Personality, hypomania, intelligence and creativity
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Abstract

This study examined the relationship between fluid intelligence, the Big Five traits, hypomania and three measures of creativity: Divergent Thinking fluency, Self-rated creativity and the Biographical Inventory of Creative Behaviours (BICB). One hundred and twenty eight sixth-form students took part. Fluid intelligence was found to be positively associated with DT fluency, but unrelated to both Self-rated creativity and the BICB. Hypomanic traits were significantly correlated to all three creativity criteria. The combination of hypomanic traits and fluid intelligence demonstrated the strongest association with DT fluency, accounting for 11% of the variance. Hypomania was the best predictor of Self-rated creativity accounting for 17% of the variance. The Big Five accounted for incremental validity of 5–8% depending on the creativity measure used.
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1. Introduction

More than 60 definitions of creativity can be found in the psychological literature (Taylor, 1988). There is no single, authoritative definition of creativity, nor is there a standardized measurement technique or agreed upon set of valid measures. Several attempts have been made...
to develop a Creativity Quotient (CQ) of an individual similar to the Intelligence Quotient (IQ), however these have generally been unsuccessful (Plucker & Renzulli, 1999). This difficulty has been attributed in part to the lack of objectivity in assessing creativity hence rendering a widely accepted standardized measure problematic to develop.

Nevertheless, the production of an idea or product that is both novel and useful is commonly accepted as a core characteristic of creativity (Barron, 1955; Mumford, 2003). Various researchers have argued that the theoretical perspective of the creativity researcher will generally define how they attempt to assess the construct (Batey, 2007; Runco, 2004). Those that emphasise a person-centered view of creativity usually assess creativity with reference to personal attributes, like intelligence or personality (e.g. Guilford, 1950). There are also those who see creativity in an almost pathological light, i.e. as a result of unusual personality processes (Eysenck, 1993, 1995). Those who emphasise a process-centered view will often assess creativity with reference to thought-processes like problem-solving (Mednick, 1962), and those emphasising the role of the environment concentrate on the circumstances in which creativity arises (Simonton, 1977, 1984).

Creativity is definitely multi-faceted and there is increasing consensus amongst researchers that creativity in the individual will be reliant upon multiple components (Amabile, 1983, 1996; Eysenck, 1993, 1995; Guilford, 1950; Woodman & Schoenfeldt, 1989). These components include cognitive ability, personality factors, cognitive style, motivation, knowledge and the environment, both as a source of stimulation (Dodds, Smith, & Ward, 2002; Moss, 2002) and evaluation (Runco, 2004). The interaction between components and environment necessary for creative performance in different domains is necessarily complex. As a result, to examine trait or cognitive ability correlates in isolation could be misleading and lead to unreplicable results (Batey, 2007). Thus, the use of multiple tests of the different criteria of creativity is thought necessary to try and capture its many nuances. It does appear though that despite the complexity and number of variables involved there is surprisingly high agreement on individual differences correlates of creativity (Batey, 2007).

This study will use divergent thinking tests as measures of creativity. They have been demonstrated to consistently predict who will produce novel and useful products (Batey, 2007; Guilford, 1950, 1967). Defined as testing the ability to generate a wide range of ideas, divergent thinking is a construct thought to include components such as fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration (Runco, 1991; Torrance, 1974). They are usually assessed quantitatively which incorporates fluency, or alternatively using the Consensual Assessment Technique (CAT) in which judges subjectively rate the products. Studies in the 1980s have revealed DT to be a measure of creative intelligence (Batey & Furnham, submitted for publication, in press), although some are prone to linguistic bias (Plucker, 1999). The tests themselves “require individuals to produce several responses to a specific prompt, in sharp contrast to most standardised tests of achievement or ability that require one correct answer” (Plucker & Renzulli, 1999, p. 38).

According to Hargreaves (1927) and Thurstone (1938), the starting point for modern investigations of creativity concerned investigations of fluency as a component of intellectual ability. Hargreaves (1927) administered a battery of fluency tests finding average correlations around \( r = 0.30 \) with IQ, suggesting that fluency is related, but not identical to general intelligence (\( g \)). Guilford (1981) himself treated creativity as a subset of overall intelligence, with DT one of the intellectual factors that constituted the structure of intellect (Batey, 2007). It seems fluency is a necessary, but not sufficient, trait for achievement in creativity. Various studies have been performed (reviewed
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