MPRI-JAEE | INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION IN EDU.
VOL. 04 NO. 8 – APRIL, 2024

CREATIVITY ORIENTATION AS DETERMINANT OF RESOURCEFUL BEHAVIOUR AMONG LECTURERS IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

***SUNDAY GBADEGESIN OLAWALE, PhD; & **ADEMOLA RAUF SALAMI, PhD**

*Department of Educational Psychology, Federal College of Education (Special), Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria.
**Department of Education for Learning Disabled, Federal College of Education (Special), Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria.
goodnesseqrs@gmail.com

KEYWORDS:
Creativity, Creative Orientation, Creative Teaching, Critical Thinking

Abstract

The study employed descriptive method to investigate creativity orientation as determinant of creative teaching and resourceful behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State. Purposive sampling technique was used to choose ten participants across schools/faculties in each of the four selected tertiary institutions. The age of the participants ranged between 30 and 62 with a mean age of 42.9 years. The instrument used in data collection was Teacher's Creativity Fostering Behavior Scale having nine indices while the overall co-efficient alpha of .92. One broad-based hypothesis was tested at .05 level of significance. Statistical mean, standard deviation and ANOVA were used for data analyses. Results showed that many lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State rated above average in creativity orientation while others were exceptional, and there were no significant difference in the mean creative fostering scores of lecturers in the four institutions. Discussions were made and recommendations advanced as regards incorporation of creativity orientation in teacher education, meritorious recruitment, job satisfaction, conducive environment, provision of required facilities and amenities as well as regular in-service workshops on creative teaching skills for lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

Introduction

The world we live in is changing fast. The machines, methods, ideas, designs and fashions of yesteryears are becoming obsolete with emergence of new ones in the quest for economic prosperity and human comfort. This describes human activities, efforts and epochs since antiquity, such as trial-and-error, purposive manual efforts, industrial revolution, technological revolution, knowledge-driven economy, information communication technology, and the present digital revolution propelled by creativity.

Creativity means the ability to think about a task or problem in a new or different way, or the ability to use imagination to generate new ideas. It denotes novelty and newness in thinking, framework, paradigm and approach to issues. It enables an individual to solve complex problems or develop interesting ways to tackle tasks. Therefore, the methods, designs, ideas and instruments of teaching, from elementary school to tertiary institutions have become creativity-compliant, sophisticated and learner-oriented. Padaychie (2023) states that creative education is crucial in the 21st century education because it fosters innovation and problem-solving skills in students. In essence, creativity is the hallmark of modern teaching (Times, 2023). If students' curiosity, thinking and creative potential are to be nurtured and developed, then the teacher (or lecturer) must be well-grounded in creativity orientation, because no one can give what he or she lacks. Therefore, lectures' ability to exhibit creative skills in teaching describes their creativity orientation.

The hallmark of creativity orientation is resourcefulness because no one can be resourceful without being creative. Nwanshak, et al (2021) maintain that a resourceful personality is dynamic, energetic, flexible, fluent, risk-taker, and motivated by challenges. At different times, Cropley (1997), Rubenstein (2000), Akinboye (2003) and Creative Thinking Organizations (2024) have emphasized 4P's of creativity: person, product, process and press (or creative environment). That is, creativity is about P (personality of the creator), P (product produced), P (procedure of creation), and P (press or environment where creativity takes place). That signifies that creativity involves problem-solving and getting things done in the face of obstacles and constraints. Therefore, a resourceful lecturer exhibits traits such as creativity, patience, empathy, adaptability, collaboration, lecture-room skills, expressive skills, passion, communication skills, compassion, engagement, and knowledge of subject matter.

All over the world, educational institutions are demanded to shift from traditional pedagogy to creative teaching, especially in tertiary institutions. Han and Abdrahim (2023) submit that society regards tertiary institutions as catalysts for human capital development that employ creativity to align with changing economic conditions and technological innovations. This enhances lecturers' self-development, students' competence and social relevance. IProject (2024) lists seven thinking skills in this regard: honesty, rationality, self-awareness, open-mindedness, discipline, judgment and

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

tolerance. These enable scholars to question traditional assumptions and dominant paradigms in ensuring that society is not stagnant.

But there have been controversies the traits of creativity orientation among lecturers in tertiary institutions. For instance, Mao, et al (2020) reported significant improvement on lecturers' creative orientation and students' creative abilities in a study on transformative leadership in China. Conversely, Wahsheh (2017) observed difficulties encountered by faculty members in their efforts to applying creative thinking skills in teaching in Najran University, Saudi Arabia and recommended training for faculty members in creative thinking skills and development of new curricula incorporating creativity. Son and Nguyen (2023) corroborated Wahsheh's (2017) observation among the lectures in the Vietnamese higher education system.

In Nigeria, Obialo (2020), Jacob, et al (2022) and Ibeh, et al (2023) variously discuss the challenges that paint lecturers in tertiary institutions as being deficient in creative teaching and resourcefulness. These factors include: poor motivation, teaching of large classes, deficiency in capacity building, inadequate infrastructural facilities, strike actions, insecurity, poor computer literacy, erratic policies, non-adherence to laid-down procedure for admission, recruitment, appointment and promotion, brain drain syndrome, corruption, maladministration and societal attitude to teachers. These factors could form the basis for the conclusion made by some people that Nigerian lecturers are deficient in creativity orientation that invariably affect their products in terms of initiative, creativity, innovation, self-dependency and competitive engagements. There are insinuations in certain quarters that many school graduates do not exhibit creativity and self-dependence because lecturers in the ivory tower are also deficient in creative teaching. Based on this, this study is embarks upon to verify the authenticity or otherwise of creativity orientation among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State.

Criteria of Creativity Orientation in Teaching

The following nine criteria depict creativity orientation of teachers in any institution of learning as identified progressively by Cropley (1997), Akinboye (2003), Olawale (2008), and Apak, et al (2021), viz:

i. Independence: Encouraging students to learn independently.
ii. Integration: Having a cooperative, socially integrative style of teaching.
iii. Motivation: Motivating students to master factual knowledge to have a solid base for divergent thinking.
iv. Judgment: Delaying judging students' ideas until they have been thoroughly worked out and clearly formulated.
v. Flexibility: Encouraging flexible thinking.
vi. Evaluation: Promoting self-evaluation in students.
vii. Question: Taking students' suggestions and questions seriously.

viii. Opportunities: Giving students opportunities to work with a wide variety of materials under different conditions.

ix. Frustration: Helping students to learn to cope with frustration, failure and disappointment so that they can have the courage to try the new and unusual.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study entails investigating creativity orientation as determinant of resourceful behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State. The specific objectives are to:

1. Showcase creativity orientation of lecturers' self-rating scores in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria.
2. Investigate the differentials in the overall resourceful behaviour of all the lecturers on the nine indices/sub-scales.
3. Determine whether there is significant difference in creativity orientation mean score of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Research Questions

Three research questions are raised in the study, viz;

1. What is the level of creativity orientation of lecturers' self-rating scores in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria?
2. What is the overall resourceful behaviour of all the lecturers in the nine indices/sub-scales?
3. Is there a significant difference in creativity orientation mean score of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria?

Research Hypothesis

One null hypothesis will be tested at .05 level of significance.

Ho: There is no significant difference in creativity orientation mean score of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Methodology

This is a descriptive survey aimed at collecting data and describing the data on their characteristics, features or facts about a given population. It is interested in describing event of interest (that is, creativity orientation of lecturers) without finding the cause-effect relationship. Purposive sampling technique was used to select ten participants each in four tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria, making forty lecturers altogether. The tertiary institutions are: University of Ibadan, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Federal College of Education (Special), Oyo, and Oyo State College of Education, Lanlate. The participants were selected across faculties/schools in each institution, The age of the participants ranged between 30 and 62 with a mean age of 42.8 years.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

Instrument

Olawale's (2008) self-rating likert instrument called "Teacher's Creativity Fostering Behaviour Scale" (TCFBS) was employed for data collection. It is a 5-point scale in which 1 depicts "very much unlike me" and 5 "very much like me". The overall obtainable score in each sub-scale is 25 while the overall obtainable score is 225. It is a forty-five item instrument with nine sub-scales and the Cronbach's alpha of .92 while the following alpha coefficients are obtained in the nine sub-scales: Independence (0.65); Integration (0.75); Motivation (0.59); Judgment (0.59); Flexibility (0.64); Evaluation (0.72); Question (0.67); Opportunities (0.65); and Frustration (0.75). The instrument is appropriate to measure teachers' creativity orientation in the classroom situation because it had undergone the process of standardization. The norm for interpreting the sub-scales is shown below.

0-10 scores indicate **No Creativity Orientation.**

11-15 scores mean Weak **Creativity Orientation.**

16-20 scores depict **Above Average Creativity Orientation.**

21-25 scores mean **Excellen**t **Creativity Orientation.**

Data Analysis: Data generated in this study are processed using the mean, standard deviation and ANOVA.

Results

The results of the study are presented in tables 1-6 below.

TABLE 1: CREATIVIVITY ORIENTATION OF SAMPLED LECTURERS AT UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

S/N	Independence	Integration	Motivation	Judgment	Flexibility	Evaluation	Question	Opportunities	Frustration	$\bar{x}$	SD
1	16	17	18	19	15	18	21	19	24	19.55	2.70
2	19	22	18	19	23	16	24	21	21	20.33	2.55
3	11	21	21	18	20	14	23	23	14	18.33	4.36
4	22	23	23	22	24	24	23	23	24	23.11	0.78
5	21	25	19	21	20	19	23	20	25	21.44	2.35
6	18	19	16	15	17	19	19	17	18	17.55	1.42
7	19	20	16	20	25	19	23	24	23	21.00	2.92

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

8	21	23	19	18	21	23	20	17	24	20.47	2.40
9	24	20	18	23	17	20	19	23	20	20.44	2.40
10	17	18	24	20	19	19	25	18	25	20.56	3.20
$\bar{X}$	18.80	20.8	19.20	19.50	20.1	19.10	22.00	20.50	21.80		
SD	3.65	2.49	2.69	2.27	2.25	2.92	2.10	2.67	3.58		

Table 1 shows ideographic creativity orientation scores of the participants at horizontal level and nomothetic creativity orientation scores vertically with the mean and standard deviation.

TABLE 2: CREATIVIVITY ORIENTATION OF SAMPLED LECTURERS AT LADOKE AKINTOLA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, OGBOMOSO

S/N	Independence	Integration	Motivation	Judgment	Flexibility	Evaluation	Question	Opportunities	Frustration	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	21	25	25	21	23	25	25	19	25	23.22	2.33
2	15	25	20	20	23	19	24	24	25	21.67	3.39
3	19	25	23	20	24	20	21	22	22	21.78	1.99
4	18	22	19	18	20	17	18	20	16	18.67	1.80
5	20	24	19	22	25	18	18	18	19	20.33	2.69
6	17	25	25	23	23	22	25	25	25	23.33	2.64
7	23	23	25	23	23	18	25	24	24	23.11	2.09
8	09	22	22	09	21	16	24	25	25	19.22	6.39
9	18	25	19	17	24	22	23	23	23	21.56	2.83
10	2	21	2	21	21	17	21	18	19	19.78	1.48
$\bar{X}$	18.00	23.70	21.70	19.40	22.70	19.4	22.40	21.80	21.70		
SD	3.86	1,57	2.63	4.14	1.57	2.84	2.76	2.82	2.91		

Table 2 describes ideographic creativity orientation scores of the participants at horizontal level and nomothetic creativity orientation scores vertically with the mean and standard deviation.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

TABLE 3: CREATIVITY ORIENTATION OF SAMPLED LECTURERS AT FEDERAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (SPECIAL), OYO

S/N	Independence	Integration	Motivation	Judgment	Flexibility	Evaluation	Question	Opportunities	Frustration	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	18	19	22	17	20	15	17	19	19	18.44	2.00
2	21	25	21	23	20	18	18	20	21	20.77	2.22
3	17	20	20	18	15	19	18	22	24	19.22	2.68
4	22	16	14	15	16	16	16	16	18	16.55	2.29
5	15	20	16	22	16	18	22	23	21	19.22	3.03
6	23	21	18	23	24	18	22	20	25	21.55	2.51
7	22	24	19	22	20	20	21	21	25	21.55	1.94
8	18	19	20	19	18	16	22	19	18	18.77	1.64
9	21	23	17	20	16	16	23	17	17	18.88	2.89
10	20	19	19	18	19	20	20	20	18	21.44	0.83
$\bar{X}$	19.70	20.70	18.60	19.7	18.4	17.60	19.90	19.70	20.60		
SD	2.45	2.87	2.41	2.75	2.76	1.78	2.47	2.11	3.10		

Table 3 depicts ideographic creativity orientation scores of the participants at horizontal level and nomothetic creativity orientation scores vertically with the mean and standard deviation.

TABLE 4: CREATIVITY ORIENTATION OF SAMPLED LECTURERS AT OYO STATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, LANLATE

S/N	Independence	Integration	Motivation	Judgment	Flexibility	Evaluation	Question	Opportunities	Frustration	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	19	22	18	22	21	23	20	22	25	21.33	3.12
2	20	22	21	20	19	14	16	23	23	19.78	3.07
3	16	18	18	20	18	17	17	20	16	17.78	1.48
4	17	19	21	19	21	17	24	22	25	20.56	2.83

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

5	14	21	25	15	21	14	20	24	24	19.78	4.41
6	22	22	20	20	20	23	23	21	23	21.56	1.33
7	15	18	22	17	21	14	21	17	22	18.56	3.05
8	19	26	22	20	21	18	21	22	18	20.67	2.24
9	20	21	25	18	20	24	18	23	21	21.44	2.65
10	22	18	20	22	15	16	23	20	24	20.0	3.12
$\bar{X}$	18.40	20.90	21.20	19.30	19.70	18.20	20.30	21.50	22.10		
SD	2.79	2.56	2.44	2.16	1.95	4.25	2.67	2.07	2.99		

Table 4 indicates ideographic creativity orientation scores of the participants at horizontal level and nomothetic creativity orientation scores vertically with the mean and standard deviation.

TABLE 5: VARIATION IN THE CREATIVITY ORIENTATION SUB-SCALES BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Independence	Between Groups	66.275	3	22.092	1.317	.284
	Within Groups	603.700	36	16.769		
	Total	669.975	39			
Integration	Between Groups	67.700	3	22.567	4.018	.015
	Within Groups	202.200	36	5.617		
	Total	269.900	39			
Motivation	Between Groups	37.475	3	12.492	.767	.520
	Within Groups	586.500	36	16.292		
	Total	623.975	39			
Judgment	Between Groups	.875	3	.292	.034	.992
	Within Groups	311.100	36	8.642		

	Total	311.975	39			
Flexibility	Between Groups	97.475	3	32.492	5.329	.004
	Within Groups	219.500	36	6.097		
	Total	316.975	39			
Evaluation	Between Groups	22.275	3	7.425	.841	.480
	Within Groups	317.700	36	8.825		
	Total	339.975	39			
Question	Between Groups	45.700	3	15.233	2.412	.083
	Within Groups	227.400	36	6.317		
	Total	273.100	39			
Opportunities	Between Groups	26.500	3	8.833	1.496	.232
	Within Groups	212.600	36	5.906		
	Total	239.100	39			
Frustration	Between Groups	17.400	3	5.800	.554	.649
	Within Groups	377.000	36	10.472		
	Total	394.400	39			

Table 5 shows statistical variation on the overall performance on the nine indices/sub-scales of creativity orientation by the participants.

HYPOTHESIS

H_o: There is no significant difference in the creativity fostering mean score in the four institutions of learning

Hi: At least, one of the four institutions creativity fostering mean score is significantly different from others.

TABLE 6: HYPOTHESIS TESTING

ANOVA

CREATIVITY FOSTERING MEAN SCORE					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	94.186	3	31.395	1.264265	.835
Within Groups	8840.411	356	24.83262		
Total	8934.597	359			

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

Decision: Both the f statistics value of 1.264265 which is less than the tabulated f at 3,356 degrees of freedom and the significant value of 0.835 which is greater than the alpha value suggest the acceptance of the null hypothesis and it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the creativity fostering mean score in the four tertiary institutions of learning in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Discussion

Discussion of results begins with an attempt to answer the research question which states that: Is there significant difference in creativity orientation mean score of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria? Results of the data collected as shown in tables 1 -4 show the idiographic and nomothetic dimensions of the respondents according to their institutions. For instance, in trying to ascertain the overall creative behavior of the second lecturer in each of the four institutions, the difference is very marginal in their respective scores $(\bar{X} = 20.33, SD = 2.55, \bar{X} = 21.67, SD = 3.39, \bar{X} = 20.77, SD = 2.22, \bar{X} = 19.78, SD = 3.07)$. This shows that the lecturers manifested a great deal of creativity orientation in their teaching careers. This confirms the submission of Nwanshak, et al (2021) that when personnel are energetic, flexible, fluent, risk-takers and motivated by challenges, creativity would be the outcome.

Apart from an individual's overall creative orientation, the results also showed how the lecturers performed on each criterion measure of creative teaching. For example, participants in three institutions were above average in encouraging students to learn independently while those in the fourth institution exhibited excellent performance $(\bar{X} = 18.80, SD = 3.65, \bar{X} = 18.00, SD = 3.86, \bar{X} = 19.70, SD = 2.45, \bar{X} = 18.40, SD = 2.79)$. Whereas, in using questions to foster creativity in students, the lecturers in three institutions were superb while the remaining one was above average $(\bar{X} = 22.00, SD = 2.10, \bar{X} = 22.40, SD = 2.76, \bar{X} = 19.90, SD = 2.47, \bar{X} = 20.30, SD = 2.67)$. .

Table 5 further explains the overall statistical variation of the nine sub-scales (or indices) of lecturers' creativity orientation are shown in table 5. This becomes more explicit because it shows the overall performance of all the participants on each sub-scale. . Precisely, both the f statistics value of 4.018, 5.329 for (integration and flexibility) respectively which is greater than the tabulated f at 3,36 degrees of freedom and the significant value of 0.015, 0.004 which is less than the alpha value suggest some differentials but remarkable performance across the four institutions' creativity orientation mean score (integration and flexibility. However, putting all other things into consideration, there is no significant difference in the overall performance. The finding was corroborated by Hayati, et al (2022) that observed that demographic factor, individual factor and organizational factor influence teachers' creative teaching.

Results of the hypothesis prove that the null hypothesis is upheld while the alternative hypothesis rejected. Results from table 6 shows that both the f statistics value of 1.26426 which is less than the tabulated f at 3,356 degrees of freedom and the significant value of

.835 suggest the acceptance of the null hypothesis ,and it was concluded that none of the four institutions' creativity orientation mean score was statistically significant. That is, in spite of the observed difficulties faced by lecturers in tertiary institutions (Jacob, et al 2022), it is commendable that the lectures were very resourceful and creative. This is at variance with the submission of Wahsheh (2017) that lack of creativity and resourcefulness by faculty members of Najran university in Saudi Arabia.

Recommendations

The following are recommended based on the findings in the study:

1. Creativity orientation (or creativity teaching skills) be incorporated in teacher education.
2. Regular in-service workshops on creativity orientation be organized for lecturers.
3. Staff recruitment, promotion and appointment into positions should be seen to be based on merit.
4. Employers of labour should ensure that lecturers are motivated and job-satisfied.
5. Work environment should be conducive and appealing to the lecturers instead of being saturated with bias, apprehension, hostility and insecurity.
6. There should be adequate facilities and amenities that can enhance lecturers' productivity.
7. There should be provision for frequent healthy competitions where lecturers can cross-fertilize ideas.
8. There must be a culture of recognition, reward and award to outstanding and/or creative lecturers.

Conclusion

The object of teaching (lecturing) is to make learners discover themselves, rational, assertive, productive and self-independent. And, since lecturers employ creative teaching skills to achieve this, they must be well-grounded in creativity orientation. This is because the age-long systems of "parroting" and "regurgitation" are becoming irrelevant and counter-productive in the new dispensation. Without mincing words, lecturers in Oyo State tertiary institutions are not lacking in creative behavior. Therefore, it is a misconception that lecturers in tertiary institutions are deficient in creativity orientation, though there is room for improvement. It is therefore necessary that school administrators, policy-makers and education ministries prioritize creative teaching skills at all levels of education by exposing the teaching staff to the rudiments of creativity orientation because of its personal, institutional, social and economic advantages in the short and long-run.

References

Akinboye, J. O. (2003). *Creativity, innovation ad success*. Ibadan: CFYO. Behavior Services Ltd.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]

Apak, J., Taat, M. S. & Suki, N. M. (2021). Measuring teacher creativity - Nurturing behavior and readiness for 21st century classroom management. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education*, 17 (3): 52-67.

Creative Thinking Organizations. (2024). What are 4P's in creativity?. https://en.m.wikipedia.org.

Cropley, A. J. (1997). Fostering creativity in the classroom: General principles. In M.A. Runco (Ed). *Creativity Research Handbook* (1. pp. 83-114). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton press

Han, W. & Abdrahim, N. A. (2023). The role of teachers' creativity in higher institutions: A systematic literature review and guidance for future research, *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 48, https://doi.org/10.1016/j..tcs.2023.101302.

Hayati, A. Mistima, M. S. & Sofwan. M. M. (2022). Factors influecing teachers' creative teaching: A systematic review. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences,17 (1): 250-264.

Ibeh, L. T., Ibeh, J. I. & Kaine, O. F. (2023). creativity and innovation thinking in tertiary institutions: A panacea for sustainable development. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 24 (2b): 335-339.

IProject. (2024). The importance of critical thinking and creative thinking in educational system in Nigeria. iproject@gmail.com. *Researchgate*.

Jacob, O. N., Jegede, D. & Musa, A. (2022). Problems facing academic staff in Nigerian universities and the way forward. *International Journal of Integrated Science*, 4 (1): 230-241.

Mao, J., Chen, J., Ling, Y. & Huebner, E. (2020). Impact of teachers' leadership on creative tendency: Role of goal-orietation. Creativity Research Journal, 32 (#): 228-236.

Nwanshak, M. B., Ochigbo, S. E. & Beetseh, K. (2021). Innovation and creativity in tertiary institutions in Nigeria,: The role of entrepreneurship education. *The Intuition*, 9 (1): 1-13.

Obialo, F. K. (2020). Fostering creativity and innovation for business success among Nigerian university students: general principles. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 7 (10): 459-470.

Olawale, S. G. (2008). Predictive value of teachers' creativity fostering behaviour: Do Nigerian teachers foster creativity in students as their Chinese counterparts? *National Association of Science, Humanities and Education Research Journal,* 6 (2): 267-276.

Padaychie, K. (2023). Creative education. www.google.com

Rubenstein, D. J. (2000). Stimulating children's creativity and curiosity: Does content and medium matter? *Journal of Creative Behaviour*, 34, pp 1, 1-17.

Son, N. T. & Nguyen, Q. N. (2023). Factors affecting the creativity of young lecturers. International Journal of Professional Bussiness Review, 8, (6): 1-14.

Son, N. T. & Nguyen, Q. N. (2023). Factors affecting the creativity of young lecturers. International Journal of Professional Bussiness Review, 8, (6): 1-14.

Times. (2023). Creativity in the classroom: Teaching and fostering creativity. https://timesinternational.net.

Wahsheh, R. A., (2017). Difficulties in applying creative thinking skills in teaching from the perspectives of faculty members in Najran University, Saudi Arabia. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5 (4): 409-419.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Prof. A.I. Mteiye [MALAWI]