# IDENTITY AND CREATIVE PERSONALITY

Blandína ŠRAMOVÁ, Katarína FICHNOVÁ

Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
Trieda A. Hlinku 1, 949 74 Nitra, Slovak Republic

*Abstract:* The present paper discusses the relation between the adolescent identity and the features of creative personality. The concept of identity comes from Berzonsky who, according to the participation of cognitive strategies in identity construction, distinguished three basic processually oriented identity styles: informational, normative, diffuse/avoidant. This author devotes special attention to the extent of that part of formed identity that he calls *commitment*. The creativity of personality also takes part as a factor in identity formation. The developing creative personality may reach identity redefinition sooner and avoid role diffusion. Goal: To identify how the selected adolescent personality traits contribute to identity construction and to determine the interrelation among the variables. Materials and methods: Identity style questionnaire (Berzonsky), WKOPAY (Khatena, Torrance). Results and conclusions: There is a mutual relationship among the traits of creative personality and adolescent identity styles. The selected traits of creative personality influence identity construction. "Authority" acceptance and disciplined imagination contribute to identity formation in the sense of obligation. A lower degree of authority acceptance as well as of other personality traits supports the active formation of autonomous adolescent identity. Adolescents with their autonomous formed identity, who rely on themselves to a higher degree in their autonomous identity formation, reject authorities. Vice versa, adolescents with unformed identity tend to uncritical acceptance of the opinions and attitudes of those in authority.

*Key words:* identity, creativity, personality traits, adolescents

## INTRODUCTION

The developmental stage of adolescence, forming a transitory period between childhood and adulthood, is at the same time a period of identity fulfillment, bringing genuineness and singularity. What has drawn the attention of several authors (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1980; Macek, 2003; Fandelova, 2004; Šramová, 2007) is the importance of investigating the adolescent stage of development as a key turning point in both constructing and reconstruct-

ing a young person's identity. The forming of identity style requires the investigation of the presence or absence of identity crisis (doubts about values and goals implanted in the child by its parents) and the presence, or absence, of commitments (stability in the selection of values, individual life standards), leading to the achievement of four identity statuses in adolescence. Marcia (1980) construes identity on the basis of the dynamic organization of personality, its capabilities, and life experiences, and maintains that on the basis of the presence/absence of identity crises and duties it is possible to determine in which of the four identity statuses the individual is found: 1) *the status of achieved identity*, i.e. the personality has passed the identity crisis via active seeking of values and

goals, having built a stable system of obligations; 2) *prematurely closed identity*, i.e. personality with a stable, fixed commitment, one achieved without analyzing and choosing values and goals, tending to adopt values set by one's parents; 3) *diffuse/avoidant identity*, i.e. the individual has not passing through the identity crisis and has no stable commitment; 4) *moratory*, i.e. the personality is passing through the identity crisis (investigating, seeking, formulating his/her goals) with no fixed obligation so far. It is important for the study of the identity maturation process to concentrate attention to the value system forming, determining aspiration level, setting life priorities of adolescent youth, including the dominant styles of education of the adolescent's family etc. (Šramová, Fandelová, 2006; Fichnová, 2004; Šramová, 2006; Berzonsky, 2004; Macek, 2003; Šramová, 2007). Marcia's (1980) conception of the structural status understanding of identity has inspired several authors to study the processes influencing identity formation; one of them being Berzonsky (2003). Berzonsky's model proceeds from the presupposition of social-cognitive processes sharing in identity construction, in selecting information important for the personality, based on which it takes personal decisions and maintains process-oriented identities (Berzonsky, 2003). It concerns cognitive strategies which the adolescent personality uses in self-defining, self-constructing, making it a long-lasting process underlain by assimilatory and accommodatory processes. Berzonsky (1990) distinguishes three basic styles of identity: informational, normative, and diffuse/avoidant. The questionnaire, which is based on the verification of its theoretical conception, classifies the individual in accordance with the dominant identity style, i.e. the highest standard score, in a particular category. *Informational identity style* is characteristic of individuals actively seeking their personality, open to experience, having an active approach to problem solving (Berzonsky, 1992; Berzonsky, Sullivan, 1992; Berzonsky, Ferrari, 1996). The informational style of identity corresponds with the achievement of the state of moratorium (Berzonsky, Kuk, 2002; Berzonsky, Neimeyer, 1994). *Normative identity style* is characteristic for the individual whose self-definition lies in the passive adoption of examples, being conscientious and goal-oriented. His behavior is adapted to the standards and expectations of others, being thus conformity oriented. He finds ambiguity unsuitable, achieving a prematurely closed state of identity (Berzonsky, 1992; Berzonsky, Neimeyer, 1994). *Diffuse/avoidant identity style* is bound to maladaptive strategies, neuroticism, depressive reactivity. It is a style in which the individual postpones defining his personality, having low self-consciousness, his behavior being underlined by situational factors, avoiding personal conflicts, and achieving a diffuse/avoidant status of identity (Berzonsky, 1992; Berzonsky, Ferrari, 1996). According to Berzonsky (2003), it is important to observe in investigating this style of identity the *commitment* which states the responsibility of the personality, stability of their decisions, optimism, increased self-esteem, sense of duty and personal adaptability.

The process of personal identity formation thus includes not only cognitive factors of personality but also social and cultural ones. In order to create targeted education strategies, it is important to learn all the given factors, both cognitive and non-cognitive, that would favorably influence the self-realization process in the adolescent period; as stated in the research

findings of Satková, Fichnová (2002), Hamranová (2003), Fandelová (1999, 2004) and Šramová (2004). Last but not least, it is important to observe the several aspects of personality that influence identity formation, one of them being the very adolescent creativity. Creativity motivates people to self-realization and to the use of the whole personality potential (Rogers, 1954). However, the definitions of creativity have been so far ambiguous. As early as in 1953 there were more than 25 different definitions) more than 25 definitions, as is stated by Morgan (in: Taylor, 1975). Sternberg and Lubart (1999, pp. 3-12) mention several approaches to the definitions of creativity: *mystical approach* (postulating that creativity is something man has been endowed with by a higher force), *pragmatic approach* (oriented primarily at the development and utilization of creativity; only secondarily at its understanding, e.g. DeBono, 1985), *psychodynamic approach* (represented by psychoanalysis and neopsychoanalysis: according to which creativity results from the tension between conscious reality and unconscious instincts, cognitive approaches (oriented at the understanding of mental representations and processes of creative thinking), *socio-personal approaches* (developed concurrently with cognitive approaches in the history of creativity investigation being oriented at the personal characteristics of the creator, motivation variables, as well as socio-cultural context: ambient conditions for successful realization of creativity), and as a recent trend the author brings the so-called confluence approaches. The confluence theories are characterized by a complex approach, including several components. These approaches perceive creativity as a process that was brought about by *multiple factors* respecting both cognitive and non-cognitive characteristics of a

creative personality and their functioning in a social environment. The first manifestations of creativity have been so far discussed in expert references; for example Szobiová (1999) stating the original creative approach in two-and-a half-year-old children namely in expressing the desire for independence in the famous motto "me-self". Thus, as early as in the toddler period, the child will be able not only to experiment, discover new information but also create new means based on mental combination (Langmeier, Krejčířová, 1998; Šramová, 2007) which can in our opinion be considered as a sign of awakening creativity. The definition of creativity by the humanist psychologist Rogers (1961) does not distinguish between good and bad creativity. All innovatory activities are creative, the differences being only in their social value, however, these innovatory activities are very changeable. His definition does not either include the criterion of product acceptability by a certain group of people in a given time or takes no distinction of acceptability criterion of with regard to its novelty and utility for an individual, reference group or society. Subjectively valuable creative acts are, in his opinion, of the same importance and utility as objective ones. Rogers (1961) maintains that the value of a product for a creative person is not determined by the appraisal or criticism but by the person himself. As long as the product enriches the individual, brings him a new view of the world and shifts him progressively towards his self-development, i.e. the really existing value. We are of the opinion that this very aspect in his definition offers the space for the acceptance of creativity as early as in the lower age categories and explains a lot concerning the ontogenesis of creativity. However, it is necessary to distinguish between the potential towards

creativity and the implementation of potential, as noticed earlier by Guilford (1950). The implementation of potential depends on many other factors. In this connection Runco and Chand (1995) stress the inevitability of inner motivation in the creative process, although describing it as secondary in the cognitive processes.

The heterogeneity of opinions concerning the substance of creativity bring ambiguity into the latter's relation to personality. Essentially and grossly simplifying, *several groups of approaches* could be brought here (as mentioned in greater detail in another paper of ours *cf.* Szobiová, Fichnová, 2003): a) creativity is understood as the basic *feature* of the personality (Kalmár, Kalmár, 1987), b) creativity as a *complex* characteristic of the personality (e.g., Zelina, Buganová, 1983), c) the creative personality possesses *several properties* (or features). However, to enumerate these properties would bring great differentiations not only concerning the number but also the types of features (Dočkal, Musil et al., 1987; Ford, Harris, 1992; Hlavsa, Jurčová, 1978; Khatena, Torrance, 1976; Pietrasiński, 1972; Popperová, 1969; and others). The most frequently stated properties were the following: independence and rebelliousness, next to inventiveness intuitiveness, humor, and playfulness. The counts of other properties ranks even lower. d) Classification of properties into a *system*, e.g. Popperová (1969), Musil (1983), Perkins (1995), Feist (1999), and others. e) Novel approaches utilize the current identification instruments of the main personality features (Big Five) describing in this context also the features of the creative personality (Szobiová, 2006). f) The authors striving for the creativity and personality relation by delimiting the *types of creative personalities* (e.g., Maslow, 1965; Gardner, 1997).

All the above-mentioned opinions, in spite of their variability, bring one *common trait*: counting on the *presence and/or absence* of certain specific traits.

A different point is presented by Czikszentmihalyi (1996) who suggests that creative individuals may be paradoxically endowed with both *presence and absence of a feature* and/or *its different* poles. g) The author presents and describes ten features that are often ascribed to creative people forming a compact whole with every other feature in the personality. Thus, e.g. creative people may frequently be energetic but lack strength; they are clever and naive at the same time; they combine responsibility with irresponsibility; creative people alternate between imagination, fantasy and rooting in sensible reality and others (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). The same picture of a paradoxical personality is presented by Cropley (1999).

According to both Csikszentmihalyi (1996) and Zelina (1997), these enumerations of creative personality traits are solved by a single true to life answer to the question: *What does then make a creative personality creative?* It is a *complexity* of personality "understood as maturity of personality that exceeds the very self in the complexity of the sense and mission of humankind and life in general. It is a tendency to think and act more and better than others. It encompasses the contradictory tendency: *"the increase of individuality and authenticity lead to the multiplicity and complexity of the creator"* (Zelina, 1997, p. 177). The same opinion has already been presented by Sternberg and Lubart (1996), who speak of the so-called integrated theory of personality since the numerous individual factors and environmental factors have to be combined to demonstrate their effect. Similarly, Tardif

and Sternberg (1989) and others coincide in the opinion that there is no simple formula corresponding to everyone who is creative. It requires the constellation of many features that may occur in one, yet need not appear in another creative personality.

Hence it results in our being able to think of the developing creative personality as one having the best prerequisites in the sense of classically understood Erickson's stages (1968) to achieving rather the redefining of one's identity, especially in relation to parents and society. It is likely that creative personalities will not exhibit diffusion of roles, i.e. excessive identification beyond the point of marked or complete loss of identity.

Kathena and Torrance (1976) proceed from the fact that an individual has a certain mental conception of his *ego* whose structures include both creative and less creative ways of behaving. According to these authors, a creative personality is one that does not have the tendency to conform to authorities (also *cf.* above: the most frequently stated features of creative personalities were independence and rebelliousness), not to accept passively and not to adapt to the given state. Another characteristic is self-confidence: belief in one's own inner forces (Barron, Harrington, 1981), a tendency toward curiosity, thoroughness, perpetual asking of questions and self-assertion. Creative people are characterized by an active, lively, inventive, own and independent approach to the seeking of solutions in complex situations and tasks. Self-evaluation in the sphere of creativity in various domains correlates with personality dimensions (Kaufman, Baer, 2004). Currently mentioned characteristics of creative people according to the summarizing review by Tardif and Sternberg (1989) also include intellectual risk-taking, inclination to probe, curiosity, inner motivation, openness to new experience, application of one's own rules, need for competence, tolerance of ambiguity, tendency to play with ideas, search for interesting situations etc. According to Sternberg (1997) three basic attributes also include, apart from intelligence and personality/motivation, cognitive styles that combine intelligence and personality into "mental self-control". Moreover, the author mentions various styles of thinking (which may support or inhibit creativity) introducing three types of them. Personalities preferring *executive style* like to implement and realize systems of rules. Another style is the so-called judicial that prefers evaluating systems of rules and people. *Legislative style* reflects the biggest tendency to formulate problems and create new, often global perspectives and system norms or rules. This according to the authors (Sternberg, Lubart, 1999) is the most important and significant for creativity.

## GOAL OF THE WORK

To identify how selected creativity features of the adolescent personality participate in constructing the identity, and to determine the correlation among the represented styles of identity with specific characteristics of creative individuals.

## PROBLEMS

Based on the facts described above, we have formulated the following problems:

1) Do the selected features of creativity have any influence on identity construction?

2) Does there exist a correlation between identity styles and the features of creative personality?

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

To identify the variables, two methods have been used:

1) *Berzonsky's Questionnaire of Identity Style* (ISI3, revised version). For our purposes, the Slovak version has been used, translated from the original and adapted (Šramová, Bianchi, Lášticová, 2004). The questionnaire consists of 40 items, the degree of coincidence with the individual items being expressed by the adolescents on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 points. Sum total score has been used for the analysis of the socio-cognitive styles of identity oriented at the solution and management of personality problems creation of the personality identity: a) informational identity style (11 items, Cronbach alpha = 0.634), b) diffusive style of identity (10 items, Cronbach alpha = 0.592), c) normative identity style (9 items, Cronbach alpha = 0.603). At the same time, constancy of personality decision was tested, i.e. identity degree, called by Berzonsky the commitment identity (10 items, Cronbach alpha = 0.678).

2) *What Kind of Person Are You? - WKOPAY* (Khatena, Torrance, 1976) self-evaluating instrument is a self-reflecting inventory that is constructed as the estimation of an individual in self-reflection on creativity. The autobiographical self-reflecting model offers the individual an opportunity to describe how he/she functions in the creativity field. It identifies several subdimensions of creative orientation of personality. The task of the individual tested shall be to mark those items in the WKOPAY questionnaire that describe his typical behavior. The subscales are described as factors, and in addition, using the questionnaire makes it possible to identify up to five such factors: authority acceptance, self-reliance, hunger for science, perception of others, and creative imagination (disciplined imagination). Since this identification instrument has not been standardized for the Slovak population, its use is predominantly oriented at research purposes. For this purpose we deem it purposeful to present some data stated in the original manual (Table 1). To compare, we also present the results obtained in our sample. As pres-

Table 1. Comparing the means and standard deviations of individual WKOPAY factors in the group of Slovak adolescents and that of J. Khatena and E.P. Torrance (1976)

| | The group of Slovak adolescents N = 141 | | The group presented by J. Khatena and E.P. Torrance (1976) As American population N = 671 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | AM | SD | AM | SD |
| Acceptance of authorities | 3.11 | 1.93 | 3.95 | 1.62 |
| Self-confidence | 9.04 | 1.90 | 6.20 | 2.04 |
| Hunger for science | 4.64 | 1.18 | 3.47 | 1.26 |
| Acceptance of others | 3.78 | 2.12 | 3.28 | 2.92 |
| Disciplined imagination | 5.51 | 1.69 | 3.63 | 3.54 |

ented in the table, significant deviations suggest that adolescents of the Slovak population are more homogeneous than adolescents of the American sample (*cf.* the factors of self-reliance, acceptance of others, but mostly those of disciplined creativity). Mean values measured are comparable with those of the American population, although in the factor of self-reliance and disciplined imagination the Slovak scores outnumber the American. In the context of the significant deviations mentioned, the category of low and high scoring (±1SD) would include participants with comparable scores. Table 2 presents correlations among the individual factors of the WKOPAY questionnaire obtained from the data measured in the tested sample of adolescents.

*Sample*

The test sample was formed of 141 adolescents of average age 19.5 years. For the purposes of our research the sample was divided into two groups, i.e. the group with formed identity (high commitment) and the group with unformed identity (low commitment). The criterion of division was AM ± 1SD. Correlation analysis, reliability measuring and t-test, ANOVA (SPSS) were used for statistical processing.

RESULTS

Table 3 shows basic differences between the representation of individual styles between adolescents with formed and unformed identities. All the observed variables showed highly significant differences. The adolescents with unformed identity scored lower in the informational style, so it can be concluded that in spite of their possibly being active in the search for their identity, they are not open to experience, nor are they sufficiently active in their approach to problem solving. It is precisely the group with the more marked

Table 2. Correlations between the individual factors of the WKOPAY measured in the tested sample of adolescents

| | | Acceptance of authorities | Self-confidence | Hunger for science | Acceptance of others |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acceptance of authorities | Correlation Coefficient Sig. (1-tailed) | | | | |
| Self-confidence | Correlation Coefficient Sig. (1-tailed) | -.232 .003 | | | |
| Hunger for science | Correlation Coefficient Sig. (1-tailed) | -.118 .082 | .230 .003 | | |
| Acceptance of others | Correlation Coefficient Sig. | -.255 .001 | -.051 .274 | .261 .001 | |
| Disciplined imagination | Correlation Coefficient Sig. (1-tailed) | -.407 .000 | .179 017 | .185 .014 | .140 .049 |

Table 3. Differences between the representation of the individual styles between the adolescents with formed and unformed identities

|  | Adolescents with formed identity | | Adolescents with unformed identity | | t-test | p | Median |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | AM | SD | AM | SD |  |  |  |
| Informational style of identity | 40.142 | 5.944 | 35.526 | 4.287 | -2.791 | .008 | 39 |
| Diffuse/avoidant identity | 27.571 | 5.853 | 32.579 | 4.100 | 3.102 | .004 | 28 |
| Normative identity style | 35.905 | 4.346 | 27.947 | 4.527 | -5.669 | .000 | 32 |

Table 4. Differences between the representation of the individual styles between the adolescents with formed and unformed identities in the selected factors of creative personality

|  | Adolescents with formed identity | | Adolescents with unformed identity | | t-test | p | Median |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | AM | SD | AM | SD |  |  |  |
| Acceptance of authorities | 2.048 | 1.717 | 4.316 | 2.382 | 3.480 | .001 | 3 |
| Self-confidence | 9.381 | 1.802 | 9.474 | 1.646 | 0.169 | .866 | 9 |
| Hunger for science | 4.714 | 1.146 | 4.421 | 1.465 | -0.709 | .483 | 5 |
| Acceptance of others | 4.524 | 2.657 | 3.526 | 2.502 | -1.219 | .231 | 4 |
| Disciplined imagination | 5.762 | 1.513 | 4.737 | 1.368 | -2.238 | .031 | 6 |

representation of the so-called diffusive style that is bound to maladaptive behavior and postponement of self-definition (Table 3). In observing statistically significant differences between adolescents with formed and unformed identity it was found that the influence of formed identity state has appeared in two dimensions: "authority acceptance" (t = 3.480, p = 0.001) and "disciplined imagination " (t = -2.238, p = 0.031) (Table 4). Nonconformity with the existing state of things, creative orientation of personality, active, lively, independent approach to problem solving, inventiveness as well as imagination, are character-

istics of adolescents with formed identity.

Significantly strong negative correlation was found in our group of (Slovak) adolescents (r = -.322***) between "commitment" and "authority acceptance" (Table 5), which means that adolescents with formed identity tend to reject authority more and to be non-conforming in behavior, along with being more active and not conforming passively to existing conditions. Vice versa, adolescents with a unformed identity tend to uncritically accept the opinions and attitudes of authorities. The result points out that the more creative adolescents tend to reach identity sooner

Table 5. Correlations between the styles of achieved identity and the features of creative personality

|  | Acceptance of authorities | Hunger for science | Acceptance of others | Disciplined imagination |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment | -0.322*** |  |  | 0.159* |
| Informational style of identity | -0.212* |  | -0.166* |  |
| Normative style of identity |  | -0.175* |  |  |

Note: Only statistically significant relations are given

than those less creative ones and that the creativity and first-creativity orientations in personality presumably help constructing identity in the sense of obligation. See too the higher positive correlation of "commitment" to *"disciplined imagination"* (r = .156*), which means that adolescents with formed identity can utilize their imagination and fantasy in task solving, where it is not possible to use ordinary procedures. Disciplined imagination enables them, as is stated in the test manual, to have an active, live, own and independent approach to the seeking of solutions and tasks. This coincides with the basic characteristics of "commitment": responsibility, sense of duty, activity. An important role is also played by the factor of self-regulation. According to Bandura's (1989) Self-efficacy theory, two properties of goals are important in self-regulation: force of interest and degree of activity in choosing the goal. As indicated by the results, adolescents with formed "commitment" are more active and significantly attracted by the goal (by the correlation to "disciplined imagination"). *The informational identity style* including active search, evaluation and utilization of self-relevant information, bears significant negative correlation to the *"dimension authority acceptance"* (r = -.212*) and to the *"acceptance of others"*

dimension (r = -.166*) (Table 5). The above findings suggest that in the informational identity style, self-evaluation does not proceed from information coming from others, but the center of evaluation appears to be the personality itself. The higher the informational identity style the lower the acceptance of authorities (i.e., also lower conformity), as well as the lower the social adjustment, including the popularity and the lower the preference for group activities contrasted with a higher individual activity. These findings of ours correspond with other authors' results emphasizing the interconnection of informational identity style and openness to experience with an independent active approach to problem solving (Berzonsky, 1992; Berzonsky, Sullivan, 1992). Following the level of representation of the authority acceptance item and that of acceptance of others among adolescents with formed and unformed identity (compared with the median) it has been shown that adolescents with formed identity show higher degree of creative perception and orientation.

In connection with the manifestation of constructive creativity, Rogers (1983) mentions several of its conditions, one of them being the existence of an inner center for evaluating one's own productions and the absence of an outer one. The outer

center of evaluation is, in the author's opinion, anti-creative at all time, as it brings threat and thus the need for defence; which means that a certain part of experience should not get into consciousness. The inner center of evaluation is more characteristic of creative individuals. Zelina, the author of the project Millennium (2001), suggests in addition to traditional education (metacognitive education, the developing of emotional intelligence, the building of internal motivation system, the cultivation of pro-sociality, ethics and creativity) the elaboration of the didactics of autoregulation. He proposed the six "S" theory, suggesting that the build-up of integrated ego can follow this sequence: self-reflection - self-evaluation - self-consciousness - self-control - self-regulation - self-formation. *"Without discipline, either the outer one toward standards, or the inner one, towards responsibility for one's goals, it is impossible to attain any important achievements, or to feel happiness. Discipline is one of the resulting accomplishments of self-regulation."* (Zelina, 2005, p. 9). In this connection the author also points to the *Handbook of Self-regulation*, (Boekaertesová, Pintrich, Zeidner, 2000), who elaborated these problems in greater detail.

The above-mentioned confirms that the personality is a complex and integrated system, which is why it is important to enrich the developing personality of children and young people in a complex way, through programs and procedures that consider all the above components.

The *normative identity style* bears negative correlation to the *hunger for science* dimension ($r = -.175*$) (Table 5). The adolescents constructing their identity along standards, rules, values, expectation of others, social conventions, prove to be less creative and not to ask "inquisitive"

questions. The normative identity style is represented in a higher degree in less creative adolescents. According to Brezonsky (1992), it is adolescents with dominant representation of normative identity style who prematurely reach the closed identity state. In our sample of (Slovak) adolescents, the level of hunger for science in adolescents with formed identity and adolescents with unformed identity, proved to be under the median value even though a higher degree of hunger for science was shown by adolescents with formed identity (no statistical significance).

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of our findings show that "authority acceptance" and "disciplined imagination" do influence the state of achieved identity, which is manifested by a higher non-conformity and higher creativity of adolescents with formed identity. However, neither non-conformity nor rejection of authorities as such can be considered as an indicator of creative personality, or of a personality with formed identity either. Acceptance of authorities as opposed to their rejection, in the Khatena and Torrance (1976) theory does mean obedience, politeness, down to passive submission and adaptation to acceptance of the given situation. In relation to these findings, it is possible to interpret the results as an expression of a more active relation to life in adolescents with formed identity (commitment) and as features of a creative personality, compared with personalities with inner motivation, with inquisitive, curious and independent attitude, seeking their own ways and modes of solution of complex tasks and problems. It is possible to surmise that it is these very factors that are also related to the trend toward higher self-reflection, self-educa-

tion and self-control, as the "disciplined imagination" factor includes them implicitly. However, it is important for educators, teachers and, last but not least, parents, to develop, intensify and support this trend. There is a real danger that even with appropriate axiological education, non-conforming personalities without creativity and well-formed self-control may develop inharmoniously, even sociopathically.

There is a correlation between styles of achieved identity and the features of a creative personality. It has been proved that adolescents with formed identity, who rely on themselves in the process of identity formation to a higher degree, do reject authorities. Vice versa, adolescents with unformed identity tend to uncritical acceptance of opinions and attitudes of authorities. The more creative adolescents reach identity in the sense of obligation (i.e., they are more responsible, more constant in their decisions) than their less creative colleagues. Based on the above results, we are of the opinion that creativity and personality to the creative orientation can help construct the formed identity.

We suggest working these findings into the practice of personality formation: into programs of school education, intervention and development programs, but also into materials designed for self-education and self-control (sense of monitoring oneself). At the same time, the results also show that it is essential to involve the developing personality of children and young people in a complex way, via programs and procedures, considering all the above-mentioned components, as it represents an intricate and integrated system.

As for the rest, it would be suitable to identify in a greater detail other concurrent variables participating in the formation of identity, as well as to delimit the ways in which educationalists, school psychologists and other specialists involved in the development of children and young people, intervene and support not only the development of creativity, creative abilities (Fichnová, 2005) and features of the creative personality, but also adequate formation of self-concept as well as identity formation of adolescents (Šramová, 2004). We consider these facts as inspirational for our future endeavors.

## REFERENCES

BANDURA, A., 1989, Social cognitive theory. In: R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of Child Development*, Vol. 6. Six theories of child development (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

BARRON, F., HARRINGTON, D., 1981, Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 439-476.

BERZONSKY, M.D., 1990, Self-construction over the life-span. A process perspective on identity formation. *Advances in Personal Construct Psychology*, 1, 155-186.

BERZONSKY, M.D., 1992, Identity style and coping strategies. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 771-788.

BERZONSKY, M.D., 2003, Identity style and well-being-does commitment matter? *An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 3, 1, 131-142.

BERZONSKY, M.D., 2004, Identity style and parental authority. (internal material).

BERZONSKY, M.D., FERRARI, J.R., 1996, Identity orientation and decisional strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 597-606.

BERZONSKY, M.D., KUK, L.S., 2002, Identity processing styles, psychosocial resources, personal problems, and academic performance. Paper presented at a Symposium on Identity, New Orleans, 2002.

BERZONSKY, M.D., NEIMEYER, G.J., 1994, Ego identity status and identity processing orientation: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 425-435.

BERZONSKY, M.D., SULLIVAN, C., 1992, Social-cognitive aspects of identity style: Need for cognition, experiential openness, and introspection. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 140-155.

BOEKAERTESOVÁ, M., PINTRICH, P.R., ZEID-NER, M., 2000, Handbook of self-regulation. San Diego, Cal.: Academic Press.

CSIKSZENTMIHALYI, M., 1996, The creative personality. *Psychology Today*, July/August, 1997, 36-40.

CROPLEY, A.J., 1999, Definitions of creativity. In: M. Runco, S. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Creativity*. San Diego, Cal.: Academic Press, 511-524.

DeBONO, E., 1985, *Six thinking hats*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

DOČKAL, V., MUSIL, M., a kol., 1987, *Psychológia nadania*. Bratislava: SPN.

ERIKSON, E.H., 1968, *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton & Company.

FANDELOVÁ, E., 1999, *Psychológia rizika a zavádzanie multimediálnych prostriedkov vzdelávania*. Nitra: UKF.

FANDELOVÁ, E., 2004, Identita adolescentov a konštrukcia sémantického priestoru. In: B. Šramová, E. Poliaková, P. Selvek (Eds.), *Zdravie, morálka a identita adolescentov*. Zborník vedeckých príspevkov, Nitra: UKF, 289-302.

FEIST, G.J., 1999, The influence of personality on artistic and scientific creativity. In: R.J. Sternberg, *Handbook of Creativity*. New York/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FICHNOVÁ, K., 2004, Niektoré aspekty sebaobrazu adolescentných dievčat a chlapcov. In: B. Šramová, E. Poliaková, P. Selvek (Eds.), *Zdravie, morálka a identita adolescentov*. Zborník vedeckých príspevkov, Nitra: UKF 79-103.

FICHNOVÁ, K., 2005, Tvorivá komunikácia a rozvoj tvorivého potenciálu u vysokoškolákov, študentov masmediálnych štúdií. In: Zborník z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie: "Univerzitné vzdelávanie po vstupe do Európskej únie, September 12-13, 2005", Nitra: SPU, 3-9.

FORD, D.Y., HARRIS, J.J., 1992, The elusive definition of creativity. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 26, 3, 186-190.

GARDNER, H., 1997, Varieties of intellectual talent. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 31, 2, 120-124.

GUILFORD, J.P., 1950, Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5, 444-454.

HAMRANOVÁ, A., 2003, Intervenčný program vo výchovno - vzdelávacom procese. Slovenské školstvo v kontexte európskej integrácie. Zborník prednášok z medzinárodnej konferencie, Nitra: UKF, 377-379.

HLAVSA, J., JURČOVÁ, M., 1978, Psychologické metódy zisťovania tvorivosti. Bratislava: Psychodiagnostické a diagnostické testy.

KALMÁR, M., KALMÁR, Z., 1987, Creativity training with preschool children living in chil-dren's homes. *Studia Psychologica*, 29, 1, 59-66.

KAUFMAN, J.C., BAER, J., 2004, Sure, I'm creative - but not in mathematics!: Self-reported creativity in diverse domains. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 22, 2, 143-155.

KHATENA, J., TORRANCE, E.P., 1976, What Kind of Person Are You? - WKOPAY. (s.l.) : (s.n.)

LANGMEIER, J., KREJČÍŘOVÁ, D., 1998b, Rozdíly v psychickém vývoji chlapců a dívek. In: J. Langmeier, D. Krejčířová, *Vývojová psychologie*. Prague: Grada Publishing, 199-203.

MACEK, P., 2003, Identita jako proces. In: I. Čermák, M. Hřebíčková, P. Macek, *Agrese, identita, osobnost*. Brno: PÚ AVČR, Sdružení SCAN, 180-200.

MARCIA, J.E., 1980, Identity in adolescence. In: J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: J. Wiley.

MASLOW, A., 1965, The need for creative people. *Personnel Administration*, 21-22, 28, 3-5.

MILÉNIUM. Ministrestvo školstva (Slovenská republika), 2001, Koncepcia rozvoja výchovy a vzdelávania v Slovenskej republike na najbližších 15-20 rokov (Projekt Milénium), http://www.educatio.gov.sk/mnvd/krv.htm [cited: 2001-02-26].

MUSIL, M., 1983, Prieniky a špecifiká psychológie vo vede a umení. *Psychológia a Patopsychológia Dieťaťa*, 18, 6, 483-496.

PERKINS, D., 1995, The snowflake model of creativity and its application to education. In: J.W. Santrock, *Children*, WCB Brown and Benchmark, Wisconsin-Dudugue Iowa.

PIETRASIŃSKI, Z., 1972, *Tvorivé myslenie*. Bratislava: Obzor.

POPPEROVÁ, M., 1971, Vzťah tvorivých schopností a inteligencie podľa výkonov v testoch. *Psychológia a Patopsychológia Dieťaťa*, 6, 3, 195-210.

ROGERS, C.R., 1954, Towards a theory of creativity. *A Review of General Semantics*, 11, 249-260.

ROGERS, C.R., 1961, *On becoming a person*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International Publishing Group.

ROGERS, C.R., 1983, *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International Publishing Group.

RUNCO, M.A., CHAND, I., 1995, Cognition and creativity. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7, 243-267.

SATKOVÁ, J., FICHNOVÁ, K., 2002, Sebahodnotenie a reálny výkon u študentov učiteľstva prvého stupňa ZŠ a "na študenta zamerané vyučovanie". In: O. Orosová, E. Schnitzerová (Eds.), *Psychológia v škole*. Zb. príspevkov z Česko-Slovenskej vedeckej konferencie. Košice: UPJŠ, 319-324.

STERNBERG, R.J., 1997, *Thinking styles*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

STERNBERG, R.J., LUBART, T.L., 1996, Investing in creativity. *American Psychologist*, 51, 677-688.

STERNBERG, R.J., LUBART, T.L., 1999, The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In: R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity*. New York/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-15.

SZOBIOVÁ, E., 1999, *Tvorivosť od záhady k poznaniu. Chápanie, zisťovanie a rozvíjanie tvorivosti.* Bratislava: Stimul.

SZOBIOVÁ, E., 2006, The Five Personality Dimensions in relation to creative thinking of adolescents. *Studia Psychologica*, 48, 3, 241-249.

SZOBIOVÁ, E., FICHNOVÁ, K., 2003, The Self - Rating Scale of Procreativity Oriented Personality for Nursery School Teachers and its relation to creative performance. *Studia Psychologica*, 45, 4, 307-321.

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., 2004, Cognitive training - Teacher`s help. *Studia Psychologica*, 46, 3, 203-210.

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., 2004, Identita vysokoškolákov. *Mládež a Spoločnosť*, 10, 4, 42-50.

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., 2006, Štýly identity adolescentov a výchovný štýl v rodine. *Psychológia a Patopsychológia Dieťaťa*, 41, 1, 3-14.

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., 2007, *Osobnosť v procese ontogenézy.* Bratislava: Melius, edícia psychológia.

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., BIANCHI, G., LÁŠTICOVÁ, B., 2004, *Dotazník Štýlu Identity.* (Berzonsky, ISI3)-slovenská verzia (interný materiál).

ŠRAMOVÁ, B., FANDELOVÁ, E., 2006, Sémantický priestor a identita adolescentov. In: M. Blatný, D. Vobořil, P. Květon, M. Jalínek, V. Sobotková (Eds.), *"Sociální procesy a osobnost 2005".* Sborník příspěvků, Brno: AV ČR.

TARDIFF, T.Z., STERNBERG, R.J., 1989, What do we know about creativity? In: R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity, contemporary psychological perspectives.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

TAYLOR, I.A., 1975, A retrospective view of creativity investigation. In: *Perspectives in Creativity.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1-36.

ZELINA, M., 1997, *Ako sa stať tvorivým.* Fontana Kiadó, Šamorín.

ZELINA, M., 2005, Milénium v roku 2005. In: Ľ. Hrdina (Ed.), *Veda, škola, život.* Bratislava: Metodické centrum, 9-15.

ZELINA, M., BUGANOVÁ, Z., 1983, Rozvoj tvorivého myslenia žiakov na hodinách slovenského jazyka. *Psychológia a Patopsychológia Dieťaťa*, 13, 3, 233-244.

# IDENTITA A KREATIVITA OSOBNOSTI

B. Š r a m o v á, K. F i c h n o v á

*Súhrn:* Príspevok sa zaoberá vzťahom medzi identitou adolescentov a črtami tvorivej osobnosti. Pri premennej identita vychádzame z koncepcie Berzonského, ktorý podľa toho, ako sa kognitívne stratégie zúčastňujú na konštruovaní identity, vyčlenil tri základné procesne orientované štýly identity: informačný, normatívny, difúzny. Osobitnú pozornosť autor venuje miere utvorenej identity, ktorú nazýva commitment. V procese formovania identity medzi faktormi pôsobí aj tvorivosť osobnosti. Vyvíjajúca sa tvorivá osobnosť pravdepodobne dosiahne skôr redefinovanie identity a vyhne sa difúzii role. Cieľ: Identifikovať ako sa vybrané črty tvorivosti adolescentov podieľajú na konštruovaní identity a určiť súvis medzi premennými. Metódy: Dotazník štýlu identity (Berzonsky), WKOPAY (Khatena, Torrance). Výsledky, záver: Medzi črtami tvorivej osobnosti a štýlmi identity adolescentov existuje vzájomný vzťah. Vybrané črty tvorivej osobnosti majú vplyv na konštruovanie identity. "Akceptácia autorít" a "disciplinovaná predstavivosť" sa podieľajú na utvorení identity v zmysle záväzku. Nižšia miera akceptácie autorít ako aj iných osobností podporuje aktívne konštruovanie vlastnej identity adolescenta. Adolescenti s utvorenou identitou, ktorí sa pri konštruovaní svojej identity vyššou mierou spoliehajú na seba, autority odmietajú. Naopak, adolescenti s neutvorenou identitou, majú tendenciu k nekritickému prijímaniu názorov a postojov autorít.