ISSN (print) 2708-7530
Наукові перспективи № 6(60) 2025

UDC 159.9

https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2025-6(60)-1127-1142

Shepelova Mariia Volodymyrivna PhD in psychology, senior researcher of the psychology of creativity department, H. S. Kostiuk institute of psychology of National academy of educational sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, tel.: (044) 288-33-20, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3293-4997

Klymenko Denys Viktorovych PhD in psychology Candidate, psychology of creativity department, H. S. Kostiuk institute of psychology of National academy of educational sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, tel.: (044) 288-33-20, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9294-2275

THEORETICAL MODELS OF CREATIVITY IN MODERN PSYCHOLOGY: COGNITIVE, PERSONALITY, AND SOCIOCULTURAL APPROACHES

Abstract. This article presents a systematic theoretical review of major models of creativity within the Western psychological tradition, emphasizing cognitive, personality-motivational, and sociocultural approaches. Creativity is recognized as a multifaceted and dynamic capacity inherent to all individuals, expressed through the generation of new, original, and socially valuable products. The cognitive paradigm focuses on mental processes such as divergent thinking, cognitive flexibility, and associative thinking as core components of creative activity. The psychometric approach highlights standardized measurement of creative abilities, including fluency, originality, and flexibility, and underscores the potential for creativity development through education. The personality-motivational perspective stresses intrinsic motivation, self-development, emotional experience, and ethical values as central drivers of creativity, framing it as a form of personal autonomy and self-realization. Meanwhile, sociocultural and systemic approaches emphasize the interaction between the individual, social environment, and cultural context, considering creativity as a co-creative process influenced by social recognition and cultural domains. Despite varying emphases, all approaches converge on the understanding of creativity as an interplay between individual capacities and external factors, requiring a comprehensive, integrative framework. This synthesis of perspectives provides a solid foundation for further research, diagnosis, and practical application in educational, managerial, and therapeutic contexts, highlighting the importance of nurturing creativity as a vital skill in the rapidly evolving social and cultural landscape.

Keywords: creativity, cognitive approach, personality-motivational factors, sociocultural approach, creative process, divergent thinking, creativity development.

ISSN (print) 2708-7530
Наукові перспективи № 6(60) 2025

Шепельова Марія Володимирівна кандидат психологічних наук, старший науковий співробітник лабораторії психології творчості Інституту психології імені Г. С. Костюка НАПН України, м. Київ, тел.: (044) 288-33-20, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3293-4997

Клименко Денис Вікторович аспірант лабораторії психології творчості Інституту психології імені Г. С. Костюка НАПН України, м. Київ, тел.: (044) 288-33-20, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9294-2275

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ МОДЕЛІ ТВОРЧОСТІ У СУЧАСНІЙ ПСИХОЛОГІЇ: КОГНІТИВНИЙ, ОСОБИСТІСНИЙ ТА СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНИЙ ПІДХОДИ

Анотація. У статті представлено систематичний теоретичний огляд основних моделей креативності в межах західної психологічної традиції з акцентом на когнітивному, особистісно-мотиваційному та соціокультурному підходах. Креативність розглядається як багатовимірна та динамічна здатність, притаманна кожній людині, що виявляється у створенні нового, оригінального та соціально цінного продукту. Когнітивна парадигма фокусується на мисленнєвих процесах, таких як дивергентне мислення, когнітивна гнучкість і асоціативне мислення, як ключових компонентах творчої діяльності. Психометричний підхід підкреслює важливість стандартизованого вимірювання творчих здібностей – швидкості продукування ідей, оригінальності та гнучкості – й акцентує на можливості розвитку креативності через освіту. Особистісно-мотиваційна перспектива наголошує на внутрішній мотивації, саморозвитку, емоційному досвіді та етичних цінностях як основних рушіях творчості, розглядаючи її як форму особистої автономії та самореалізації. У той час як соціокультурний і системний підходи акцентують на взаємодії між особистістю, соціальним середовищем і культурним контекстом, розглядаючи творчість як процес співтворення, що залежить від соціального визнання та культурних доменів. Незважаючи на різні акценти, всі підходи сходяться у розумінні креативності як взаємодії між індивідуальними здібностями та зовнішніми чинниками, що вимагає комплексної інтегративної моделі. Такий синтез підходів створює надійну основу для подальших досліджень, діагностики й практичного застосування в освіті, управлінні та терапевтичній практиці, підкреслюючи важливість розвитку креативності як ключової навички в умовах стрімко змінного соціального та культурного середовища.

Ключові слова: творчість, когнітивний підхід, особистісно-мотиваційні чинники, соціокультурний підхід, творчий процес, дивергентне мислення, розвиток креативності.

Problem Statement. In contemporary scientific discourse, the psychology of creativity holds a significant place, as the ability for creative thinking is considered a key condition for personal development, self-realization, and adaptation to a rapidly changing social and cultural environment. In the context of transformational changes in education, culture, technology, and economics, there is a growing demand for individuals with innovative thinking who are capable of producing original and socially valuable outcomes. This situation necessitates a systematic scientific understanding of the nature of creativity, the mechanisms of its development, and the factors that either contribute to or hinder its realization.

Analysis of Recent Studies and Publications. The Western psychological tradition has proposed a range of theoretical approaches to the study of creativity, which have laid the groundwork for the formation of an interdisciplinary understanding of this phenomenon. In particular, the cognitive approach (J. Guilford [24], M. Boden [9], R. Finke [17], among others) views creativity as the result of specific mental processes – divergent thinking, associative thinking, insight, and cognitive flexibility. The psychometric approach (E. P. Torrance [36], F. E. Williams [38], F. Barron [7]) focuses on measuring creativity as an individual ability through standardized testing. The personality-motivational perspective (T. Amabile [1], M. Runco [30], H. Gardner [18]) emphasizes the connection between creativity and intrinsic motivation, emotional states, and self-actualization.

Sociocultural and systems-based approaches (M. Csikszentmihalyi [13], V. Glăveanu [20], H. Gruber [22]) highlight the interaction between the creative individual and their culture, social field, and educational and professional environment.

The problem of studying creativity becomes particularly relevant in the context of education, where fostering the creative potential of students is a priority task. This necessitates the integration of various theoretical and methodological approaches to create a comprehensive model of creativity development. A deeper analysis of cognitive, emotional, motivational, and social factors in the creative process has not only theoretical value but also practical significance for fields such as pedagogy, psychotherapy, management, and human resources.

Thus, the relevance of this issue lies in the need to synthesize existing approaches to understanding creativity, identify both universal and contextually determined mechanisms of its formation, and develop effective psychological and pedagogical strategies for nurturing creativity as one of the key characteristics of the modern individual.

The article aims to conduct a systematic theoretical review of the main approaches to understanding creativity in the Western psychological tradition, to analyse key models of creativity from the perspective of cognitive, personality, and sociocultural paradigms, and to define their shared and divergent positions regarding the nature, structure, and factors contributing to the development of creativity.

Presentation of the Main Research Content. Western psychology distinguishes various approaches to the study of creativity.

The cognitive approach views creativity as the result of mental processes (imagination, thinking, associations, insight). Key researchers in this field include J. Guilford [23], who initiated the study of divergent thinking as the foundation of creativity. He contrasted convergent thinking, which focuses on finding a single correct answer (typical of logic, IQ tests, and traditional education), with divergent thinking – the ability to generate many different ideas or solutions to an open-ended problem. According to Guilford, divergent thinking is the core of creativity and manifests through openness, flexibility, and the ability to discover non-standard solutions.

In his *Structure of Intellect* model, Guilford identified several psychometric characteristics to measure creativity: Fluency – the number of ideas a person can generate in a limited time; Flexibility – the ability to shift between different categories of thinking or strategies; Originality – the uniqueness or rarity of ideas; Elaboration – the level of detail and depth of ideas; Associative ability – the capacity to establish remote or unusual connections.

These components were later incorporated into E. P. Torrance's tests, which further developed Guilford's ideas in practical application.

Guilford also developed a three-component model of intellect including: Operations (how we think), Content (what we think about), Products (what results we achieve).

Within this framework, he identified 120 types of intellectual abilities, where creative abilities result from combinations of operations that generate new ideas. Thus, Guilford viewed creativity as a specific form of thinking that relies on the development of divergent processes and should be considered equally important for education and psychology as traditional cognitive abilities [23].

R. Sternberg [34] proposed the triarchic theory of intelligence, which comprises analytical, creative, and practical components. Analytical intelligence is associated with logic and problem-solving, creative intelligence with the generation of new ideas and adaptability, and practical intelligence with applying knowledge to real-life situations and solving everyday problems. This approach expands the conventional view of intelligence by incorporating creativity as an integral component.

R. Finke, T. Ward, and S. Smith [17] developed the "genplore model" of creative cognition, which explains creativity as a combination of generative and exploratory phases. In the generative phase, individuals produce initial mental structures – so-called preinventive forms – which are not yet complete ideas. In the exploratory phase, these forms are refined, transformed, or combined to generate new, creative solutions. This model demonstrates that creativity is not a spontaneous act but a dynamic interplay between imagination and rational thought.

M. Boden [9] introduced a concept of three types of creativity, each based on distinct cognitive mechanisms and types of surprise: Combinatorial creativity – the novel combination of existing ideas or images, resulting in a sense of innovation through unexpected synthesis; Exploratory creativity – the in-depth study of an existing conceptual space, revealing new variations or structures within a known system; Transformational creativity – the most radical type, which alters the very framework or rules of a conceptual space, leading to a genuine paradigm shift.

Boden thus illustrates that creativity is not a single process, but a diverse set of activities involving various levels of novelty and depth.

Representatives of the psychometric approach believed that creativity could be measured using standardized assessment tools. Among the key figures in this approach is E. P. Torrance [36], who developed the most well-known psychometric instrument – the *Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking* (TTCT), still widely used in psychological practice. Torrance viewed creativity as a universal human ability, not exclusive to "geniuses," and emphasized that it could be developed through education, imagination stimulation, and favorable environmental conditions.

His TTCT tests assess four core components of divergent thinking: Originality – the uniqueness of ideas; Fluency – the number of generated ideas; Flexibility – the variety of ideas; Elaboration – the degree of detail in an idea.

Torrance considered the creative process as a sequence of stages, similar to problem-solving: awareness of a problem, idea generation, evaluation, and refinement of solutions. He also emphasized the emotional side of creativity: the courage to be different, overcoming the fear of making mistakes, and openness to new experiences. Thus, Torrance's core idea was that creativity is a natural human capacity that can be measured, nurtured, and supported through practice and learning. The most crucial element is creating environments that foster imagination, risk-taking, and self-expression [36].

A significant contribution to the psychometric approach was made by F. E. Williams [38], who developed his own tools for measuring creativity, including the Williams Test of Divergent Thinking and creativity rating scales for students. His approach combined cognitive and affective components, emphasizing both the intellectual and emotional aspects of creativity. Williams also created an educational model for developing creativity aimed at diagnosing and systematically cultivating students' creative abilities. His research supports the view that creativity can be studied, assessed, and intentionally developed within educational settings [38].

T. Amabile proposed the componential theory of creativity [1], in which creativity arises from a combination of three core factors: domain-relevant skills, creative thinking processes, and intrinsic motivation. Later, in collaboration with M. Pratt, she introduced the dynamic componential model of creativity that incorporates the influence of organizational context and time [5].

In the dynamic model, the authors expanded the previous approach, including the following key elements: Social and organizational context – leadership, managerial support, access to resources, organizational culture, and climate for creativity are all crucial in stimulating or inhibiting creativity; Inner Work Life – the sum of employees' daily emotions, motivations, and perceptions, which dynamically fluctuate and directly affect productivity and innovation; Progress orientation – even small advances in meaningful work can significantly boost intrinsic motivation and emotional well-being, which in turn stimulate creativity; Temporal perspective – creativity is considered a process unfolding over time, with behavioral and emotional patterns changing in response to events and organizational support.

Thus, the central idea of the Amabile–Pratt model is that creativity and innovation in organizations emerge from the interplay between personal traits, motivation, emotions, and external context. Their development is a dynamic process, sensitive to daily changes and influences [5].

Amabile also proposed the consensual assessment technique, which posits that creativity is not measured through objective quantitative criteria (e.g., number of ideas or speed of task completion), but rather by expert judgment from individuals familiar with the relevant field.

A product is considered creative if multiple independent experts agree it is so.

Key features of the consensual assessment technique include: Product-oriented focus – what is evaluated is the outcome (a work, text, drawing, idea, design, etc.), not the process or the person; Evaluation by independent experts – professionals with experience in the relevant field (e.g., artists for drawings, writers for texts) provide their assessments independently; Contextual nature of creativity – based on what is considered novel, appropriate, and original within a given domain; Reliability through consensus – when several experts offer consistent evaluations, the result is considered reliable.

F. X. Barron [7] introduced a *psychometric approach with humanistic and aesthetic orientation*, combining objective testing with a deep understanding of the inner world of the creative individual. He viewed creativity not only as an intellectual ability but as a complex interaction of personal traits, motivations, worldview, and aesthetic sensitivity. Barron developed and used psychometric tools such as the Barron–Welsh Art Scale to assess aesthetic preferences related to creative potential. He also employed questionnaires to study traits like openness to experience, tolerance for ambiguity, independent thinking, self-perception, and autonomy – qualities characteristic of creative personalities.

Thus, Barron's approach acts as a bridge between psychometrics and humanistic psychology: he relied on scientific tools to measure creativity, but never reduced it to mere numbers – he saw creativity as a form of personal freedom, vitality, and aesthetic perception [7].

The *personality-motivational approach*, although it includes cognitive and humanistic elements, is primarily represented by the works of T. Amabile [5, 2], H. Gardner [18], and M. Runco [30].

T. Amabile developed the intrinsic motivation model, according to which true creativity arises when a person engages in an activity out of internal interest, enthusiasm, or joy, rather than due to external stimuli such as money, grades, or recognition [2].

External motivation may reduce creativity if it causes pressure or control, although it can sometimes support it when it reinforces a sense of autonomy. In her experimental studies, Amabile demonstrated that intrinsic motivation fosters open-mindedness, flexibility, and risk-taking – all crucial components of the creative process. Her approach also underlies practical recommendations for education and organizations aiming to stimulate innovation.

M. Runco emphasized that creativity is not the exclusive trait of geniuses but a potential inherent in every individual. In his theory, he distinguishes between creative potential (the ability to generate original ideas) and actualized creativity (realized outcomes in the form of creative products) [30].

Runco believed that creativity is a universal capacity that can be developed given appropriate conditions, motivation, and support. He also highlighted the importance of self-expression, autonomy, and individual experience in the development of creativity.

Howard Gardner's work [18], though incorporating cognitive and humanistic dimensions, is focused on personal development and self-realization. Analyzing the biographies of outstanding creators (e.g., Jean Piaget, Albert Einstein, Pablo Picasso, Sigmund Freud, T. S. Eliot, and others), Gardner concluded that creativity is the product of a holistic life path, values, motivation, and character – not merely cognitive abilities.

He stressed the role of internal ethics, responsibility to the cultural community, and personal calling, which underlie intrinsic motivation toward creative activity. Gardner viewed creativity as the ability to transform symbolic systems (such as language, music, or science) within a culture. To do so, one needs not only abilities but also a value-based readiness for transformation. His concept of Good Work combines creativity, ethics, and personal responsibility [19].

The *systemic and sociocultural approaches* emerged as an attempt to overcome the limitations of individual-centered models and to view creativity as a phenomenon that arises in interaction with the social, cultural, and historical environment.

M. Csikszentmihalyi [13], one of the founders of the systems theory of creativity, argued that it should not be understood solely as a property of an individual. Instead, creativity arises at the intersection of three elements: the person (who introduces new ideas or products), the domain (the symbolic system or field in which the novelty occurs, such as music, science, or painting), and the field (a group of

professionals, experts, or cultural "gatekeepers" who evaluate and determine whether a product is truly creative).

Only when a person offers something new to a domain, and this novelty is recognized by the field, can we speak of creativity in the full sense. Csikszentmihalyi thus emphasizes that creativity is not an isolated act, but a social and cultural process involving interaction with norms, traditions, values, and collective assessments [13].

He also introduced the concept of "flow" – a state of optimal experience in which a person is fully immersed in activity, loses track of time, and feels intrinsic satisfaction from the process. Flow is often observed during creative work and is considered a key psychological condition for creativity [13].

J. C. Kaufman [28] is a well-known American psychologist specializing in creativity and intelligence research. He is recognized for his contribution to creativity theory, particularly the development of the 4C model of creativity, which classifies creativity into four levels: mini-c (personal, internal creative understanding), little-c (everyday creativity), Pro-C (professional creativity), and Big-C (major creativity that transforms culture). His work emphasizes the importance of context and sociocultural factors in shaping creativity, as well as the diversity of creative expressions throughout an individual's life. Kaufman has also explored intellectual abilities, their interaction with creativity, and issues related to creativity assessment.

Although Kaufman is not primarily a specialist in aesthetics, his works address aspects related to the aesthetic component of creativity, especially regarding how creative products are evaluated within society. He highlights that creativity is often defined not only by originality but also by the value or impact that a work or idea holds within a particular sociocultural context – which undoubtedly includes the aesthetic dimension. For example, within the 4C model, "Big-C" creativity typically involves producing works of high aesthetic or cultural value.

However, Kaufman does not deeply analyze philosophical or psychological theories of aesthetics – this remains more the domain of other scholars, such as John Dewey or contemporary researchers in neuroaesthetics [28].

L. S. Vygotsky's [37] cultural-historical theory provides a foundational sociocultural perspective on creativity, emphasizing that creative thinking develops through social interaction and the internalization of cultural tools such as language, symbols, and art. He identified imagination as a crucial mental function that enables the transformation of reality by generating new meanings, especially in the context of artistic creativity. According to Vygotsky, creativity emerges within the interpersonal space through a dynamic dialogue between the individual and culture, enriching the inner world and expanding opportunities for self-expression. His approach highlights the inseparability of creativity from its historical and cultural context, emphasizing that creative activity is deeply embedded in specific cultural practices and social conditions.

Vygotsky's ideas have profoundly influenced contemporary sociocultural theories of creativity, offering a comprehensive framework for understanding creativity as a complex, multidimensional process shaped by continuous interaction between the individual, society, and culture.

H. Gruber [22] is an American psychologist and a leading researcher of creativity, renowned for developing a historical-systems approach to the study of creative processes. He focused not only on individual creative ideas or products but also on the prolonged development of the creative personality within the context of their life, work, and social environment. Gruber analyzed the biographies of eminent creators, such as Charles Darwin, to understand how internal mental processes combine with external factors influencing creativity.

His approach conceptualizes creativity as a dynamic system in which the creative individual, their ideas, activities, and social environment interact and evolve over time. Gruber emphasized that the creative process is not an instantaneous flash of inspiration but a prolonged, often nonlinear development involving mistakes, revisions, and adaptations. Such a systemic analysis helps to better comprehend how creative discoveries arise from the interplay of personal qualities, working practices, and cultural context.

Thus, Gruber made a significant contribution to sociocultural and historical approaches to studying creativity, demonstrating that creativity should be considered within a broad temporal and social framework.

In his works, H. Gruber primarily focused on creativity in scientific activity, particularly exploring the creative processes of distinguished scientists such as Charles Darwin. He wrote considerably less about the aesthetic component or artistic creativity directly.

However, his systemic approach – analyzing creative activity as a complex interaction of personality, activity, and environment – is applicable to the arts as well, especially artistic creativity, where aesthetic values and cultural context play a crucial role.

Therefore, although Gruber did not directly focus on aesthetics, his approach provides a foundation for understanding the aesthetic component as part of a broader creative system. His ideas can be successfully integrated into the study of artistic creativity from a comprehensive, systemic perspective [22].

V. Glăveanu [21] developed a cultural psychology of creativity, emphasizing that creativity arises not within the individual but between people, in the space of dialogue, cooperation, and interaction.

He proposed a "Five A's model" of creativity, which includes: Actor (the person engaging in creative action), Action (the creative process), Audience (those who evaluate or witness creativity), Affordances (the opportunities and resources the environment provides), and Artefacts (the results or products of creativity) [21].

This model shifts the focus from isolated "geniuses" to everyday creativity, collective processes, and the role of culture. Glăveanu also highlights the role of social imagination, narrative, and communication in shaping creative meanings.

Thus, sociocultural approaches emphasize the embeddedness of creativity in a social context and consider it not only as a product of individual abilities or traits but as a form of participation in cultural life. Creativity is viewed as a dialogical, value-oriented, and co-constructed process that always reflects cultural norms, expectations, and innovations.

Recent advances in neuroscience have significantly enriched our understanding of creativity by providing empirical evidence about its neural correlates and mechanisms. Neuroimaging studies using fMRI and EEG have identified that creativity involves complex interactions between multiple brain networks, including the default mode network (DMN), responsible for spontaneous and associative thinking; the executive control network (ECN), which manages focused attention and cognitive control; and the salience network, which facilitates switching between these two modes [8]. This dynamic interplay supports the flexible shifting between idea generation and evaluation, key components of the creative process. Additionally, research highlights the role of the prefrontal cortex in higher-order cognitive functions such as planning and problem-solving, which are crucial for creative thinking [15]. These neuroscientific findings complement cognitive and personality theories by illustrating how creativity emerges from both automatic and controlled processes within the brain [8]. Moreover, comprehensive reviews and handbooks on the neuroscience of creativity [26] further consolidate our knowledge of the complex brain mechanisms underlying creative cognition. Incorporating neurobiological evidence thus deepens the theoretical models of creativity, offering a more integrated understanding of how creative cognition unfolds at multiple levels – from neural activity to social interaction [31].

The rapid development of digital technologies has profoundly transformed the landscape of creativity, introducing new opportunities and challenges for creative expression and collaboration. Digital tools and platforms enable individuals to access vast amounts of information, experiment with diverse media, and share their creative works globally with unprecedented ease [29]. This democratization of creative production has expanded the notion of creativity beyond traditional domains, fostering new forms such as digital art, multimedia storytelling, and interactive design [33].

Moreover, the rise of social media and online communities has reshaped the social dynamics of creativity, facilitating collaborative innovation and collective intelligence. These digital environments support the exchange of ideas across cultural and geographic boundaries, enhancing the diversity and reach of creative endeavours [32]. At the same time, algorithmic curation and data-driven content creation introduce novel questions about authorship, originality, and the role of human creativity in the era of artificial intelligence [10].

Artificial intelligence technologies, including machine learning and generative models, are increasingly participating in creative processes – generating music, art, literature, and design [12]. This convergence challenges traditional definitions of creativity and calls for an expanded theoretical framework that considers the interaction between human creativity and intelligent systems [10].

In sum, the digital age compels creativity researchers to revisit existing models and incorporate technological, cultural, and ethical dimensions. Understanding creativity in this context is essential for fostering innovative capacities that are adaptive to rapidly changing technological landscapes and for guiding educational and organizational practices in the 21st century.

Creativity, while a valuable and sought-after trait, is often constrained by multiple psychological barriers that limit an individual's capacity to produce original and innovative ideas. One of the primary inhibitors is the fear of failure or negative evaluation, which can lead to risk-averse behaviour and self-censorship, thereby restricting creative exploration and experimentation [3]. Individuals may avoid proposing unconventional ideas due to concerns about social rejection or professional repercussions.

Another significant barrier is conformity and the pressure to adhere to established social norms and expectations, which can suppress divergent thinking and originality [14]. Excessive self-criticism and perfectionism can further stifle creativity by fostering a harsh internal environment where ideas are prematurely judged and discarded, preventing the iterative process essential for creative development [27].

Cognitive rigidity, characterized by fixed mental sets, functional fixedness, and difficulty in shifting perspectives, impedes the flexible thinking required for creative problem-solving [25; 35]. This rigidity can manifest as resistance to novel ideas or an inability to see alternative uses or meanings, limiting the capacity to generate innovative solutions.

Additionally, low intrinsic motivation undermines creative engagement. According to Amabile's [3] componential theory of creativity, intrinsic motivation – the genuine interest and enjoyment of the task – is a key driver of creativity. Without it, individuals may lack the persistence and passion necessary to overcome challenges inherent in creative work. Similarly, low self-efficacy reduces the belief in one's creative abilities, which can diminish effort and reduce the likelihood of pursuing creative endeavors [6].

Stress and environmental factors also play roles in constraining creativity. High levels of stress can impair cognitive flexibility and reduce openness to experience [11]. Furthermore, unsupportive social environments that discourage risk-taking or provide inadequate feedback can hinder the expression of creative potential [4].

Recognizing and addressing these psychological barriers is essential for educators, managers, and policymakers aiming to cultivate environments conducive to

creativity. Creating psychological safety – where individuals feel free to take risks without fear of ridicule or punishment – and fostering openness and resilience can help individuals transcend these constraints and fully realize their creative capacities [16].

Conclusion. Based on the theoretical analysis of contemporary approaches to understanding creativity in Western psychology, the following key points can be formulated:

Creativity is a universal ability inherent in every person, manifested in the capacity to create new, original, and socially valuable products. All approaches recognize that it includes not only intellectual but also motivational, emotional, and sociocultural components. The cognitive approach interprets creativity because of mental processes, primarily divergent thinking (J. Guilford, M. Boden, R. Finke), which is manifested in flexibility, originality, and associativity of thought. This approach emphasizes internal intellectual operations. The psychometric approach (E. Torrance, F. Williams, F. Barron) focuses on measuring creative abilities through standardized tests that assess the quantity, quality, flexibility, and originality of ideas. It also highlights the potential for creativity development through education. The personality-motivational approach (T. Amabile, M. Ranko, H. Gardner) emphasizes the importance of intrinsic motivation, self-development, affective experience, as well as the role of values, vocation, and the ethical dimension in the creative process. Creativity here appears as an expression of personal autonomy and self-realization. The sociocultural and systemic approach (M. Csikszentmihalyi, V. Glăveanu, G. Gruber) treats creativity as a process occurring through interaction between the individual, society, and cultural context. Attention is focused on the importance of social recognition, cultural domain, and interaction experience. Emphasis is placed on creativity as a form of co-creation.

Common to all approaches is the understanding of creativity as a multi-component and dynamic process that includes both individual abilities and the influence of the external environment. The development of creativity is possible through the combination of cognitive processes, motivation, experience, and a supportive social context. The main differences between the approaches concern the dominant factors of creativity: cognitive factors in the cognitive approach, motivational and emotional factors in the personality approach, and sociocultural factors in the systemic approach. This indicates the multidimensional nature of creativity, which requires a comprehensive approach to its study and development.

Recent neuroscience reveals creativity emerges from interactions among brain networks like the default mode, executive control, and salience networks. This supports the integration of automatic and controlled processes, complementing cognitive, personality, and sociocultural models. Neurobiological insights thus enrich creativity theories by linking brain activity with cognition and social context.

The digital age has fundamentally reshaped creativity by expanding access to tools, platforms, and global networks that facilitate diverse forms of creative expression and collaboration. Technologies such as social media and artificial intelligence have introduced new opportunities and challenges, transforming traditional notions of authorship, originality, and creative processes. Understanding creativity within this evolving technological and cultural landscape is essential for developing effective theoretical models and practical approaches that foster innovation in contemporary society.

Psychological barriers such as fear of failure, conformity, cognitive rigidity, low intrinsic motivation, and lack of self-efficacy can significantly hinder the creative process, underscoring the importance of fostering supportive environments that promote psychological safety, openness, and resilience to fully realize creative potential.

Thus, contemporary theoretical models of creativity in Western psychology create a solid foundation for further research, diagnosis, and development of creative abilities, both in research and educational-practical dimensions.

References:

1. Amabile, T. M. (1982). Social psychology of creativity: A consensual assessment technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(5), 997–1013.
2. Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Westview Press.
3. Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press.
4. Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Harvard Business Review Press.
5. Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 36*, 157–183.
6. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
7. Barron, F. X. (1969). *Creative person and creative process*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
8. Beaty, R. E., Benedek, M., Kaufman, S. B., & Silvia, P. J. (2015). Default and executive network coupling supports creative idea production. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 10964.
9. Boden, M. A. (2010). *Creativity and art: Three roads to surprise*. Oxford University Press.
10. Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.
11. Byron, K., Khazanchi, S., & Nazarian, D. (2010). The relationship between stressors and creativity: A meta-analysis examining competing theoretical models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 201–212.
12. Colton, S., Goodwin, J., & Veale, T. (2015). Full-face poetry generation. *The International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 1294–1300.
13. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. HarperCollins.
14. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.

15. Dietrich, A., & Kanso, R. (2010). A review of EEG, ERP, and neuroimaging studies of creativity and insight. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(5), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019749
16. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
17. Finke, R. A., Ward, T. B., & Smith, S. M. (1992) Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
18. Gardner, H. (1993). *Creating Minds: An Anatomy of Creativity Seen Through the Lives of Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Gandhi*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
19. Gardner, H. (2006). *Five Minds for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
20. Glăveanu, V. P. (2014). *Distributed Creativity: Thinking Outside the Box of the Creative Individual*. Springer.
21. Glăveanu, V. P. (2014). *Distributed Creativity: Thinking Outside the Box of the Creative Individual.* Springer.
22. Gruber, H. E. (1993). *Creativity in scientific discovery: The case of Charles Darwin*. In M. A. Runco & R. S. Albert (Eds.), *Theories of Creativity* (pp. 37–57). Sage Publications.
23. Guilford J. The nature of human intelligence / J.Guilford. N.-Y.: McGraw Hill, 1967. 290 p.
24. Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist, 5*(9), 444–454.
25. Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.
26. Jung, R. E., & Vartanian, O. (2018). The Cambridge handbook of the neuroscience of creativity. Cambridge University Press.
27. Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2004). Sure, I'm creative – but not in math!: Self-reported creativity in diverse domains. *Creativity Research Journal*, 16(2-3), 163–178.
28. Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four c model of creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, 13(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688
29. Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2019). *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
30. Runco, M. A., & Acar, S. (2012). Divergent thinking as an indicator of creative potential. *Creativity Research Journal, 24*(1), 66–75.
31. Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92–96.
32. Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
33. Shneiderman, B. (2000). Creating creativity: User interfaces for supporting innovation. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 7(1), 114–138.
34. Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge University Press.
35. Sternberg, R. J. (2006). *The nature of creativity*. Creativity Research Journal, 18(1), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1801_10
36. Torrance, E. P. (1966). *Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking: Norms-Technical Manual*. Scholastic Testing Service.
37. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Harvard University Press.
38. Williams, F. E. (1980). *The Creativity Assessment Packet*. Psychologists & Educators Inc.

Література:

1. Amabile, T. M. (1982). Social psychology of creativity: A consensual assessment technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(5), 997–1013.
2. Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Westview Press.
3. Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press.
4. Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Harvard Business Review Press.
5. Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 36*, 157–183.
6. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
7. Barron, F. X. (1969). *Creative person and creative process*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
8. Beaty, R. E., Benedek, M., Kaufman, S. B., & Silvia, P. J. (2015). Default and executive network coupling supports creative idea production. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 10964.
9. Boden, M. A. (2010). *Creativity and art: Three roads to surprise*. Oxford University Press.
10. Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.
11. Byron, K., Khazanchi, S., & Nazarian, D. (2010). The relationship between stressors and creativity: A meta-analysis examining competing theoretical models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 201–212.
12. Colton, S., Goodwin, J., & Veale, T. (2015). Full-face poetry generation. *The International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 1294–1300.
13. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. HarperCollins.
14. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
15. Dietrich, A., & Kanso, R. (2010). A review of EEG, ERP, and neuroimaging studies of creativity and insight. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(5), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019749
16. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
17. Finke, R. A., Ward, T. B., & Smith, S. M. (1992) Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
18. Gardner, H. (1993). *Creating Minds: An Anatomy of Creativity Seen Through the Lives of Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Gandhi*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
19. Gardner, H. (2006). *Five Minds for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
20. Glăveanu, V. P. (2014). *Distributed Creativity: Thinking Outside the Box of the Creative Individual*. Springer.
21. Glăveanu, V. P. (2014). *Distributed Creativity: Thinking Outside the Box of the Creative Individual.* Springer.
22. Gruber, H. E. (1993). *Creativity in scientific discovery: The case of Charles Darwin*. In M. A. Runco & R. S. Albert (Eds.), *Theories of Creativity* (pp. 37–57). Sage Publications.
23. Guilford J. The nature of human intelligence / J.Guilford. N.-Y.: McGraw Hill, 1967. 290 p.
24. Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist, 5*(9), 444–454.
25. Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.
26. Jung, R. E., & Vartanian, O. (2018). The Cambridge handbook of the neuroscience of creativity. Cambridge University Press.

27. Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2004). Sure, I'm creative – but not in math!: Self-reported creativity in diverse domains. *Creativity Research Journal*, 16(2-3), 163–178.

28. Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four c model of creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, 13(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688

29. Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2019). *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

30. Runco, M. A., & Acar, S. (2012). Divergent thinking as an indicator of creative potential. *Creativity Research Journal, 24*(1), 66–75.

31. Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92–96.

32. Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

33. Shneiderman, B. (2000). Creating creativity: User interfaces for supporting innovation. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 7(1), 114–138.

34. Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge University Press.

35. Sternberg, R. J. (2006). *The nature of creativity*. Creativity Research Journal, 18(1), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1801_10

36. Torrance, E. P. (1966). *Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking: Norms-Technical Manual*. Scholastic Testing Service.

37. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Harvard University Press.

38. Williams, F. E. (1980). *The Creativity Assessment Packet*. Psychologists & Educators Inc.