INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 03 (2026)

CREATIVITY AS A PHILOSOPHICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PHENOMENON: DEVELOPING DIVERGENT THINKING IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Vakhobova Marguba Abdukhamidovna
Senior Lecturer, PhD
Department of Social and Exact Sciences
Tashkent State University of Economics
vahobova@gmail.com
ORCID 0009-0006-7050-5110

ABSTRACT: This study examines the problem of developing creativity in university students within the context of modern higher education. The research highlights the limitations of traditional educational models, which are primarily based on reproductive learning and convergent thinking, restricting students' ability to think independently and creatively. In contrast, the study emphasizes the importance of fostering divergent thinking as a key component of creativity, enabling students to generate multiple solutions and approach problems from different perspectives. The paper analyzes the philosophical and psychological foundations of creativity, considering it as an essential characteristic of human individuality and intellectual development. Special attention is given to the role of education in shaping creative competencies, as well as to the need for transforming teaching methods, curricula, and teacher-student interaction. The findings suggest that creativity can and should be systematically developed across all academic disciplines, not only in traditionally "creative" fields. The study concludes that integrating creativity into higher education is crucial for preparing competitive, flexible, and innovative specialists capable of solving real-life problems in rapidly changing environments.

KEY WORDS: Innovation, education, development, creativity, divergent thinking, higher education.

INTRODUCTION

The goal of our research is to develop personal creativity in University students. What prevents this, when it would seem that everyone has long agreed that society needs creative graduates, creative specialists? The answer is obvious: the education system itself. Much has been written about the shortcomings of the education system: we do not teach our students to be active, creative individuals, preferring a long-outdated reproductive model of education. In most cases, the teacher tries to give as much material as possible at the lecture, to tell everything, without giving students the opportunity to understand the material themselves, to think of something, to find answers to questions. Students can only come to the practical class and tell all what they heard at the lecture. Western countries have long ago moved away from this type of training: they do not give ready-made answers to all questions, and students ' originality and flexibility of thinking are always welcome. A logical question arises: is it possible to teach creativity? The answer, in our opinion, is unambiguous. It is possible, and it should be done not only in schools, but also at the University. Changes are needed not only for the position of teachers, but also for curricula that do not have disciplines that specifically teach creativity and creative thinking.

This applies to all specialties, not just creative ones. If you need to teach mathematics, physics, or a foreign language, then why don't you teach creativity, because it's no secret that employers make creativity one of the most important requirements for an applicant, as well as in any resume, you can find creativity among the personal advantages of an applicant. The word "creativity" has become fashionable, but if you look at it, no one really knows what it means.

This word was first used by the American psychologist joy Paul Guilford in 1959, understanding creativity as a special kind of thinking. The so-called divergent ("divergent, going in different directions") thinking, which allows many ways to solve a problem, leads to unexpected conclusions and results. Such thinking is contrasted with convergent ("converging") thinking aimed at the only correct solution. Human uniqueness and individuality are closely linked to the problem of creativity. The development of personal creativity as a subject of scientific research has a peculiar specificity: in the scientific description, "creativity" is identified with the concept of "creativity" and its derivatives (prerequisites for creativity, General and special specifically teach creativity and creative thinking.

This applies to all specialties, not just creative ones. If you need to teach mathematics, physics, or a foreign language, then why don't you teach creativity, because it's no secret that employers make creativity one of the most important requirements for an applicant, as well as in any resume, you can find creativity among the personal advantages of an applicant. The word "creativity" has become fashionable, but if you look at it, no one really knows what it means. This word was first used by the American psychologist joy Paul Guilford in 1959, understanding creativity as a special kind of thinking the so-called divergent ("divergent, going in different directions") thinking, which allows many ways to solve a problem, leads to unexpected conclusions and results. Such thinking is contrasted with convergent ("converging") thinking aimed at the only correct solution, where there is a danger of leaving the scientific foundations of the nature of creativity. Therefore, it makes sense to consider and analyze scientific research on the structure and content of the concept of "creativity" from a psychological point of view. Why, in most cases, are the tasks and problems that students face aimed at using convergent thinking? The most significant advantage of traditional intellectual search over creative search is that it is guaranteed to lead to an acceptable (in most cases for the teacher) result. But this is only possible with a few assumptions: the problem or task in principle has the only correct solution or a clearly limited range of correct solutions; A well-known algorithm for solving this problem; There is a complete and correct initial data for its solution.

It must be recognized that most educational tasks that a person they are trained to solve problems at school, and then at the University, are built in this way and are solved in accordance with the convergent strategy of intellectual search. Perhaps this is one of the explanations for the fact that many excellent students who do well with academic tasks are helpless when trying to solve real problems that lie in wait for them both at work and in other life situations. Statistics show that 80 % of life success depends on the creativity of a person, and only 20 % on his intelligence.

It is obvious that not all real life and professional tasks and problems that a person faces correspond to the above assumptions. A significant number of situations do not fully respond to them or do not respond at all, especially if you have to act in rapidly changing conditions. This often concerns the judgment about the completeness and accuracy of the source data. When faced with any life problems, we are almost alwavs forced to act in situations. Human uniqueness and individuality are closely linked to the problem of creativity. The development of personal creativity as a subject of scientific research has a peculiar specificity: in the scientific description, "creativity" is identified with the concept of "creativity" and its derivatives (prerequisites for creativity, General and special abilities, potential, etc.), where there is a danger of leaving the scientific foundations of the nature of creativity. Therefore, it makes sense to consider and analyze scientific research on the structure and content of the concept of "creativity" from a psychological point of view. Why, in most cases, are the tasks and problems that students face aimed at using convergent thinking? The most significant advantage of

traditional intellectual search over creative search is that it is guaranteed to lead to an acceptable (in most cases for the teacher) result. But this is only possible with a few assumptions:

The problem or task in principle has the only correct solution or a clearly limited range of correct solutions; A well-known algorithm for solving this problem;

There is a complete and correct initial data for its solution. It must be recognized that most educational tasks that a person they are trained to solve problems at school, and then at the University, are built in this way and are solved in accordance with the convergent strategy of intellectual search. Perhaps this is one of the explanations for the fact that many excellent students who do well with academic tasks are helpless when trying to solve real problems that lie in wait for them both at work and in other life situations. Statistics show that 80 % of life success depends on the creativity of a person, and only 20 % on his intelligence. It is obvious that not all real life and professional tasks and problems that a person faces correspond to the above assumptions. A significant number of situations do not fully respond to them or do not respond at all, especially if you have to act in rapidly changing conditions. This often concerns the judgment about the completeness and accuracy of the source data. When faced with any life problems, we are almost alwavs forced to act in situations where the information we know is obviously incomplete, and in the reliability of the information that is available to us, it is impossible to be completely sure. And since this is the case, traditional intelligence does not guarantee that the problem will be solved adequately, even if we know exactly how to solve it.

In creative thinking, it is not so much how true certain elements of information are, but how useful a particular combination of them seems, whether it will allow us to see the problem in a new, unusual perspective, and see possible ways to solve it. Ideas should be evaluated by the teacher not so much from the position of right / wrong, but from the position of functionality, originality, applicability in specific conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Shavkat Mirziyoyev (2020). The Strategy of Actions for the Development of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Tashkent: Uzbekistan. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan (2020).
2. On Measures to Improve the Quality of Education and Develop Human Capital. Tashkent.
3. Исохужаева, М. Я., & Хасанова, Х. Х. (2020). Электрон иқтисодиёт шароитларида рақамли компетентлик. Бизнес-эксперт, 35–37.
4. Runco, M. A., & Acar, S. (2020). Divergent thinking as an indicator of creative potential. Creativity Research Journal, 32(3), 1–10.
5. Shavkat Mirziyoyev (2022). Human Dignity and Active Mahalla Year: State Program. Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
6. Vakhobova, M. (2022). The general characteristics of teaching and reading comprehension. Архив научных исследований, 4(1).
7. Vakhobova, M. (2022). The use of games as a strategy of developing communicative competence of learners. Архив научных исследований, 4(1).
8. Karimova, D. (2022). The role of creativity in modern education system of Uzbekistan. International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, 8(2), 120–126. Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of Uzbekistan (2021).
9. Concept for the Development of Higher Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030. Tashkent.
10. Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2021). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 41, 100162.

11. Beghetto, R. A. (2021). Creativity in education: A review of theory and practice. Cambridge Journal of Education, 51(1), 1–17.
12. Henriksen, D., Mishra, P., & Mehta, R. (2021). Creativity and technology in education: An interdisciplinary perspective. Educational Technology Research and Development, 69(1), 1–15.
13. Park, J. H., Niu, W., & Cheng, L. (2021). Fostering creativity and critical thinking in higher education. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 760351.
14. Xia, T., Kang, M., & Chen, M. (2021). Design training and creativity: Divergent thinking in education. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 695002.
15. Yuldashev, O. (2021). Innovative approaches in developing students' creative thinking in higher education institutions of Uzbekistan. Journal of Education and Practice, 12(5), 45–50.
16. Abdullaeva, N. (2023). Development of students' independent and creative thinking in higher education. Uzbek Journal of Pedagogy, 3(1), 33–40.
17. Sulaymanova, D. B. (2024). The importance of programs in creating electronic textbooks. Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 30, 18–21.
18. Abdurahmanova, S. (2024). Morphological analysis in database formation. International Journal of Literature and Languages, 11, 396–405.
19. Khasanova, Kh. (2025). Directions for improving the efficiency of services in the banking sector in the context of digital transformation. Norwegian Journal of Development of the International Science, 149, 14–17.
20. Shaber, N., Shah, S. K., & Imran, M. (2025). Exploring the relationship between critical thinking and creativity in university students. Education Sciences, 15(4), 464.
21. Duvlaeva, N. X. (2026). Strategies for improving management efficiency in higher education institutions based on the use of artificial intelligence and big data. Proceedings, 1, 199–202.
22. Vakhobova, M. (2022). Main principles of ICT-assisted language learning and teaching. *Архив научных исследований*, *4*(1).
23. Vakhobova, M. A. (2022). INNOVATIVE METHODS OF THE DISTANCE LEARNING PROCESS IN MODERN UNIVERSITIES. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *2*(5-2), 641-645.
24. Vakhobova, M. (2022). The Richness of the English Language. Архив научных исследований, 4(1).
25. Vakhobova, M. (2022). INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CREATIVITY OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS. *Архив научных исследований*, *4*(1).