

Enhancing Creative Problem Solving and Creative Self-Efficacy: A Preliminary Study



Tammy Dempster¹, Ian Hocking¹, David Vernon¹, Heather Snyder²

¹Canterbury Christ Church University, UK ²Edinboro University, USA

Contact email address: ian.hocking@canterbury.ac.uk



Creative Problem Solving

A model of creativity which addresses open-ended problems via a set of stages, including: identifying problems, producing ideas, and turning those ideas into *useful* solutions (Puccio et al., 2006).

Creative Self-Efficacy

The degree of confidence an individual has in their ability to be creative (Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Creative self-efficacy has been argued to be an important factor in the creative process (Puente-Díaz, 2016).

Introduction

- Creative self-efficacy and creative performance have been shown to have a positive relationship (see Puente-Díaz, 2016, for a review).
- C.P.S. (creative problem solving) training is considered to be one of the most successful ways of training creativity (Puccio, Wheeler, & Cassandro, 2004).
- Being able to improve C.P.S. skills are therefore considered important in a variety of fields such as education (see Murdock, 2003) and business (see Thompson, 2003).
- However, of the large variety of tools available for training C.P.S. skills, only a few have been empirically supported (see Vernon et al., 2016, for a full review).
- Additionally, although there are creativity interventions which have been shown to improve C.P.S. skills (e.g., DeHann, 2009; Ma, 2006; Scott et al., 2004a, 2004b), and creative self-efficacy and creativity (e.g., Byrge & Tang, 2015), Vernon et al. (2016) point out that:
 - It is not always clear what tools are being used
 - It can be difficult to untangle the effect that each of the different tools are having.
- This current study therefore aimed to address this.

Research Question

Does an 8 week CPS training program utilising an empirically based creativity toolkit improve students' creativity, creative self-efficacy, and C.P.S. skills?

C.P.S. Training Program

Week 1	Week 2 and 3	Week 4	Week 5 and 6	Week 7 and 8
Introduction to C.P.S	Creative Problem Solving (C.P.S.)	Formative Q and A	Creative Ideation	Creative Evaluation
1 x 2 hours	2 x 2 hours	1 x 2 hours	2 x 2 hours	2 x 2 hours


Output
Creativity assignment
Presentation using C.P.S. on a real world problem of their choice

Results - Creativity


Creative Problem Solving Task

Control Group
No significant change from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(5) = .00, p = 1.000$.

Experimental Group
A significant increase from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(18) = 2.48, p = .023$.




Unusual Uses Tests (U.U.T.s)



Results Creative Self-Efficacy

Control Group
No significant change from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(5) = .61, p = .567$.

Experimental Group
A significant increase from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(18) = 2.63, p = .017$.



Control Group
No significant change from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(5) = 2.31, p = .069$.

Experimental Group
A significant increase from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(18) = 4.81, p < .001$.

Outcome

- Improved C.P.S. skills
- Improved creative self-efficacy
- Improved creativity

References

- Byrge, C., & Tang, C. (2015). Embodied creativity training: Effects on creative self-efficacy and creative production. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 16*, 51-61.
- DeHaan, R. L. (2009). Teaching creativity and inventive problem solving in science. *Life Sciences Education, 8*, 172-181.
- Ma, H. (2006). A synthetic analysis of the effectiveness of single components and packages in creativity training programs. *Creativity Research Journal, 18*, 435-446.
- Murdock, M. C. (2003). The effects of teaching programmes intended to stimulate creativity: A disciplinary review. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 47*, 339-358.
- Puccio, G. J., Firestien, R. L., Coyle, C., & Masucci, C. (2006). A review of the effectiveness of CPS training: A focus on workplace issues. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 15*(1), 19-33.
- Puccio, G. J., Wheeler, R. A., & Cassandro, V. J. (2004). Reactions to creative problem solving training: Does cognitive style make a difference? *Journal of Creative Behavior, 38*(3), 192-216.
- Puente-Díaz, R. (2016). Creative self-efficacy: An exploration of its antecedents, consequences, and applied implications. *The Journal of Psychology, 150*(2), 175-195.
- Scott, G., Lertz, L. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2004a). The effectiveness of creativity training: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal, 16*, 361-388.
- Scott, G., Lertz, L. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2004b). Types of creativity training: Approaches and their effectiveness. *Journal of Creative Behaviour, 38*, 149-179.
- Thompson, L. (2003). Improving the creativity of organisational work groups. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*, 96-109.
- Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: It's potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1137-1148.
- Vernon, D., Hocking, I., & Tyler, T. C. (2016). An evidence-based review of creative problem solving tools: A practitioner's resource. *Human Resource Development Review, 1*-30.
- Vernon, D., & Hocking, I. (2014). Thinking hats and good men: Structured techniques in a problem construction task. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 14*, 41-46.

Discussion

- Psychology undergraduates were given eight 2 hour sessions once a week comprising either C.P.S. training (experimental group) or cognitive psychology lectures (control group).
- Only the experimental group showed significant improvements on the measures of C.P.S, creativity (U.U.T.) and creative self-efficacy.
- Suggests that the empirically based creativity toolkit used in this study is effective in enhancing creative problem solving skills.


Limitations

- Control group was too small to enable direct comparisons with the experimental group.
- Fluency was the only measure of creativity was used. Does not therefore tell us about other measures of creativity such as elaboration (e.g., Byrge & Tang, 2015), and quality and originality (e.g., Vernon & Hocking, 2014).
- The experimental group scored lower on measures of C.P.S. and creativity at time 1 compared to controls.
- The experimental group were a self-selected sample interested in creativity.

Conclusion

This study offers preliminary support for the use of an empirically based creativity toolkit for enhancing creative problem-solving skills and creative self efficacy but a follow-up study utilising a larger control group is recommended.

Method



For further information

<http://cccpsychology.com/creativitycognition/>