

DEVELOPMENT OF CREATIVITY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Inga Bertašienė

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania
inga.bertasiene@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose – to reveal the aspects of creativity development in teacher education.

Design/methodology/approach – the method of the research is analysis of research literature. the author reviews that is based on the research findings of both Lithuanian and foreign scholars as well as on the strategic documents underlying the significance of developing creativity in teacher education. The scientific analysis of the study has been done with reference to the existing different definitions of creativity and the respective research in the field about forms of manifestation of creative personality and its education.

Finding – the concept of creativity, its definition and education have been widely discussed in research literature. Creativity is analyzed as a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon within the context of personality, society and culture, and it is viewed as a systemic phenomenon. Present-day science tends to view creativity as a systemic phenomenon (Sternberg, Lubart, 1996), especially with reference to its wide context, not merely the psychological one; and patterning of creative tasks here is treated as an effective way of developing creativity. Rimkutė-Jankuvienė (2016), while generalizing the research on creativity, states that different directions in the study of creativity appeared due to the fact that researchers from quite different fields got interested in creativity. There have been attempts at designing different instruments to measure creativity, and creativity itself was related to individual abilities, also analyzed as the process and outcome of creation. Supporters of confluent education (Sternberg, 2006; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Sternberg, Lubart, 1996; Weisberg, 2006) speak about the interaction of components that can explain and/or influence creativity. Sternberg (2006), while exploring the nature of creativity, claimed that creativity is not an inborn human quality. In his opinion, developing one's creativity could be a matter of a personal choice of the individual. His Theory of Investment into Creativity claims that everyone can become a creative personality if only they choose to invest time and effort into that. The patterns and styles of thinking, according to Sternberg (2006), are decisive in the choice

of ways and employment of personal qualities in decision-making. According to Beresnevičius (2006), the individual thinking style is also very important as it preconditions the individual's subconscious worldview and with other individuals. Grakauskaitė-Karkockienė (2010) asserts that development of creativity is an integral part of overall personality development. Rakauskaitė (2014) agrees to the opinion that creativity is not an exceptional feature of only very capable people, it is achievable for every individual as it is the kind of skill that should be developed on a regular basis. Craft (2008), while discussing the situation in the research of creativity, states that creative personalities tend to display different qualities, that is why it is difficult to apply one and the same measure to them. In Valantiejiūtės view (2009), the techniques that encourage creativity can be successfully used by separate individuals. In Sternberg's view (2006), the factor of environment also plays a significant role in manifestations of creativity. The author believes that some people need creativity-supportive acknowledgement in the form of reward and extra bonus while other people, with a strong inwardly-hidden potential for creativity, badly need outwardly-expressed support and encouragement coming from the environment to be able to reveal their creativity. Thus it could be stated that in terms of creativity-favorable environment in an educational institution, education can play in both directions – for and against in the development of creativity (Ganusauskaitė, Liesionis, 2009; Girdzijauskienė, 2012). In the situation of constant change in the present-day world, the development of creativity appears of utmost importance as learners constantly face newly-emerging phenomena, and the need for life-long education becomes accompanied by the need to learn to think creatively. In the Recommendation issued by the European Parliament and European Council for developing lifelong education skills (2006), it is stated that well-developed general competences not only guarantee the individual's professional growth but also add to their creativity, personal growth and motivation to further work and learn. The future of present-day society depends on how many creative personalities will be educated that are able to function in the world creatively and suggest unconventional ideas as well as shape new alternatives.

Research limitations/implications – this research provides an approach of on that teacher creativity is the indispensable component of the overall educational process in a broad sense; it is the creative teacher that can educate creativity in the learner. Foreign and Lithuanian researchers point out that present-day institutions of education tend to use a lot of practices that are directed towards reproductive rather than creative approaches towards education. Traditional teaching that had mainly been knowledge transmission-oriented is no longer valid in training teachers for fairly unpredictable future activity while living in the ever-changing world. This is a based on a deep analysis of literature.

Practical implications – the review could be used as a base for the further research.

Originality/Value – on the basis of the study of strategic documents for education and different sources for developing creativity, it is legitimate to assert that systemic education of creativity should find place in the system of education. Ganusauskaitė and

Liesionis (2009) believe that it is of utmost importance for teacher educating institutions to conceptualize the essential value of educating ‘the whole personality’. There is no doubt that creativity is an essentially important quality of the teacher, indispensable for developing creativity in the learner and supporting different forms of its manifestation.

Keywords: creativity, research of creativity, educating creativity, teacher education.

Research type: general review

References

- Beresnevičius, G. (2006). Creative Problem Solving Using Algorithmic Methods. *ACTA PAEDAGOGICA VILNENSIA*, 17, 57–65.
- Craft, A. (2008). *Creativity in Schools*, from: <http://itari.in/categories/Creativity/16.pdf>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). The Domain of Creativity, in M. Runco and R. Albert (eds), *Theories of Creativity*, 200–205. London: Sage.
- Ganusauskaitė, A., Liesionis, V. (2009). Lithuanian Higher Education Perspective – Creative Society Development. *Journal of Management*, 14 (1), 33–39.
- Girdzijauskienė, R. (2012). The Surroundings Benevolent for the Development of Creativity at Lithuanian Schools. *Tiltai*, 4, 79–91, from: <http://etalpykla.lituanistikadb.lt/fedora/objects/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2012~1367188917007/datastreams/DS.002.0.01.ARTIC/content>
- Grakauskaitė – Karkockienė, D. (2010). Training of Creativity: Theoretical and Practical Aspects. *Educational Psychology*, 21, 66–74.
- National Strategy of Education 2013–2022 (2013), from: http://www.smm.lt/uploads/documents/VSS_2013-2022_2013-08-23.pdf
- Rakauskaitė, E., D. (2014). Development of Creativity – an Investment to the Creative Society, *Social Technologies*, 4 (2), 333–347, from: <https://www.mruni.eu/upload/iblock/844/ST-14-4-2-07.pdf>
- Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on key competences for lifelong learning (2016), from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32006H0962>
- Research Report of Qualitative (2012). *Project Creativity Development: Research and Methodology*, Nr.VP1-2.2-ŠMM-05-K-02-029, from: http://11a.lt/krsc/p/kurybiskumas/d/kokybinio_tyrimo_atask.pdf
- Rimkutė – Jankuvienė, S. (2016). Theoretical Discourse of Creativity. *Creative Teacher – Creative Students*. Klaipėda, 5–14, from: <http://lyra.365.lt/leidiniai/kurybiskas-mokytojas/kurybiskas.pdf>
- Sternberg, R., J., Lubart, T., I. (1996). Investing in Creativity. *American Psychology*, 51 (7), 677–688.
- Sternberg, J., R. (2006). The Nature of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*. 18 (1), 87–98.
- Valantiejiūtė (2009). *Edward de Bono: We Did Not Learn How to Think Creatively*, from: <http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/2009-10-29-edwardas-de-bono-taip-ir-neismokome-kurybingaimastyti/34330>.
- Weisberg, R., W. (2006). *Creativity: Understanding Innovation in Problem Solving, Science, Invention, and the Arts*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.