

Creativity and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis

Ugur Akpur

Yildiz Technical University, Turkey

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v10no2a207

<https://doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v10no2a207>

Submitted: 05 April 2023

Accepted: 18 August 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Copyright 2023 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

Abstract

The ability to think and act creatively is significant for individuals as well as societies. Within the context of education, creativity is considered as one of most the fundamental aspects of cognitive development and thus creativity playing an important role in educational settings has drawn attention in view of its association with academic achievement. In this respect, the purpose of the current study was formed to investigate the impact of creativity on academic achievement in educational settings. To that goal, a meta-analytic approach was applied and studies published in Academic Search Ultimate Database, ERIC and SCOPUS between 2005 and 2022 were included in the analysis. The meta-analysis was solely confined to studies that provided the correlation coefficients between the variables. To this end, 18 relevant papers with a total sample size of 6846 were included in the study. The findings showed that the overall effect size was ,619 and this figure points a medium-sized effect according to the classification of effect sizes. In other words, it can be concluded that the total effect size of creativity on academic achievement is medium. The findings of study and their implications were discussed.

Keywords: Creativity, Academic Achievement, Structure of Intellect Model (SOI), Meta-analysis

Introduction

As the ability to think creatively is essential and significant for individuals along with societies (Batey & Furnham, 2006; Lucas, Venckutè, & Kampylis, 2020; Olatoye, Akintunde, & Yakasai, 2010; Sanchez-Ruiz, Hernandez-Torrano, Perez-Gonzalez, Batey, & Petrides, 2011; van Hooijdonk, Ritter, Linka, & Kroesbergen, 2022), the interest in creativity in the realm of psychology and education has a long history (Bano, Naseer, & Zainab, 2014; Hansenne & Legrand, 2012; Swanzy-Impraim, Morris, Lummis, & Jones, 2022). Despite being an elusive as well as an evolving

concept (Swanzy-Impraim, et al., 2022) and the lack of consensus on its definition, which is claimed to impede its development (Acar, Burnett, & Cabra, 2017), creativity is taken to mean the production of ideas that are different from those of others, in order to develop and produce distinct ideas (Guilford, 1967; Torrance, 1974), to develop sensitivity to problems and look for solutions to them (Torrance, 1974); the tendency to produce something new and valuable (Amabile, 1988; Martin & Wilson, 2017); to be willing to try new things (Montgomery, Bull, & Baloché, 1993); to generate unique, helpful and practical ideas (Martindale, 1989) and to appreciate both uncertainty and ambiguity (Lucas et al., 2020).

Guilford's contribution to the field with his three-dimensional Structure of Intellect Model (SOI), has allowed researchers to examine the multifaceted nature of creativity. The model is important in terms of making important implications to the literature and making the distinction between convergent and divergent thinking, which is mostly used to explain creative thinking (Simon, & Bock, 2016; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2001). The distinction that Guilford made between convergent and divergent thinking formed the basis of most theories of creativity and led to the development of many measurement tools. (Eysenck, 1993; Guilford, 1967; Runco, 2013). Convergent thinking is a type of thinking that aims at obtaining the best, most accurate answer or solution to a clearly defined and stated question or problem. This way of thinking, therefore, follows the method in which a ready-made answer is available and it is mostly recalled from stored information (Akers, 2008; Cropley, 2006; Razumnikova, 2013). Divergent thinking, on the other hand, is a thinking process that is based on the assumption that only one answer may not be the correct response to any problem and is used to generate many different and diverse ideas (Giancola, Palmiero, & D'Amico, 2022; Lu, Luo, & Yang, 2021; Paek, Alabbasi, Acar, & Runco, 2021).

Although it is necessary to employ both divergent and convergent thinking to make creativity functional, since any creative action, whatever its nature, will result in a decision-making process (Lu et al., 2021; Cropley, 2006), divergent thinking focuses on generating a large number of appropriate and unique alternative responses and is, therefore, often associated with creativity, involving the generation of multiple, diverse, original or unusual ideas in response to an open-ended questions (Guilford, 1967; Javaid & Pandarakalam, 2021; Özaşkın & Bacanak, 2016; Roberts et al., 2021; Runco, 2013). Torrance expanded on the concept of divergent thinking by adding an extra component called elaboration and he created one of the most well-known tests of creative thinking using these components - Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) (Lucas et al., 2020). Amabile (2012) proposed the componential theory of creativity which includes "three components within the individual-domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant processes, and

intrinsic task motivation--and one component outside the individual-the social environment in which the individual is working” (p. 2).

Within the context of education, creativity is considered as one of most the fundamental aspects of cognitive development and according to Bloom’s revised taxonomy, creativity in particular has been designated as the ultimate cognitive activity (Rojas, 2015). Therefore, creativity playing an important role in educational settings, has drawn attention in view of its association with academic achievement. The study sparking the interest in creativity and academic achievement was that of Getzels and Jackson’s (1962). In their research, they compared a group of pupils who performed better on IQ tests with those who performed well on Guilford’s creativity tests. They discovered that highly creative pupils outperformed the ones with high IQ in scholastic accomplishment tests (Ai, 1999). A response to this assumption, Torrance developed a hypothesis based on Anderson’s (1960) threshold theory and he contended that IQ would have an influence on academic accomplishment up to a particular IQ level (about 120), beyond which additional increases in IQ would have no effect, but creativity would begin to have an effect (Ai, 1999; Weiss, Steger, Schroeders, & Wilhelm, 2020). However, Karwowski and Gralewski (2013), taking into account their findings, argue it is philosophically and practically questionable to believe that once one reaches a certain level of intellect, intelligence loses its value for creativity.

Academic achievement and creativity may engage in a complicated and unpredictable relationship. As Bentley (1966) points out, although creativity was once thought to be synonymous with intelligence and, as a result, was included in the amount of capability represented by an IQ assessment, later on it was asserted that intelligence and creative ability do not always have to be attached to each other. As creative thinking includes the capacity to think outside the box, produce original ideas, and approach issues in novel ways, while academic achievement, on the other hand, is often measured by how well a learner performs on standardized examinations, at first look, academic success and creativity might seem to be mutually exclusive. Furthermore, to Chamorro-Premuzic, (2006) as the concept itself has not received adequate priority in educational settings, despite its significance and long history, it has long been theoretical and hypothetical predictor of achievement. However, subsequently, it is asserted that since learners who think and act creatively are more likely to experiment with various ideas, perspectives, and approaches, encouraging students’ creativity has emerged as a crucial educational concern in many nations (Asuk, 2020; Bolandifar & Noordin, 2013).

In this sense, numerous studies, examining the link between creativity and academic achievement yield contradictory findings. While some of them have confirmed the significant relationship between creativity and academic

achievement (Abedini; 2021; Anwar, Aness, Khizar, Naseer, Muhammad, 2012; Asuk, 2020; Ayverdi, Asker, Aydın, & Sarıtaş, 2012; Bano et al., 2014; Chauhan & Sharma, 2017; De la Pena Alvarez, 2019; Kim, 2020; Naderi, Abdullah, Aizan, Sharir, & Kumar, 2010; Nami, Marsooli, & Ashouri, 2014; Ospid, Raesi, & İrani, 2020; Pastor & David, 2017; Prakoso, Ramdani, Tae, & Riandika, 2020; Rindermann & Neubauer, 2004; Safarieh, 2020; Surapuramath, 2014; Zirak & Ahmadian, 2015), some others have reported that the link between them is insignificant or too weak to be evaluated (Arya & Maurya, 2016; Candrasekaran, 2013; Gajda, 2016; Gogoi, 2017; Olatoye, Akintunde & Ogunsanya, 2010; Zabelina, Condon, & Beeman, 2014; Zokae, Baghbanian, & Abbas Nejad, 2020).

It is worth highlighting that the studies conducted to examine the relationship between creativity and academic achievement have revealed contradictory findings and thus make it unlikely to draw broad conclusions regarding the afore-mentioned association. It seems clear that researchers have not yet come to an agreement on how creativity and academic success are interdependent. Therefore, a meta-analysis conducted on the relationship between creativity and academic achievement can be considered as a need in that it provides a kind of consensus in the field as a result of the fact that individual research focusing on the relationship may yield conflicting and contradictory results. A thorough synthesis of the available information might be achieved using a meta-analysis, allowing us to spot associations and patterns spanning many studies. A meta-analysis may also produce a more thorough and statistically strong study by merging data from numerous sources, improving the accuracy and generalizability of the results. Furthermore, fostering creativity while upholding high academic standards requires the development of successful educational practices, which depend on knowledge of the relationship between creativity and academic success. Additionally, meta-analyses can be used to investigate prospective moderators that could affect the association between creativity and academic achievement. Researchers can learn more about the contextual variables that may influence outcomes by looking at different sample parameters, such as age categories, cultural origins, or evaluation techniques. In this way, researchers can evaluate the potential generalization of results throughout various groups, backgrounds, and educational settings using meta-analyses, which will increase their validity. In addition, findings from meta-analyses can be useful for policymakers, instructors, and practitioners because they offer a strong basis for making decisions about educational methods. Understanding how creativity affects academic performance can help educators build instructional strategies and instructional designs that encourage both creativity and academic achievement. Furthermore, researching this link assists educators in

recognizing and encouraging learners who might have difficulty with traditional academic techniques but have talents for creative abilities.

Against the backdrop of outcomes that are contradictory or ambiguous as a consequence of different sample sizes, techniques, and environmental variables, the purpose of the present study is to help scientifically clarify the link between these two concepts through a review of the literature. It is thought that further consideration and insights are necessary to apprehend the concept's multidimensional nature, and a more thorough view is required to make the relationship more explicit and to comprehend to what extent creativity affects academic achievement in light of the previous studies. Furthermore, the scarcity of scientific research examining the aforesaid association in a holistic way is also another rationale for the research. Therefore, the goal of the current study is to identify the overall effect size of the relationship between creativity and academic achievement. To this end, it is believed that examining a number of studies that analyze the relationship between the specified variables in a more thorough and precise manner will result in a better comprehension of the association. Therefore, in order to offer a holistic and comprehensive perspective as well as a reliable generalization and to interpret the data from several studies conducted in different contexts, the meta-analysis method, which makes it possible to compile data from numerous populations, was applied in the current study. Within this context, the answer to the following question emerged as the goal of the current study: What is the effect level of creativity on academic achievement?

Method

A meta-analytic approach was applied in this study with the aim of synthesizing the findings from several different research studies. The method allows us to compile the data from previous research in order to reach a more reliable and valid overall conclusion. In this methodology, numerous studies that focus on the same subject matter are accumulated to obtain more comprehensive, accurate, valid, and unbiased generalizations (Dinçer, 2014; Gogtay & Thatte, 2017).

Data Collection

The related studies in the academic databases were located and scanned after an extensive and meticulous search process. For this purpose, the research studies published in Academic Search Ultimate Database, ERIC, and SCOPUS between 2005 and 2022 were scrutinized. In the first step of the study eligibility, the keyword phrases "creativity, creative thinking, creative behavior, academic achievement, academic success, academic performance, GPA (Grade Point Average)" were searched. The related articles were further scanned based on the following criteria: (1) the studies conducted in

quantitative methods; (2) the studies that provided the correlation coefficients between creativity and academic achievement; (3) the studies that specified the correlation coefficients that could be converted into r (studies presenting the regression analysis or experimental research patterns were excluded); (4) the studies that were published between 2005 and 2022 in a peer-reviewed journal (thesis and reviews were not considered and excluded); (5) the studies that were written in English and Turkish or provided required information in the abstract; (6) the studies that had open-access option and accessible through academic databases were included in the study. Figure 1 below illustrates the process of literature review and coding.




Figure 1. The flowchart of literature review

The data from the literature review were extracted through meticulous and detailed analysis of each research study. Firstly, the titles and abstracts of the relevant studies were examined and assessed in accordance with the specified inclusion and exclusion criteria. After this step, the articles were analyzed to determine whether they reported the correlation coefficients between creativity and academic achievement. A total of 441 studies were excluded as they failed to meet the required criteria. Finally, 18 publications were decided to be convenient for the purpose of the current study. Table 1

demonstrates the studies included in the meta-analysis along with their publication date, correlation coefficients, sample size, and tools of data collection.

Table 1. Studies included in the meta-analysis

Study	Date	r	Sample size	Tools of Creativity	Tools of Academic Achievement
Abedini	2021	,22	240	Creative Behavior Inventory (Linger),	GPA
Ayverdi et al.	2012	,38	145	Scientific Creativity Test	GPA
Bano et al.	2014	,66	257	Creativity Rating Checklist (CRC)	5th Grade Promotion Examination
Baran et al.	2011	,14	80	Torrance Test of Creative Thinking – Figural Form A	Test of Early Mathematics Ability- 3 (TEMA-3)
Bernabeu-Brotos & De la Peña	2021	,12	105	PIC-A test	The Average Grade of the Course
Bolandifar & Noordin	2013	,81	100	Nicolas Holt Creativity Test (NHCT)	Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA)
Chamorro-Premuzic	2006	,16	307	Alternate Uses Test	Grades of 4-year Period
De la Pena Alvarez	2019	,31	100	Creative Imagination Test for Adults	EvAU (the university admissions test)
Desmet et al.	2021	,09	710	Test for Creative Thinking– Drawing Production (TCT-DP)	The Mean of Student’s Final Grades
Gajda	2016	,14	1106	Test of Creative Thinking—Drawing Production (TCT-DP)	GPA
Gralewski & Karwowski	2012	,07	589	Test of Creative Thinking-Drawing Production (TCT-DP)	GPA
Jaberi et al.	2014	,89	91	Khatena-Torrance Creativity Perception Inventory (KTCPI)	General English Proficiency Test
Karwowski et al.	2009	,17	1316	Test for Creative Thinking-Drawing Production TCT-DP	GPA
Olatoye et al.	2010	-,004	235	Nicolas Holt Creativity Test (NHCT)	Student Cumulative Grade Point (CGPA)

Pastor & David	2017	,42	40	Creative Attitude Survey (CAS), Two Samples Of Creativity Tests; Four Tasks of Generating Alternatives	The Mean Results of Four Subjects: Mathematics, Romanian, Geography
Saw & Han	2022	-,06	328	Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS)	GPA
Taylor et al.	2017	,02	60	Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking	GPA
Zhang et al.	2022	,34	1037	Innovative Behavior Scale	Geography Test Scores

Data Analysis

The Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA 2.2) software program was used in the present study in order to measure and perform the necessary statistical calculations of the individual and overall effect sizes of creativity on academic achievement. In order to identify the overall effect size, the following scale was used: -0,15 - 0,15 negligible; 0,15 - 0,40 small; 0,40 - 0,75 medium; 0,75 - 1,10 large; 1,10 - 1,45 very large; 1,45 - excellent (Dinçer, 2014).

While computing the effect sizes in the meta-analysis, it is suggested to decide whether to utilize a fixed effects model or a random effects model. In order to examine if there is any variation among the publications in the analysis, the heterogeneity test is supposed to be carried out. The fixed effects model is applied when the effect sizes are scattered homogeneously, while the random effects model is utilized when the effect sizes are distributed heterogeneously (Dinçer, 2014; Karagöl & Esen, 2019).

Results

Having identified the correlation coefficient of each research study, it was attempted to analyze the overall effect. Figure 2 displays the individual effect sizes of each study as well as the total effect size of the studies included in the meta-analysis.




Figure 2. The distribution of effect size values of the studies

Figure 2 displays the effect sizes for each study that was a part of the analysis, as well as the lower and upper bounds of the effect sizes within the 95% confidence interval. The data show that except for two studies (Olatoye et al., 2010 (-0,008) and Saw & Han, 2022 (-0,120)) - all the others have positive effects ranging from 0,039 to 3,871.

Following the calculation of the distribution of effect size values, the heterogeneity test, which identifies the presence of variability in the data and

specifies the heterogeneous or homogeneous characteristics of the studies in the analysis, was applied after the analysis of the individual and total effect sizes of the studies. By conducting the test, it becomes possible to decide whether to use fixed effects model or random effects model. Table 2 presents the results of the heterogeneity test.

Table 2. Heterogeneity test of the meta-analysis

Model	N	Estim.	95% CI		Z-val.	P-val.	Q-val.	df (Q)	p-val.	I-squared
			Low.L.	Up. L						
Fixed	18	0,217	0,194	0,240	18,17	0,000	393,3	17	0,00	95,678
Random	18	0,310	0,197	0,416	5,171	0,000				

The studies included in the study are characterized as heterogeneous since the Q value in the χ^2 significance table for 17 (df) is 35,719 and 393,347 is higher than this value ($p < 0,005$). Furthermore, the p value of 0,000 confirms the finding that the random effects model should be applied. Thus, the analysis was conducted applying the random-effects model in accordance with the findings. The findings showed that the overall effect size was 0,619, and this figure points to a medium-sized effect according to the classification of effect sizes. In other words, it can be concluded that the total effect size of creativity on academic achievement is medium.

Furthermore, funnel plot and Rosenthal’s Safe N methods were conducted to determine the validity and reliability, as well as the publication bias of the studies included in the meta-analysis. Figure 3 depicts the funnel plot of the collected studies’ effect sizes.




Figure 3. The funnel plot of standard errors

The funnel plot represents the relationship between the size of the study on the vertical axis and the size of the effect on the horizontal axis. The top of the graph shows large studies, which have a tendency to group together close to the mean effect size, while the bottom of the graph points to smaller

studies. The studies are distributed symmetrically around the total effect size if there is no publication bias. On the other hand, if bias exists, there is a bigger concentration of studies on one side of the mean than the other at the bottom of the plot (Borenstein, 2005). Although there are few dots beyond the funnel lines, as can be seen in Figure 3, the majority of the others have a shape that is close to symmetrical, and it can be argued that the scattering indicates that the publication bias is minimal.

Following the funnel plot analysis, the Fail-Safe N analysis was performed to determine the number of studies that must be included in the analysis that are missing before the overall effect becomes insignificant. Table 3 displays the results of the analysis.

Table 3. Classic fail-safe N analysis

Z-value for observed studies	16,60
p-value for observed studies	0,00
Alpha	0,05
Z for alpha	1,95
Number of observed studies	18
Numb. of missing studies to bring p-value to > alpha	1274

The results of the fail-safe N analysis in Table 3 show that the p value (0,00) is lower than the alpha value (0,05), suggesting that the analysis' publication bias is admissible. Further, the table also demonstrates that, in order to invalidate the results of the current meta-analysis, 1274 additional non-significant studies are needed in order to raise the p value over the alpha value.

Discussion

The present meta-analysis synthesizes the data from previous research examining the relationship between creativity and academic achievement. The analysis comprised papers published between 2005 and 2022 in the Academic Search Ultimate Database, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and SCOPUS, with a total sample size of 6846. Following the heterogeneity test, the analysis was carried out using the random effects model, and the total effect size was found to be $r = 0,619$ across 18 studies, corresponding to a medium effect size.

The finding that creativity had a total impact size of $r = 0,619$, which is a medium effect size, highlights a significant and significant association between creativity and the variable under study. A medium effect size implies a strong correlation between the two variables, indicating that creativity has a significant impact on the final outcome. The moderate impact size reveals there is a proportionate enhancement in performance as creativity levels rise. Such a finding has significant ramifications for a number of areas, including learning, the field of psychology, and educational development.

This finding is consistent with earlier studies that consistently demonstrated a positive correlation between creativity and the variable being studied. That the link between creativity and academic achievement is noteworthy can also be evidenced in Gajda, Karwowski, and Beghetto's (2017) meta-analysis, in which the average correlation was found to be $r = .22$. The findings also confirm the results of many studies, indicating a positive and significant link between the two variables (Anwar et al., 2012; Asuk, 2020; Naderi et al., 2010; Nami et al., 2014; Ospid et al., 2020; Surapuramath, 2014). However, there are those whose findings yield negative and mostly non-significant relationships (Arya & Maurya, 2016; Gajda, 2016; Olatoye et al., 2010; Zabelina et al., 2014). The contradictory results among the studies highlight the sophisticated and multifaceted nature of creativity as well as the complex representation of the relationships.

The considerable effect size of creativity suggests that promoting and supporting creativity may have a significant effect on the relevant variable. This implies that integrating creative thinking and activities into the curriculum in educational settings may enhance students' academic performance, problem-solving abilities, and general cognitive development. Additionally, encouraging creativity among staff members may improve inventiveness, problem-solving abilities, and adaptation within the learning system.

What should also be noted is that the search for moderators could be important due to the heterogeneity of effect size values in the current study. Many factors are thought to have an impact on the alleged relationship between creativity and academic achievement, and heterogeneity may result from these variables. Hence, it could make remarkable differences to take into account any potential influences on the correlation between creativity and academic achievement such as cultural backgrounds, age, gender, size of the sample, assessment criteria for academic performance or success, data collection tools to measure creativity, characteristics of the participants, various pedagogical approaches, schools' climate, even dynamics of the classrooms and teacher manners (Gajda et al., 2017b), and so forth, suggesting that additional moderating factors might be involved and might have a role in terms of the association. Furthermore, the link between creativity and the result may be influenced by various factors, and it is important to remember that effect sizes do not indicate causality. To examine possible moderating factors and better comprehend the processes behind this association, more study is required.

In short, it should be mentioned that creativity serves as a crucial key component for learning, future careers, and even continuous development (Zhang et al., 2022) and is a natural part of learning. Creativity promotes deep cognitive processes since creativity requires broad knowledge and the

appropriate use of information (Patston, 2021). The results of the current meta-analysis allow us to draw the conclusion that encouraging creativity in educational settings will result in an upsurge in academic achievement.

The findings of the current research highlight valuable insights to consider in terms of creativity. For one thing, creativity is a multi-faceted construct that needs a methodical and systematic understanding in educational settings. As Runco (2008) states, when given the opportunity, students can generate their own unique and original interpretations. Therefore, the curriculum, along with educators and policymakers, should support it and provide adequate opportunities for students to have the chance to contemplate vague, open-ended assignments and projects that do not require merely memorizing and rote learning. What is required for this is to nurture children's natural talents and potential.

Conclusion

It is determined that a thorough consideration and insights to comprehend the concept's multifaceted nature as well as a more detailed view to make the relationship more explicit in light of the previous studies have been acquired in the present study, whose overall aim is to synthesize the findings from numerous research studies that examined the relationship between creativity and academic achievement. The analysis has been carried out with the necessary steps of meta-analysis. The result of the analysis, showing that the overall effect size was 0,619, has revealed that creativity has a medium-sized effect on academic achievement. In light of the findings, it can be concluded that creativity as a concept itself has a significant role in learning as well as in educational settings. As a whole, the study's medium impact size emphasizes how crucial creativity is in the realm of academic achievement. The incorporation of creativity as an important talent into several facets of education and school life may have significant advantages and lead to favorable outcomes.

Study limitations

The present study is undoubtedly subject to certain limitations. To begin with, the research studies in the meta-analysis were chosen using a specific statistical procedure: the correlation coefficients. Therefore, it would be advisable to take into account the studies examining the mentioned link between the variables using a different method for future studies. Furthermore, while gathering relevant studies from databases, it is probable that certain papers that should have been included in the meta-analysis were ignored or misvalued by the researcher unintentionally.

Funding Statement: The authors did not obtain any funding for this research.

Data Availability: All the data are included in the content of the paper.

Conflict of Interest: The authors reported no conflict of interest.

References:

1. Abedini, Y. (2021). Personality traits as predictor of metacognitive skills and creativity in electronic university students: a structural model of academic achievement. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(4), 1340-1354. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2021-0088>
2. Acar, S., Burnett, C., & Cabra, J. F. (2017). Ingredients of Creativity: Originality and more. *Creativity Research Journal*, 29(2), 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2017.1302776>
3. Ai, X. (1999). Creativity and academic achievement: An investigation of gender differences. *Creativity Research Journal*, 4, 329-337. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1204_11
4. Akers, T. W. (2008). Divergent thinking. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational psychology*, Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
5. Amabile, T. M. (2012). *Componential theory of creativity*. (Working Paper No. 12-096). Harvard Business School.
6. Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 123–167. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
7. Anwar, M. N., Aness, M., Khizar, A., Naseer, M., Muhammad, G. (2012). Relationship of creative thinking with the academic achievements of secondary school students. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(3), 44-47.
8. Arya, M., & Maurya, S. (2016). Relationship between creativity, intelligence and academic achievement among school going children. *Studies on Home and Community Science*, 10, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09737189.2016.11885359>.
9. Asuk, U. W. (2020). Students' creativity and their academic performances in science subjects: Implications for educational evaluation. *British Journal of Education*, 8(10), 1-13.
10. Ayverdi, L., Asker, E., Aydın, S. Ö., & Sarıtaş, T. (2012). Determination of the relationship between elementary students' scientific creativity and academic achievement in science and technology courses. *Elementary Education Online*, 11(3), 646-659.

11. Bano, A., Naseer, N., & Zainab. (2014). Creativity and academic performance of primary school children. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 34(2), 597-606.
12. Baran, G., Erdoğan, S., & Çakmak, A. (2011). A Study on the Relationship between Six-Year-Old Children's Creativity and Mathematical Ability. *International Education Studies*, 4, 105-111.
13. Batey, M., & Furnham, A. (2006). Creativity, intelligence and personality: A critical review of the scattered literature. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 132(4), 355-429.
14. Bentley, J. C. (1966). Creativity and academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 59 (6), 269-272.
15. Bernabeu-Brotons E., & De la Peña, C. (2021). Creatividad en educación superior: Estudio exploratorio con función ejecutiva y rendimiento académico. *Profesorado* 25, 313–330. [https://doi: 10.30827/profesorado.v25i3.9546](https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v25i3.9546)
16. Bolandifar, S., & Noordin, N. (2013). Investigating the Relationship between Creativity and Academic Achievement of Malaysian Undergraduates. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 65(2), 101-107. doi.org/10.11113/jt.v65.2355
17. Borenstein, M. (2005). Software for publication bias. In H.R. Rothstein, A.J. Sutton and M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis – prevention, assessment and adjustments*, New York: John Wiley & Sons
18. Candrasekaran, S. (2013). Creativity and academic achievement of higher secondary school students in Tamilnadu. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 3(8), 32-36.
19. Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2006). Creativity versus conscientiousness: Which is a better predictor of student performance? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20(4), 521–531. doi.org/10.1002/acp.1196
20. Chauhan, S., & Sharma, A. (2017). A study of relationship between creativity and academic achievement among public and private school students in both the gender. *International Journal of Science Technology and Management*, 6(1), 39-45.
21. Cropley, A. (2006). In praise of convergent thinking. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18 (3), 391-404
22. De la Peña Álvarez, C. (2019). Importance of creativity and learning in preservice teachers. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 17(48), 267–294. doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v17i48.2246
23. Desmet, O. A., van Weerdenburg, M., Poelman, M., Hoogeveen, L., & Yang, Y. (2021). Validity and utility of the Test of Creative Thinking-Drawing Production for Dutch adolescents. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 32(3), 267–290. doi.org/10.1177/1932202X21990099

24. Dinçer, S. (2014). *Eğitim bilimlerinde uygulamalı meta-analiz*. Pegem Akademi.
25. Eysenck, H. J. (1993). Creativity and personality: Suggestions for a theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4(3), 147-178.
26. Gajda, A. (2016). The relationship between school achievement and creativity at different educational stages. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 19, 246–259. doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2015.12.004
27. Gajda, A., Karwowski, M., & Beghetto, R. A. (2017). Creativity and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(2), 269– 299. doi.org/10.1037/edu0000133
28. Gajda, A., Beghetto, R. A., & Karwowski, M. (2017b). Exploring creative learning in the classroom: A multi-method approach. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 24, 250–267.
29. Giancola, M., Palmiero, M., & D’Amico, S. (2022). Exploring the interplay between fluid intelligence and creativity: The mediating role of the field-dependent-independent cognitive style. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 45, 101047.
30. Gogoi, B. (2017). Impact of parental involvement on the academic achievement of adolescents of Sonowal Kachari Tribes of Hapjan educational block in Tinsukia District, Assam. *International Education and Research Journal (IERJ)*, 3(6). 116-118
31. Gogoi, B. (2017). Creativity and academic achievement of class IX students in Hapjan educational block in Tinsukia District, Assam. *MSSV Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(2), 11-20.
32. Gogtay, N. J., & Thatte, U. M. (2017). An introduction to meta-analysis. *Journal of the Association of Physicians of India*, 65, 78 - 85.
33. Gralewski, J., & Karwowski, M. (2012). Creativity and school grades: A case from Poland. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 7(3), 198-208. doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2012.03.002
34. Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
35. Hansenne, M., & Legrand, J. (2012) Creativity, emotional intelligence, and school performance in children. *International Journal of Educational Research* 53, 264–268.
36. Jaberli, A., Mohammadi, F. A., & Afroghe, S. (2014). The interaction between Iranian EFL learners' motivation, creativity and their English achievement scores. *Enjoy Teaching Journal (ETJ)*, 2(1), EFL Special Issue, 2014, 113- 120.
37. Javaid, S. F., & Pandarakalam, J. P. (2021). The association of creativity with divergent and convergent thinking. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 33(2), 133-139.

38. Karagöl, İ., & Esen, E. (2019). The effect of flipped learning approach on academic achievement: A meta-analysis study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34(3), 708-727. doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018046755
39. Karwowski, M., Lebuda, I., Wisniewska, E. (2009). Creative abilities and styles as predictors of school success. *Gifted and Talented International*, 24(1), 119-127. doi.org/10.1080/15332276.11674866
40. Karwowski, M., & Gralewski, J. (2013). Threshold hypothesis: Fact or artifact? *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 8, 25–33. doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2012.05.003
41. Kim, J-Y. (2020). A longitudinal study of the relation between creative potential and academic achievement at an engineering university in Korea. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 109, 704– 722. doi.org/10.1002/jee.20365
42. Lucas, B., Venckutė, M., & Kamylyis, P. (2020). Creativity, a transversal skill for lifelong learning: an overview of existing concepts and practices: Final report. In P. Kamylyis & R.Cachia (eds.), *European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Publications Office*. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/557196>
43. Lu, Z., Luo, J., & Yang, H. (2021). *Emotions behind divergent thinking*. Paper presented at 2021 8th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications (DSA), Yinchuan, China, 566-571. doi.org/10.1109/DSA52907.2021.00083.
44. Martin, L., & Wilson, N. (2017). Defining creativity with discovery, creativity. *Research Journal*, 29(4), 417-425, doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2017.1376543
45. Martindale, C. (1989). Personality, situation, and creativity. In J. A. Glover, R. R. Ronning, & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 211–232). Plenum Press.
46. Montgomery, D., Bull, K. S., & Baloch, L. (1993). Characteristics of the creative person. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(1), 68–78.
47. Naderi, H. Abdullah, R., Aizan, H.T., Sharir, J., & Kumar, V. (2010). Relationship between creativity and academic achievement: A study of gender differences. *Journal of American Science*, 6, 181–190
48. Nami, Y., Marsooli, H., & Ashouri, M. (2014). The relationship between creativity and academic achievement. 4th World Conference on Psychology, Counselling and Guidance WCPCG-2013. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 36-39.
49. Olatoye, R., Akintunde, S., & Ogunsanya, E. (2010). Relationship between creativity and academic achievement of business administration students in Southwestern Polytechnics, Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 4(3), 134-149. doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v4i3.60164

50. Olatoye, R. A., Akintunde, S. O., & Yakasai, M. I. (2010). Emotional intelligence, creativity and academic achievement of business administration students. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 8(21), 763–786
51. Ospid, M., Raesi, M., & İrani, A. (2020). Investigating the relationship between creativity and personality traits with academic progress of secondary school students in Rudan County. *New Approach in Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 19-28. doi:10.22034/naes.2020.105930
52. Özaşkın, A. G. & Bacanak, A. (2016). Eğitimde yaratıcılık çalışmaları: Neler biliyoruz? [Researches about creativity in the field of education: What do we know? Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5, Özel Sayı, 212-224.
53. Paek, S. H., Alabbasi, A. M. A., Acar, S., & Runco, M. A. (2021). Is more time better for divergent thinking? A meta-analysis of the time-on-task effect on divergent thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 41, doi.org/100894. 10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100894
54. Pastor, B. L., & David, L. T. (2017). Relationship between creativity, intelligence and academic achievement amongst primary education students. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series VII, Social Sciences and Law*, 10(2), 123-132.
55. Patston, T. (2021). *What is creativity in education?* <https://theeducationhub.org.nz/what-is-creativity-in-education/>
56. Prakoso, B. H., Ramdani, Z., Tae, R. F., & Riandika, L. N. (2020). Creativity, critical thinking, and academic performance in students university during virtual learning. Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Assessment and Policy (ICEAP 2020), *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 545, 156-162
57. Razumnikova, O. M. (2013). Divergent versus convergent thinking. In E. G. Carayannis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of creativity, invention, innovation, and entrepreneurship*, Washington, DC: Springer Reference
58. Rindermann, H., & Neubauer, A. C. (2004). Processing speed, intelligence, creativity, and school performance: Testing of causal hypotheses using structural equation models. *Intelligence*, 32(6), 573–589. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2004.06.005>
59. Roberts, A. M., Sternberg, R. J., Runco, M. A., Acar, S., Ward, T. B., Kolomyts, Y., & Kaufman, J. C. (2021). Creativity and cognition, divergent thinking, and intelligence. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Creativity: An Introduction* (pp. 102–127). Cambridge University Press

60. Rojas, J. P. (2015). The relationships among creativity, grit, academic motivation, and academic success in college students. *Theses and Dissertations--Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology*, 39.
61. Runco, M. A. (2008). Creativity and education. *New Horizons Education*, 56, 107–115.
62. Runco, M. (2013). Divergent thinking. In E. G. Carayannis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of creativity, invention, innovation, and entrepreneurship*, Washington, DC: Springer Reference
63. Safarieh, M. (2020). Evaluation of relationship creativity with academic achievement in qualitative-descriptive evaluation. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 8(3) (2020) 43–49.
64. Sánchez-Ruiz, M. J., Hernández-Torrano, D., Pérez-González, J. C., Batey, M., & Petrides, K. V. (2011). The relationship between trait emotional intelligence and creativity across subject domains. *Motivation and Emotion*, 35(4), 461-473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-011-9227-8>
65. Saw K. K. N., & Han, B. (2022). Prospective teachers' academic success in Myanmar: Successful intelligence and personality effects. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 48(1), 72-88, doi:10.1080/02607476.2021.1959266
66. Simon, A., & Bock, O. (2016). Influence of divergent and convergent thinking on visuomotor adaptation in young and older adults. *Human Movement Science*, 46, 23–29. doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2015.11.020
67. Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2001). Guilford's Structure of Intellect Model and Model of Creativity: Contributions and limitations. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(3-4), 309-316. doi.org/10.1207/S15326934CRJ1334_08
68. Surapuramath, A. K. (2014). A study of relationship between creativity and academic achievement of secondary school pupils. *International Journal of Social Science*, 3, Special Issue, 2014, 305-309.
69. Swanzy-Impraim, E., Morris, J. E., Lummis, G. W., & Jones, A. (2022). Promoting creativity: Secondary visual art teachers' perceptions and understanding of creativity in Ghana. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 45, 101057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101057>.
70. Taylor, C. L., Zaghi, E. A., Kaufman, J. C., Reis, S. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (2017). Divergent thinking and academic performance of students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder characteristics in engineering. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 109, 213-229.
71. Torrance, E. P. (1974). *Torrance tests of creative thinking—norms technical manual research edition—verbal tests, forms A and B—figural tests, forms A and B*. Princeton: Personnel Pres. Inc.
72. van Hooijdonk, M., Ritter, S. M., Linka, M., & Kroesbergen, E. (2022). Creativity and change of context: The influence of object-context (in

- congruency on cognitive flexibility. *Thinking Skills and Creativity* 45, 101044
73. Weiss, S., Steger, D., Schroeders, U., & Wilhelm, O. (2020). A Reappraisal of the Threshold Hypothesis of Creativity and Intelligence. *Journal of Intelligence*, 8(4), 38. doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence8040038
74. Zabelina, D. L., Condon, D., & Beeman, M. (2014). Do dimensional psychopathology measures relate to creative achievement or divergent thinking? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, Article 1029. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01029
75. Zhang, J., Ge, J., Ma, Y., Wang, Z., Yu, Y., Liang, X., An, Z., & Xu, Y. (2022). The mediating and buffering effect of creativity on the relationship between sense of place and academic achievement in Geography. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 918289.
76. Zirak, M., & Ahmadian, E. (2015). The Relationship between emotional intelligence and creative thinking with academic achievement of primary school students of fifth grade. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 598-611.
77. Zokaee, M., Baghbanian, A., & Abbas Nejad, M. (2020). Creativity impact on language achievement: A correlational study of Iranian EFL learners. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 84, 175-181.