conflict management ➢ Shared values and goals

It's also important to mention that merely "mechanically" applying methods or even a well-designed program to foster creativity won't be effective, and sometimes might even be detrimental to participants if a suitable environment isn't created, or if the program facilitator acts too directive or performs their work merely formally. As studies have shown, tolerance, emotinal engagement, and appropriately selected

teaching materials are paramount. Furthermore, the environment should not only be tolerant and encourage reasonable risk-taking, allowing deviation from norms, and tolerating ambiguities, but also be somewhat restrained, ensuring respectful beaviour, emotional regulation, and so on (*Plucker J. A. & Runco M. A., 1999*).

The concept of Creativity. Scientific literature, spanning from 1950 onwards, reveals approximately 100 definitions of creativity, each addressing various facets of this complex construct. However, creativity is most commonly defined as the ability to discover something new, original, and unexpected, while remaining appropriate and effective within a given context (*Guilford J. P., 1968; Lubart T. I. & Runco M. A., 1999; Sternberg R. J. et al., 2005*).

The change in the concept of creativity. One of the most renowned contemporary creativity researchers, M. A. Runco (*Runco M. A., 2023*), along with other author (*Runco M. A. & Jaeger, 2012*), long championed the traditional definition of creativity, describing it as an idea or product that is both *novel (original)* and *appropriate (useful, effective)*. However, after 2020, with the rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) and its capacity to generate "original" and "appropriate" results, M. A. Runco (2023) (*Runco M. A., 2023*) began to reconsider how to define creativity in a way that distinguishes "human" creativity from AI-generated products or results.

Thus, a *new definition* was proposed, stating that human creativity must not only be original but also characterized by *human volitional action/intention* and *authenticity*, which stem from human consciousness, experience, and goals. Therefore, only a human creative outcome can be authentic and arise from conscious choice/intention. These two factors are essential in distinguishing human creation from an algorithmic result.

So, the conventional definition of creativity, whose most important elements, *originality* and *effectiveness*, were supplemented by two additional crucial criteria: *authenticity*, where the creative act arises from an inner, genuine experience, self-expression, and a person's unique identity; and *intentionality*, which involves conscious determination, will, and effort, as well as an investment of energy in exploring ideas and their relevance, rather than accepting a quick and not fully considered solution.

Thus, artificial intelligence operates according to algorithms and pre-provided data, without any profound human deliberation, problem-seeking, or intention (*Runco M. A., 2023*).

2. Overview of Research on Creativity Development in Universities.

Numerous studies have explored how universities foster students' creativity and the challenges faculty face when aiming to cultivate it.

Creativity in Education: Core Concepts and Assessment Methods. A. M. Abdulla, B. Cramond (*Abdulla A. M., Cramond B., 2017*) focus on the practical opportunities for creativity development, rather than theoretical aspects. They present a comprehensive and multifaceted understanding of creativity and its evolution over the past six decades. Their work synthesizes research findings and provides valuable practical recommendations for educators. A key insight highlighted by the authors is that creativity is not merely an innate trait but rather a skill that can be cultivated. The article further reviews various models of creativity, ranging from Guilford's divergent thinking model and T. M. Amabile's *Intrinsic motivation model* (*Amabile, T. M., 1996*). to Csikszentmihalyi's *"Flow" theory* (*Csikszentmihalyi M., 2016*). The authors present the following crucial insights:

1. Creativity can be developed; it is not an inherent "given" peculiar only to a select few.

2. Key factors fostering creativity include: openness to ideas, a psychologically safe environment, and tolerance for risk.

3. Educators must be knowledgeable about and apply diverse methods for both assessing and fostering creativity. Given that creativity manifests through a creative personality and a creative process (encompassing problem identification, idea generation, and refinement), it is paramount for teachers to possess extensive knowledge of creativity's expression and to be proficient in nurturing the aforementioned personality traits while effectively organizing the learning process.

Defining and Assessing Creativity: Implications for Educators. E.M.L.S. Alencar and D. de S. Fleith (*Alencar E.M.L.S. and Fleith D. de S. 2015*) investigated opportunities for creativity development in universities. The authors assert that while

the importance of fostering creativity is acknowledged in higher education institutions, actively promoting it presents a genuine challenge for faculty members. They identify the following primary obstacles:

1. *Student Resistance***:** Some students may be inclined to resist unusual, new teaching methods because these approaches demand greater engagement, independence, risk-taking, accountability, and tolerance for uncertainty. Students are typically accustomed to traditional, more structured teaching methods.

2. *University Organizational Structure***:** Bureaucratic procedures and evaluation systems are standardized, focused on measuring learning achievements/outcomes and efficiency, rather than on fostering creativity. Thus, the organization of learning activities established by universities themselves can limit the freedom of both faculty and students to experiment and explore.

3. *Faculty Attitudes***:** Some faculty members might perform their work rather formally, and also lack sufficient knowledge and skills on how to integrate creativity development methods into the teaching process. Moreover, faculty attitudes can often vary significantly, sometimes even being negative. All these factors influence and obstruct the actual development of creativity during learning.

4. *Pedagogical Competencies and Experience of Faculty***:** Requirements for evaluating results and the prevalence of traditional teaching methods (lectures, seminars, literature analysis, etc.) often suppress and even prevent the creative conduct of classes. Furthermore, there's often a lack of innovative, student-centered, and experience-oriented teaching methods that would stimulate both critical and creative thinking, teach problem-solving, and foster idea generation.

5. *Lack of Time and Resources***:** Fostering creativity demands additional time, both for preparing tasks and for executing them. There's also often a lack of suitable environments, learning spaces, technologies, and supplementary teaching materials, which universities cannot always provide.

To foster creativity, the following aspects are crucial:

1. *Flexibility and Autonomy***:** Providing greater freedom and autonomy (to both faculty and students) would create more opportunities for experimentation and the generation of original ideas.

2. *Student-Centered Methods***:** This includes active teaching methods, problem-based learning, project work, discussions, and idea generation.

3. *Supportive Environment***:** The instructor themselves should encourage students not to fear taking risks or making mistakes, support original ideas, and promote critical thinking.

4. *Faculty Professional Development***:** Deeper familiarization with creativity theories and development methods is vitally important for faculty.

5. *Interdisciplinary Collaboration***:** Collaboration and the creation of joint activities with faculty from other disciplines could be one of the factors promoting creativity.

In summary, to foster creativity in universities, it's essential not only to acknowledge its importance but also to actively change pedagogical practices, organizational structures, and faculty attitudes. The conditions and environment in which learning takes place are also very significant. This requires a systemic approach and continuous attention both to addressing challenges and encouraging positive decision-making.

Creativity Development in Higher Education: Perceptions and Challenges. The results discussed by the aforementioned authors are further complemented and confirmed by a study conducted by M. Z. Hussain and A. Adeoye (*Hussain, M. Z., & Adeoye, A., 2015*) with university faculty and students. The aim was to determine how the university community (faculty and students) perceives the necessity of creativity development and what obstacles they identify that hinder such teaching/development. The results revealed that the respondents' attitudes towards the development and application of creativity competencies are very favorable, recognizing it as highly important. It became clear that the role of faculty in fostering creativity is primary and even decisive. This indicates that faculty are considered those who exert direct influence and are responsible for this process. However, a number of obstacles were

identified: an excessive reliance on testing (exam results, focus on knowledge reproduction/memory). Such learning leaves no room for the search for alternative solutions, free idea generation, or opportunities for experimentation. Another obstacle is insufficient financial, material, and human resources (lack of suitable and creativity-conducive spaces, absence of specialized learning tools, lack of opportunities for faculty professional development). One of the biggest obstacles identified was ineffective educational systems (lack of flexibility, interdisciplinarity, and practical tasks that would stimulate learners' creativity).

In conclusion, the authors state that although faculty and students value the importance of creativity, they face very significant challenges in reality. The study authors recommend reviewing and modifying student knowledge assessment methods, allocating more resources for creativity-promoting infrastructure, reviewing and updating curricula and methodologies, and investing in faculty professional development to ensure they are prepared to implement creativity-promoting practices.

Fostering Critical Thinking, Creativity, and Communication through Evaluation. S. Dadelo's (*Dadelo's S., 2025*) study aimed to determine how first and final-year university students assess their creative, critical thinking, and communication skills. It also asked them to indicate the teaching and assessment methods used. A comparison of the self-assessments from the first and final-year students revealed no statistically significant differences in their evaluations of creativity. This suggests that the teaching methods employed at the university might not be helping students develop their creativity. However, the study did find that assessment methods incorporating reflection, creative tasks, and group collaboration significantly fostered student creativity and critical thinking. Therefore, by applying effective teaching methods, it's possible to develop students' creative abilities.

Fostering Creativity Through Film in University Education. The integration of films into university learning programs has proven to be a valuable educational tool for several decades. Beyond enhancing subject comprehension, knowledge retention, and student engagement, research suggests that films can significantly foster creativity. A notable body of studies, particularly within psychology and medical disciplines,

highlights the benefits of using films in teaching (*Klemenc-Ketis Z. & Kersnik J., 2011; Holloway, 2016; Nittoli J. M. & Guiffrida, D. 2017*). Furthermore, numerous investigations have explored the broader possibilities and integration of films as a learning resource in university curricula (*Koch G. & Dollarhide C. T., 2000; Petkari E., 2017; Zeppegno P. et al., 2016; Nguyen N. et al., 2022; Nguyen N. N. R., 2023; Rüb M. et al., 2024*).

One such recent qualitative study by D. Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė (2025) involved students enrolled in a Counselling Psychology course. Students, working in groups of 3-4, were given the autonomy to select a film from a provided list that most interested them. Their task was to prepare a 90-minute presentation analyzing the chosen film through aspects relevant to counselling psychology. They were also required to develop and lead practical, topic-relevant activities for the group, such as discussions, role-playing, or situation analyses. At the course's conclusion, students submitted a detailed learning reflection on their experience.

The study's results demonstrated that students highly valued the freedom to choose their preferred film and topics for presentation. They also appreciated the provision of general guidelines rather than rigid requirements for task execution and structure. Analysis of student reflections indicated that this film-based learning approach allowed for unique, creative presentation formats, the development of practical tasks, and facilitated discussions and the expression of personal opinions. Many students emphasized that this method not only deepened their understanding of the subject matter and improved collaboration and discussion-leading skills but also significantly stimulated their creativity. It was also noted that students had rarely, if ever, encountered similar film-based assignments in their previous university studies.

In conclusion, the appropriate selection and use of films across various disciplines, including psychology, medicine, education, history, and foreign languages, during the learning process is an effective way to cultivate creativity, increase learning motivation, and stimulate curiosity. The consistent and thoughtful application of films, coupled with clear task guidelines and substantial freedom in topic selection, represents

an underexploited educational tool that can significantly enhance student creativity, motivation, and engagement.

Fostering Creativity in Preservice Teachers: Current Research Landscape. The work by Y. Muñoz-Salinas et al. (*Muñoz-Salinas Y. et al., 2025*) provides an analysis and synthesis of research dedicated to fostering creativity in preservice teachers. Their review, covering studies from the past decade (2014–2024), highlights that despite the acknowledged importance of creativity in teaching, this field remains underexplored. The analysis revealed that the most commonly used and recommended methods for developing creativity include project-based and problem-based learning, reflection, creative tasks, and Design Thinking. Major obstacles identified were curriculum inflexibility, lecturers' attitudes and insufficient competencies, unmotivated students, rigid assessment systems, and a lack of adequate resources. Critically, systemic barriers, which individual lecturers cannot resolve, were noted as the most significant hindrances. The study also emphasized that both academic and practical experience are crucial for developing preservice teachers' creativity, though these aspects are often not systematically integrated into many programs. Furthermore, a lack of specific tools and clear guidelines for integrating creativity development into pedagogy and psychology studies was identified. Muñoz-Salinas et al. conclude that further research (qualitative, longitudinal, and interdisciplinary studies on creativity development) is needed to inform evidence-based recommendations, advocating for the systematic inclusion of creativity development in preservice teacher training programs.

The Impact of AI (*Artificial Intelligence*) *on Creativity in Universities*. A timely and relevant study by E. Butrimė and V. Zuzevičiūtė (*Butrimė E. & Zuzevičiūtė V., 2025*) explored the use of AI in fostering student creativity, based on a pilot student survey. The results revealed a positive student attitude towards AI, indicating their readiness to embrace its integration into their studies and future professional endeavours.

The respondents also emphasized the significance of creativity in this context, understanding that AI will not replace human creative abilities, but may instead complement and even enhance them. Overall, the findings suggest that university study

programs should adopt AI more flexibly and rapidly, both in updating curricula and pedagogical practices, with the aim of cultivating student creativity.

Creative competencies are crucial and must be developed even (or especially) in the context of AI's growing prevalence. This will help future specialists better adapt to the dynamic job market.

Fostering Creative Process Engagement: The Role of Humble Teacher Leadership and Student Empowerment. A study by Z. Li and J. Chen (*Li, Z., & Chen, J., 2025*) focused on the teacher's role in fostering student creativity. The student survey results revealed that humble teacher leadership is a crucial factor promoting creativity. This instills confidence in students, empowering them to act independently and boldly, make decisions, engage in the learning process, helps create a safe learning environment, and increases trust. Therefore, universities should cultivate the importance of humble leadership, thereby increasing student confidence and empowerment, and providing more opportunities for creativity to flourish. In summary, this research supports and confirms the insights of other authors regarding the critical importance of the teacher's personality traits, appropriate behaviour (from which students would want to learn and emulate), and a non-aggressive communication style in developing student creativity (*Hussain M. Z. & Adeoye A., 2015*; *Muñoz-Salinas Y. et al., 2025*).

Conclusions. Creativity is one of the most relevant, but at the same time one of the most complex topics in psychology. To date, there is no unified understanding of creativity, with on-going discussions regarding the validity and accuracy of survey methodology. While the first research conducted by J. P. Guilford in 1950 (*Guilford J. P., 1950*) explored many aspects of creativity, the complexity and multifaceted nature of creativity continues to raise more questions than answers. The concept of creativity varies, but often creativity is defined as a personality trait associated with the ability to discover what is new, original and unexpected. However, after 2020, with the advent of artificial intelligence, which can also "be original" and create a "novel" outcome, the concept of creativity was redefined. Thus, a new definition was proposed, stating that

human creativity must not only be original but also characterized by human volitional action/intention and authenticity.

It's not enough to just know creativity theories or concepts. To effectively foster creativity, it's really important to understand what can be developed, how it can be developed, and under what conditions.

That's why discussing the possibilities for creativity development, identifying its cultivable components, highlighting the importance of the environment where creativity workshops happen, and also focusing on the leader's/teacher's behaviour and their relationship-building with group members should prove practically useful for anyone wanting to use creativity development methods with students.

The analysis of studies on the possibilities of fostering creativity in universities, presented in the article, revealed that while creativity development is considered crucial in the study process, it is rarely implemented in reality. It became evident that only a few university lecturers utilize creative methods in their lectures. Their observations indicate that creativity, engagement, and intrinsic motivation are fostered by active teaching methods, reflective writing, the freedom to choose tasks and their completion methods, and a non-directive, trust-building communication style from lecturers. The most frequently identified obstacles included: student resistance, insufficient lecturer knowledge regarding creativity theories and pedagogical methods, limited financial resources, inflexible curricula, rigid achievement assessment systems, and an unsuitable learning environment. Thus, the research field in this area remains underexplored, as studies on creativity development possibilities from various perspectives (including those of lecturers, students, and educational policymakers) could initiate evidence-based recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Lecturers/teachers are a critically important group, having a real impact on students in fostering creativity. It would be important to enable and motivate as broad a circle of educators as possible to apply specific creativity educational techniques in their lessons. This also encourages teachers to use specific creative development, and creates opportunities for teachers themselves to become more deeply acquainted with

scientific paradigms of creativity, and place greater value on their own creativity development.

2. For both educators, as well as administrators and education system coordinators, it is advisable to encourage and create more opportunities for Lecturers/teachers to participate in the creativity fostering workshops, organize systematic methodological tools with specific creativity training methods and specific tasks which encourage creative thinking, design and publishing.

3. For many of teachers it would be useful to create a centralized database of tasks that nurture creativity, which could include: a) tasks available to all lecturers/teachers, b) for those interested in more in-depth training, access to more demanding tasks after completing special teacher creativity training.

4. Teacher motivation in a variety of ways (including material/financial), is another important way to encourage teachers to not only create creativity in their assigned tasks, but to also to share them with their colleagues.

5. Of greatest importance is to change working teachers' approach to creativity at all levels of education, and to promote this not only by declaration, but by utilizing specific techniques, supported by vetted research, to develop school aged children's creativity. This requires specific investment, support and effort of all interested parties.

References:

1. Abdulla, A. M., & Cramond, B. (2017). After six decades of systematic study of creativity: What do teachers need to know about what it is and how it is measured? *Roeper Review*, *39*(1), 9–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2016.1257008
2. Alabbasi, A. M. A., Hafsyan, A. S. M., Runco, M. A., & AlSaleh, A. (2021). Problem finding, divergent thinking, and evaluative thinking among gifted and nongifted students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 44*(4), 398–413. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/01623532211044539
3. Alencar, E. (1996). University students' evaluation of their own creativity and their teachers' and colleagues' level of creativity. *Gifted Education International*, *11*, 128–130.
4. Alencar, E. M. L. S., & Fleith, D. de S. (2015). Creativity in higher education: Challenges and facilitating factors. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(9), 555–562. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/026142949601100303
5. Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to The social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press. URL: https://surli.cc/ufgnnx
6. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2016). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience* (Revised ed.). Harper Perennial. URL: https://www.harpercollins.com/products/flow-mihaly-csikszentmihalyi
7. Dadelo, S. (2025). Possibilities for evaluation to foster the soft skills of critical thinking, creativity, and communication in higher education. *Creativity Studies*, *18*(1), 13–29. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2025.20943

8. Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė, D. (2006). *Studentų kūrybiškumo kaitos ypatumai* [Daktaro disertacija, Vilniaus universitetas]. URL: https://elaba.lt
9. Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė, D. (2025). Film as an educational tool: Using films in Counselling Psychology course. In *ICLEL 2025 Abstract Collection* [or *Conference Proceedings*]. (in press).
10. Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, *5*, 444–454. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063487
11. Guilford, J. P. (1968). Intelligence has three facets. *Science*, *160*(3828), 615–620. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.160.3828.615
12. Holloway, L. J. M., Oxford, R. L., & Wilczek, R. S. (2016). Using films to teach counseling psychology in a media-drenched culture. *International Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *3*(11), 31–38. URL: https://www.ijessnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_11_November_2016/5.pdf
13. Hussain, M. Z., & Adeoye, A. (2015). Creativity in higher education: A case of perception in the University of Mostar. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(9), 598–605. URL: https://surl.lu/fqeyiq
14. Klemenc-Ketis, Z., & Kersnik, J. (2011). Using movies to teach professionalism to medical students. *BMC Medical Education*, *11*(1), Article 60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-11-60
15. Koch, G., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2000). Using a popular film in counselor education: Good Will Hunting as a teaching tool. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *39*(3), 203–210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2000.tb01232.x
16. Li, Z., & Chen, J. (2025). Enhancing creative process engagement in university students: The mediating role of trust and empowerment and the moderating effect of proactive personality in humble teacher leadership. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *100*, Article 102224. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2025.102224
17. Lubart, T. I., & Runco, M. A. (1999). Economic perspective on creativity. In M. A. Runco & S. Pitzer (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Creativity* (pp. 623–627). Academic Press. URL: https://surl.lu/sjovlk
18. Manchanda, S., & Garg, R. (2025). Can students' perceived teacher autonomy support promote creativity? A moderated chain mediation model. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *87*, Article 102028. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2025.102028
19. Muñoz-Salinas, Y., Caro-Zúñiga, D., & Jeria, I. (2025). Creativity and preservice teachers: A literature review of an underexplored field (2014–2024). *Education Sciences*, *15*(3), Article 395. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030395
20. Nguyen, N., Guerin, C., Barbieri, W., Palmer, E., & Pugsley, P. (2022). The role of technological knowledge in the pedagogical integration of film in disciplinary teaching at universities. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *19*(3), 9–17. URL: https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol19/iss3/02/
21. Nguyen, N. N. R. (2023). How do university lecturers learn to teach with film? Formal and informal academic development. *Educational Media International*, *60*(1), 14–30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2023.2174915
22. Nittoli, J. M., & Guiffrida, D. (2017). Using popular film to teach multicultural counseling: A constructivist approach. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, *13*(3), 344–357. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2017.1365302
Petkari, E. (2017). Building beautiful minds: Teaching through movies to tackle stigma in psychology students in the UAE. *Academic Psychiatry*, *41*(2), 234–237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-016-0618-3
23. Plucker, J. A., & Runco, M. A. (1999). Enhancement of creativity. In M. A. Runco & S. R. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of creativity* (pp. 669–675). Academic Press. URL: https://surl.li/danupx
24. Rogers, C. R. (2005). *Apie tapimą asmeniu: psichoterapeuto požiūris į psichoterapiją*. Via Recta. URL: https://www.worldcat.org/title/69442194
25. Rüb, M., Rehfuess, E. A., Siebeck, M., & Pfadenhauer, L. M. (2024). Cinemeducation: A mixed methods study on learning through critical reflection, perspective taking and emotional narratives. *Medical Education*, *58*(1), 63–92. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14978

26. Runco, M. A., Jager G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *24*(1), 92–96. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092
27. Runco, M. A. (2023). Updating the standard definition of creativity to account for the artificial creativity of AI. *Creativity Research Journal*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2023.2257977
28. Sheehy, N., Chapman, A. J., & Conroy, W. A. (2002). *Biographical dictionary of psychology*. Routledge. URL: https://surl.lu/ohqbdi
29. Sternberg, R. J., Lubart, T. I., Kaufman, J. C., & Pretz, J. E. (2005). Creativity. In K. J. Holyoak & R. G. Morrison (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 351–370). Cambridge University Press. URL: https://surl.li/ahulea
30. Torrance, E. P. (1974). *Norms - technical manual, Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking*. Scholastic Testing Service. URL: https://ststesting.com/ttct.html
31. Zeppegno, P., Gramaglia, C., Feggi, A., Lombardi, A., & Torre, E. (2016). The effectiveness of a new approach using movies in the training of medical students. *Medical Education, 50*(6), 602–610. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12962

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AFFAIRS

SCIENCE AND EDUCATION IN THE THIRD MILLENNIUM:

Information Technology, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Security and Work, Management

International collective monograph

Volume II.

Lublin, Polska
2025

DOI
UDK 001.9
H 34

Recommended for publication by INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AFFAIRS №1-08/08 dated 08-08-2025

Editorial committee:
JANUSZ NICZYPORUK, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Professor Maria Curie Skłodowska University (Lublin, Poland);
OLEG BATIUK, Doctor of Legal Sciences,, Professor, Chairman of the Board of the NGO "IESF" (Kyiv, Ukraine);
Reviewers:
OLGA BALYNSKA, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of General Legal Disciplines of the Law Institute of the Lviv State University of Internal Affairs (Lviv, Ukraine).
MARIJA CZEPIL, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Professor Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, (Lublin, Poland);

Authors: Tran Minh DUC, D. GRAKAUSKAITĖ-KARKOCKIENĖ, V. ŠIMEK, M. ŠIMKOVÁ, D. MAZÁK, K. SLEZÁKOVÁ, O. M. ELBREKHT, O. MARUSHCHAK, L. MELNYCHUK, M. KRAVCHENKO, O. SOTULA, O. STEPANOVA, O.YAKOVLEVA, F. TRISHYN, I. ZAKHAROVA

SCIENCE AND EDUCATION IN THE THIRD MILLENNIUM: information technology, education, law, psychology, social security and work, management. *International collective monograph. Volume II.* Institute of Public Administration Affairs. Lublin, Polska, 2025. 410 p.

The collective monograph is the result of the generalization of the scientists' conceptual work who study current topics from such fields of knowledge as Information Technology, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Security and Work, Management through the prism of the possibilities of science and education in the third millennium.

For scientists, educational staff, PhD candidates, masters of educational institutions, university facilities, stakeholders, managers and employees of management bodies at various hierarchical levels and for everyone, who is interested in current problems of Information Technology, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Security and Work, Management through the prism of the possibilities of science and education in the third millennium.

ISBN: 978-83-65444-68-4

© Institute of Public Administration Affairs, 2025;
© The collective of authors, 2025.


Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International