SUMMARY

Creativity is a valuable attribute with significant applications in all spheres of life. Over the last century, the construct of creativity has invited the attention of researchers from almost every field pertaining to the sciences and humanities. The humble beginnings of the concept of creativity lie in the numerous deliberations of early philosophers who saw creativity as a divine gift to mankind. Today, however, we have managed to arrive at a position where creativity is believed to be worthy of empirical scrutiny.

In its most general form, creativity can be defined as the ability to generate original ideas and productions that are appropriate to the task requirements (Lubart and Sternberg, 1995). Multiple issues do exist in the area of creativity research, with the most serious problem being a lack of congruity and agreement on the definition of creativity. Firstly, researchers are divided on the issue of what level of creativity qualifies to be labelled as genuinely creative. On one hand there is the exceptional creativity of the genius and on the other hand is the more personal, everyday type of creativity. Secondly, researchers do not agree on whether the locus of creativity is the person, process or product. Thirdly, the judgment of creativity continues to be a source of conflict. The only consensus that has been achieved is that to qualify as being creative, an individual has to produce something that is both, original and worthwhile.

Varied theoretical perspectives have emerged in an attempt to answer the intricate questions that surround the construct of creativity. Creativity theories can be broadly divided into two categories: (1) scientifically oriented theories and (2) metaphorically oriented theories. Theories that fall in the former category, attempt to provide empirical and applicable explanations. Theories that fall in the latter category, attempt to provide speculations and new possibilities related to the concept. While the value of scientific theories can certainly not be undermined, they tend to get restricted to what is observable and provable and may thus ignore undiscovered phenomena. Metaphorically oriented theories, on the other hand, look into the hypothetical aspects that can help uncover unexplored possibilities.
The current investigation has tried to look into the issue of domain generality versus domain specificity of creativity. While some researchers are clearly divided on this issue, there are others who have preferred to follow a middle path by claiming that creativity is partially generalised and partially specific. To believe that a creative individual can be creative in any task he/she takes up is an appealing but naive idea. Hence, for the present research, Stark’s (1968) dualistic conceptualisation of creativity has been relied upon, according to which creativity can be exhibited in two kinds of context, namely novelty and meaning. The novelty type of creativity is analogous to the problem solving conceptualisation of creative behaviour. The meaning type of creativity insinuates a more aesthetic form of creative expression characterised by ambiguous intra-psychic experiences. On one hand, the novelty context is associated with action and performance, whereas the meaning context is associated with experience and consciousness expansion (Sandhu and Sandhu, 2014). Both types of creativity, novelty and meaning, are independent of each other. The presence or absence of either kind of creativity does not affect the presence or absence of the other (Stark, 1968).

The romantic idea that a complete understanding of the creative process is unattainable has been fed by many, wrongly so. While taking up research in creativity may be deemed as a risk due to reasons such as a lack of consensus regarding its definition, its links to mysticism, ambiguity in assessment, etc., systematic analysis of creativity in terms of empirical investigation is extremely crucial and justified. Creative behaviour benefits not just an individual or an institution, but civilisation as a whole. Creative ideas make the human race more productive, adaptable and evolved. Therefore the risks when compared to the potential payoffs of creativity research seem miniscule.

The current investigation has focused on deciphering the roles of different cognitive, affective and conative components that are at play for the expression of both, novelty and meaning creativity. The separate analysis of the cognitive, affective and conative components of human behaviour is often looked down upon for merely being a convenient and artificial method of breaking down psychological research into more manageable units. Inspite of warning against this practice in early literature, modern psychologists have taken it for granted that not just the problem, but also the researchers can be divided into these three categories. (Snow, 1980). However, it is
increasingly becoming evident that any conceptualisation of human behaviour, outside the laboratory settings, is possible only through the amalgamation or simultaneous assessment of what Hilgard (1980) rightly labelled as the ‘trilogy of the mind’, i.e., cognition, affect and conation. As human, we constantly seek information and try to order and organise it to make it meaningful. Our affective system responds to this new information in accordance to its complexity and ambiguity. Inability to make sense of it easily leads to an arousal of interest which motivates us for further exploration (Singer, 1966, 2004). Therefore, all three components, cognitive, affective and conative must converge to promote creative behaviour.

In sum, what have been taken in the form of constructs in the present study are intelligence and field dependence-independence as the cognitive variables; positive and negative affect as the affective variables; and four conative modes, namely, fact finder, follow through, quick start and implementor as the conative variables. The role that each of these variables play in two types of creativity, namely, novelty creativity and meaning creativity is the main focus of the present investigation.

**Objectives of the Study**

To study the association between

2. Affective component and Novelty & Meaning creativity.
3. Conative component and Novelty & Meaning creativity.

To assess the contribution of

2. Affective component in Novelty and Meaning creativity.
3. Conative component in Novelty and Meaning creativity.

**Hypotheses**

1. Intelligence and Field Independence would be more closely associated with Novelty creativity than Meaning creativity.
2. Positive affect would have positive and significant association with Novelty creativity while ambivalent affect would align with Meaning creativity.
3. Empirical conative style would have higher positive affinity with Novelty creativity while Inspirational conative style would align with Meaning creativity.

4. Contribution of cognitive ability index would be significantly higher in Novelty creativity than Meaning creativity.

5. Contribution of positive affect would be significantly higher in Novelty creativity and ambivalent affect in Meaning creativity.

6. Contribution of Empirical conative style would be significantly higher in Novelty creativity and Inspirational conative style in Meaning creativity.

**Method**

**SAMPLE**

A total of 425 students, belonging to various parts of the country, currently studying in reputed educational institutions in Punjab, served as subjects for the present research investigation. An attempt was made to select students studying in a similar kind of institutional environment, in order to have a homogenous sample, with special emphasis on the criteria selected for the research. The sampling could be labelled as incidental, as only those students were included who were available and who agreed to be a part of this study. Out of the entire sample of 425 students, results obtained from 36 subjects were excluded from the final analysis due to issues such as incomplete questionnaires, ambiguities in information provided, non-serious attitude, etc. Hence, the final sample comprised of 389 students, out of which 215 were males and 174 were females. The age of the subjects ranged from 18-24 years, with the mean age being 20.76.

**TOOLS**

1. Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (Torrance, 1990, 2007)
2. Rorschach Inkblot Test (Rorschach, 1921)
3. Cattell’s Culture Fair Intelligence Test (Cattell, 1949)
4. Group Embedded Figures Test (Oltman, Raskin and Witkin, (1971)
5. Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark and Tellegen, 1988)
6. Kolbe Conative Index (Kolbe, 1990a)
7. NEO FFI (Costa and McCrae, 1992)
Main Findings of the Study

i. Creativity emerged as a multidimensional construct with novelty and meaning contexts in the projective domain and verbal and figural creativity in the psychometric domain, representing relatively independent contexts of creativity (Factors I, VI, II, III).

ii. Though the psychometric indices of creativity (verbal, figural as well as total) correlated positively with indices of novelty (F+ and O) and meaning (M) creativity, but degree of strength of association of psychometric indices of creativity with novelty creativity was much higher than meaning context of creativity.

iii. Fact finder, follow through, quick start and implementor represented independent conative modes (Factor VII and XII).

iv. While novelty creativity showed affinity with form perception and focus on details (Factor I), meaning creativity found expression in attending to wholes and responding to stimulus cues using intelligence to organize the field (Factor VI).

v. Positive affect had significantly positive correlation with originality index of novelty creativity but no significant association was found between positive and negative affect with meaning type of creativity. The findings partially support the second hypothesis which states that positive affect would have positive and significant association with novelty creativity while ambivalent affect would align with meaning creativity.

vi. However, affect was found to be linked with follow through conative style (Factor V).

vii. In the context of personality, openness to experience dimension of personality had highly significant and positive association with novelty creativity alongwith verbal and figural indices of creativity. While conscientiousness showed positive association with verbal and figural creativity, extraversion favoured overall production of responses and originality in Rorschach protocols.

viii. Negative affect was found to align with neuroticism alongwith colour-form (CF) index of Rorschach which indicates labile disposition and poor degree of ego control, a condition which is bound to be antithetical to creativity.
ix. Affinity between form-colour (both chromatic and achromatic) and human movement indices (Factor XI) indicate flexible perceptual approach to the stimulus cues with higher order perceptual control in meaning type of creativity.

x. Contribution of cognitive ability (a combined effect of intelligence and field independence) in good form perception (F+) was found to be 9.3% (p<.01) while for originality (O) it was 1.8% (p<.05), implying high significance of cognitive ability in novelty type of creativity.

xi. Contribution of cognitive ability in M (human movement) responses was 3.7% (p<.01) which is significant but much less than its contribution to novelty creativity.

xii. Contribution of cognitive ability in psychometric creativity (TTCT Total) was 8.6% (p<.01). When analysed separately for verbal and figural creativity, it was 6.7.5 and 7.4% (p<.01), respectively. These three findings lend support to the conjecture stated in the fourth hypothesis that contribution of cognitive ability index would be significantly higher in novelty creativity than meaning creativity.

xiii. Contribution of positive affect was found to be significant in case of originality index O only. For F+ and M, it was non-significant. For psychometric creativity, positive affect contributed 1% (p<.05). This partially affirms the fifth hypothesis which states that contribution of positive affect would be significantly higher in novelty creativity and ambivalent affect in meaning creativity.

xiv. With regard to conation, role of both empirical and inspirational conative styles was found non-significant in case of novelty creativity as well as psychometric creativity. However, the ‘fact finder’ conative mode was found to be a positive predictor while the ‘implementor’ conative mode was found to be a negative predictor of psychometric creativity scores.