

Psychological studies of creativity in the literary domain

Katya Stoycheva

Abstract. This paper extrapolates creativity research and its findings to the field of literary creativity and its investigation. Psychological studies of the creative person, the creative process and the creative product in the domain of literature are reviewed and discussed. Their presentation exposes the variety of methodological approaches that were employed: case studies of eminent writers which outline the foundations of their contributions or examine their way of doing what they do; qualitative analyses of writers' interviews, commentaries, and personal accounts of their writing process and career path; empirical studies of the personality of outstanding contemporary writers; historiometric analyses of writers' life span and creative productivity in different literary genres; and conceptually driven and empirically grounded content analyses of literary texts.

Keywords: psychology of creativity, literature, eminent creators, creative writers, literary works

Introduction

Psychology and literature share an interest in the person, in human experience and relationships, and also in writing. Anna Roe, in her study of eminent American scientists, found that many of the social scientists she interviewed (anthropologists and psychologists) considered or even worked toward a literary career at a certain stage in their life (Roe 1970). The writings of Sigmund Freud, one of the founders of the psychological domain and recipient of the Goethe Prize for literature in 1930, show how literature played an important part in all his discoveries. One of Freud's famous statements is that poets and philosophers before him discovered the unconscious; what he discovered was the scientific method by which the unconscious can be studied. By analogy, we shall say that psychology of creativity has discovered ways to study creativity in the literary domain. This paper is devoted to their discussion.

Psychological investigations of creativity in the literary domain are organized around the focus of their research interest: the creative person, the creative process, or the creative product, and their presentation emphasize methodological and conceptual aspects of the research.

1. The creative person in the domain of literature

1.1. Case studies of eminent writers

Howard Gardner's accounts of the creative contributions of writers like T. S. Eliot (Gardner 1993) and Virginia Woolf (Gardner 1997) reconstruct information from their biographies and autobiographic materials to reveal patterns in creators' life and work with the purpose to grasp the underpinnings of their creations. His organizing framework (what Csikszentmihalyi (2014) will term systems view of creativity) encompasses the interactions between three core elements: the individual with his/her abilities, talents, proclivities and idiosyncrasies; his/her relationship with the work in which they are engaged, in one or more domains or disciplines with their relevant symbolic language; and the other persons in the life of the creative individual (family, teachers and mentors, peers in their formative years, and colleagues, rivals, judges, and supporters in their mature years).

These two case studies are part of a larger group of eminent individuals in various artistic, scientific and social domains whose work illuminate different types of exceptional achievements. Woolf as the great introspector - someone who deeply explores her inner mind, thoughts, feelings, subjective experiences; develops new methods to express the richness of individual's inner life and communicate her insights to the world (Gardner 1993); and the poet Eliot, whose life provides an opportunity to consider how the formation of subsequent productive identities - in his case, as a critic, playwright, and editor - serves an aging creative individual (Gardner 1993).

1.2. Empirical research with eminent writers

Another way to approach the problem about what makes creative individuals uniquely creative was proposed by researchers carrying out empirical studies with contemporary creators whose achievements have been publicly recognized. Their interest in the individual leads to the question: what are specific personality characteristics of the creative individuals and how personality characteristics are part of the inner mechanisms of creative functioning?

The work of Frank Barron and his colleagues illustrates this way of studying creative writers. First, they asked four experts (literature and drama professors) to nominate the most creative among the contemporary American writers. Of all the nominated writers whom they invited to participate in the study, 30 accepted and constituted their experimental group. Another 26 contemporary writers who were not among the nominated ones, constituted the control group. In this way, researchers came up with a list of 56 writers, who were invited to participate in extensive testing and interviewing. Results from numerous personality tests, social psychological and cognitive tests, behavioural observations and in-depth clinical and biographical interviews were compiled together in order to identify those particular features that differentiate outstanding creators from less creative individuals in the same domain, and were correlated with their creative productivity (Barron 1969).

While contemporary creators are tested or interviewed in search for better understanding of the individual factors behind the great creative achievements, historiometric research of eminent writers has also produced interesting findings. Catharine Cox's (1926) investigation of the 301 historical geniuses covered both nonfiction and fiction writers. She analysed available biographical and autobiographical data to generate estimates of IQ and of 67 personality characteristics. The relation between eminence and intelligence was examined, and her most famous conclusion was "high but not the highest intelligence, combined with the greatest degree of persistence, will achieve greater eminence than the highest degree of intelligence with somewhat less persistence" (Cox 1926: 187).

Cox's data were reexamined by Dean Simonton (2014) using more complicated analytical technique which allowed to control for unreliable data and the year of birth, among others. On this basis, the relationship of estimated intelligence to ranked eminence was replicated, both for eminent creators and eminent leaders.

1.3. Studies of the literary life paths

Within the historiometric method (Simonton 2014), biographical and historical information is first quantified and then subjected to statistical analysis. It generates nomothetic quantitative research as well as case studies of historical individuals, and allows analyses of the creative productivity across domains and ages, and the possibility to test hypotheses about the nature of creativity on unique, large-scale samples of eminent creativity. Of special relevance to the literary domain are studies of the creator's life path, as they reveal some interesting observations (e.g., great poetry is written at a younger age than great prose is) and raise special questions (e.g., why do poets die younger than novelists and other literary geniuses?).

Vincent Cassandro (1998) tested a data set of 2102 eminent historical subjects (creators from seven different creative-achievement domains, at least 36 different nations, and a wide range of measured eminence) and replicated the finding that the average life span of literary artists tends to be between four and nine years shorter than that of their contemporaries in the sciences, visual arts, and humanities. He also reviewed three proposed explanations for this finding. These hypotheses link writers' life span to particularities of the creative trajectory (poets tend to produce influential works earlier in their lives than do individuals in other creative disciplines), available resources (fewer and smaller financial rewards in the field of literary arts), and the (un)healthful character of leisure activities (the work of literary artists providing them with little immediate reward or sensory stimulation and leading to greater risk-taking and sensation-seeking in leisure activities). It was found that "the career-landmarks and the differential-resources explanations were able to adequately account for the resulting general pattern of life-span findings" (Cassandro 1998).

1.4. Explorations with creative writers

While Barron, Cox and Simonton gathered their subjects among the eminent writers, Jane Piirto (2018) studied successful creative writers who were listed in the Annual Directory of American Poets and Writers. She defined creative writers as those who write poetry, fiction, plays, song lyrics, and creative nonfiction essays and books; Piirto differentiated them from writers who write scholarly pieces, journalists who write for newspapers and magazines, or writers of nonfiction books. Her approach differed in several other ways. She favoured qualitative research, using multiple sources of information including encyclopedias, directories, published interviews, autobiographical and biographical essays, and also some questionnaires and surveys. Based on published research findings about the creative personality, Piirto developed her conceptual framework of personality attributes seeming to be essential to the development of talent, and used it to guide her analyses. Piirto proposed seven traits specifically found in writers based on her studies: ambition/envy; concern with philosophical matters; frankness often expressed in political or social activism; psychopathology; depression; empathy, sense of humour.

Also, Piirto focused on female creative writers (the subjects in her study were 80 female creative writers, aged 35 to 65, for whom significant print material was available). Sixteen themes common to the lives of successful contemporary female creative writers emerged, as keeping journals, and treating writing as a form of therapy for example (Piirto 1998).

Extrapolating creativity research and its findings to the field of literature proved to be stimulating. Kaufmann (2002) used Sternberg and Lubart's investment theory of creativity as a framework to identify the basic features of the creative writer. He examined empirical research on six variables: motivation, intelligence, personality, thinking styles, knowledge, and environment, and discussed their relevance to writer's creativity through the prism of the literature on the creative individual. In conclusion, intrinsic motivation and personality traits of instability and impulsivity stood out as particularly important for creative writers.

2. Psychological studies of the creative process in writers

2.1. Writers' extraordinary ways of working

Howard Gruber and his collaborators (Wallace et al. 1989) adopted the case study method in their investigations of how creators do what they do. Each case study acknowledges the uniqueness of the creator. The coherence of the works is provided by the common approach which a) describes the aspects of the creator's work and analyses how they evolve; b) in doing so examines not only the creative products themselves but also notebooks, journals, letters, drafts, sketches, and interview statements and recollections of the subject; and c) takes into account the multiple contexts in which the individual operates, including work tasks and enterprises, family and their private world, professional milieus, social settings,

and cultural and historical period. Several of the case studies that were carried out under this paradigm involved writers and were focused on particular processes found in their creative work. For example, the history and the role of revision in William Wordsworth's poetry; how Dorothy Richardson accomplished her life's goal of creating a literature of feminine realism; and the processes of transformation and development of Anaïs Nin's methods of working, her way of thinking and writing (Wallace et al. 1989).

This approach motivated M. K. Raina (1997) to apply the evolving systems approach to a creator coming from non-Western country - Rabindranath Tagore, the 1913 Nobel prize laureate in literature. He analysed Tagore's overall purpose in undertaking creative work and the complexity of his literary enterprise in particular (Raina 1997).

Csikszentmihalyi (1996) grounded his explorations of the way creative people work and live on the analysis of videotaped interviews with a group of ninety-one exceptional individuals who have made a difference to a major domain in arts and humanities, sciences, business and politics, and inventors. Among them were four poets and nine writers, of whom two Nobel prize winners. The in-depth analysis of these interviews helps illustrate what creative people are like, how the creative process works, and what conditions encourage or hinder the generation of original ideas. The organizing framework for this work is the systems model of creativity, stating that creativity can be observed only in the interrelations of a system made up of three main parts. Creativity occurs when a writer (first), using the symbols and the procedures of the literary domain (second), conveys a new idea, proposes a new form of expression, or sees a new pattern in human experience and describes it; and when this novel literary creation is recognized as deserving to be preserved and is selected for inclusion by the appropriate field of individuals (third) who act as gatekeepers to the domain.

2.2. Studies of the creative process in writing

The work of Albert Rothenberg (1979/2016) outlines several perspectives in the psychological study of literary creativity, methodologically and conceptually. His account of the creative process is a composite one, developed from bits and pieces from different methods and perspectives, where observations on the creative process here-and-now are also included. He chose the domain of literature since literary creativity is widely appreciated. He revealed the creative process in writers through interviews with eminent creative persons. Specifically designed to focus on the creative process as directly as possible, the interviews, very intensive, were regularly scheduled and carried out over an extended period of time, up to three or four years. He also consulted writers' published commentaries.

Another type of research subject were novice literary creators, persons who were identified by a teacher or a critic as having creative potential. Independent creativity assessments from peers were also obtained for these subjects. The systematic discussion of their work in progress or recently completed one focused on affects, motivations, and thought processes involved in carrying out the task.

Rothenberg (1979/2016) also employed other research methods consisting of a) special reconstructions of the creative process through objective and statistical studies of archived literary manuscripts, a means of studying outstanding creations of the past; and b) special psychological experiments designed to test specific hypotheses and carried out with subjects of the interview studies as well as with additional groups of creative and non-creative research subjects.

Rothenberg analysed the creation of a specific poem by a major American poet - a process he closely followed and thoroughly discussed with the author, and used this analysis to illustrate the psychological processes involved in creativity. There are several steps in this process: elucidating the psychological processes involved in the poet's creation; retracing and summarizing the salient features of the history of the poem; inductively moving from data to proposing conceptual understanding and description of the processes involved in creating poetry; and providing some general formulations about the process of creation on this basis.

Rothenberg (1979/2016) described two specific thought processes and explained in detail how these particular thought processes operate in the poem. Then he illustrated how they operate in various types of creative processes, ranging from poetry, art, and music to science and intellectual endeavors. His work generates evidence that the creative process, similarly to dreaming, molds and structures deeply unconscious material, producing affect-laden and vivid images, symbols, and new connections. But the creator consciously uses the mechanisms and processes characteristic of dream thought and dreaming for the purposes of abstracting, conceptualizing, and concretizing as well as reversing the effects of unconscious censorship. Used consciously, these processes tend to reveal unconscious material rather than to conceal and distort it. Creative cognition is adaptive, progressive, and logical in the sense that creative thinking is rooted in reality, and is clear about distinctions and similarities, and is capable of, and often permeated with, highly abstract formulations.

Rothenberg (1979/2016) labelled the specific forms and operations of the creative cognition that he observed janusian thinking and homospatial thinking. These psychological processes are not merely characteristic of this particular poet's functioning nor of the particular process of creation of this poem. Janusian thinking and homospatial thinking operate generally and universally in creativity, and Rothenberg's work with subjects of physical science and studies of the scientific enterprise provides evidence in support of this conclusion. Janusian thoughts and homospatial superimposition of identities referring to disparate and distinct entities are often implied or transformed in the final version of a poem, as well as in the final versions of other types of creations, because in them the simultaneous opposition is integrated into a unified structure such as an image, metaphor, or a complete poem or theory. Moreover, both janusian and homospatial thinking operate throughout the course of the creative process: from the beginning, during what has been called the illumination phase, to the end, during the long sequences of revising, shaping, and working out (Rothenberg 1979/2016).

2.3. Interviews about experiences while writing

Susan Perry's (2009) research consists of interviews with 76 regularly publishing writers (40 novelists and 36 poets; 43 males, 33 females) about their experiences while writing. Participants included both best-selling novelists and prize- and award-winning literary authors and poets. She also examined hundreds of published accounts of and interviews with writers. Many of them reported having regularly entered a state of flow, a special state of intense absorption "when time seems to stop and the writing flows through you with little or no angst" (Perry 2009: 213). Employing the concept of flow, proposed by Csikszentmihalyi (1996), and his definition of conditions of flow in creativity, Perry's analyses reveal some of the most salient factors that lead writers toward becoming fully immersed in writing, among which are intrinsic motivation, getting feedback, regular writing rituals, and audience (un)awareness.

Charlotte Doyle (1998) emphasized the interdisciplinary conversation around the experience of writing creative fiction as a promising approach. She asked five contemporary fiction writers who have achieved recognition for their works to describe the creation of particular short stories or novels and how their works developed over time. Across the different personal stories about the creation of a fiction story, commonalities emerged which Doyle articulated with theoretical concepts from psychology, phenomenology, and literary theories. "Combined, the interviews and the theoretical work allowed me to put together a tentative, composite account of creating fiction", concluded the researcher (Doyle 1998: 29).

2.4. Analyses of writers' accounts and personal reflections on their creativity

Steven Bindeman (1998) offered a phenomenological analysis and reinterpretation of the creative process in visual artists and writers. He analysed accounts of creatively productive individuals upon their creative act collected in the 1952 anthology edited by Brewster Ghiselin (1952). His investigation of creativity as it is experienced by creators themselves is grounded in the phenomenological method and guided by the reflections of Henri Poincare and Friedrich Nietzsche upon their creative process. Its findings are then referred to recent psychological theories of the creative process, to underscore the fruitfulness of the integration of the philosophical and psychological perspectives on human creativity.

A note is due before the end of this section on the creative process in writers. In line with paper's interest in psychological research on literary creativity, studies that examine eminent writers and creative writers were reviewed. Yet there are other genres, e.g., expository writing, which also offer opportunities for creative products. A research report, a proposal, or a magazine article could be judged creative if it presents information in a new and valuable way to meet the needs and constraints of its audience and its purpose. The question how people in that larger class of "effective" writers produce a creative response to a

given rhetorical problem entails investigations of the occupational creativity of professional writers. Though this topic is outside the scope of the present paper, research work in this area is worth mentioning, for example, through the following case. Linda Carey and Linda Flower (1989) browsed the findings about the mechanisms of development from an inexperienced novice to an expert writer, as evidenced in cognitively oriented studies of expertise. Then they proposed their interpretation as to which of these mechanisms could be conducive to creativity in the writing of the expert writers working in expository genres. They identified several processes which can provide opportunities for working creatively in expository genres. The subjective reinterpretation of the given initial assignment and the construction of a dynamic representation of the task is one such example: when expert writers tackle academic or professional expository tasks, they engage in active and complex problem solving in order to define their task in a way that allows them to solve their rhetorical problems in unique and interesting ways.

3. Researchers' focus on the literary works

3.1. Conceptual analysis of literary masterpieces

In the study of the literary text as a creative product, an inspiring example is Sylvano Arieti's (1976) analysis of poetry and its implications for the understanding of the aesthetic process in literature in general, and in other forms of art. Arieti identified the synthesis of primary and secondary processes as responsible for the creative properties of the poetic work. It is the tertiary process of integration of the primary process content and its transformation with the secondary process of elaboration that gives aesthetic significance to the form and content in poetry. Thus, in the metaphoric language, one of the fundamental components of poetry, there is almost perfect welding of the abstract concept with the concrete example; a fusion which adds many levels of meaning to our understanding through a vision of unsuspected depths or realms of possibilities and dimensions, and leads to the experience of pleasure and confers aesthetic value. This integration also transpires in instances of perceptualization, when abstract concepts that are difficult to objectify are given concrete, specific or perceptual representations, and are transformed into concrete, tangible symbols. There are two other phenomena of literary creativity which belong to the tertiary process discussed by Arieti. First, the "as if" artistic phenomenon, when intense feelings are transformed into image of supernatural power, i.e., impossibility is transformed into an actual image that has a real artistic effect. Second, the emphasis on verbalization with words acquiring importance as phonetic entities or sounds which increases or accentuates some aspects of their connotative power (Arieti 1976: 136-171).

The creative artist has a special access to primary processes (greater than average accessibility to imagery, metaphors, emphatic verbalization) and still is in position to use the secondary process in order to put together many elements of different origins to make syntheses of higher order creating artistic

unities. “The primary process offers the artist the imagination - that is, the faculty of presentation which provides the basic matter, as well as a loose form of organization such as the emergence of similarities, suggestions, and partial representations. The secondary process provides the screening and elimination of many suggestions and partial representations, whether in verbal, pictorial or in other forms. The tertiary process ultimately comes into being as a “click”, or match between the primary and the secondary process which brings about an accepted emerging representation. Eureka! The new unity is created!” (Arieti 1976: 186).

3.2. Empirical studies of literary creations

Simonton’s (2009) investigation of William Shakespeare’s dramas reveals, with respect to style, a set of changes throughout Bard’s career that are “a manifestation of the dramatist’s drive toward increased originality, a drive that required that he leave behind the constraints in which he initially created his plays” (Simonton 2009: 133). He also found that certain themes were predictive of the relative aesthetic success of the 37 plays, and that their thematic content was a function of artist’s age and of the social and political context in which they were written. In another study, Simonton (1990) analysed the 154 sonnets of Shakespeare and examined the connection between poem’s intrinsic properties and its final artistic merit and impact on readers. First, the differential popularity of all 154 poems was determined using a 27-item measure that tapped how much and how often a given sonnet was quoted, cited, and anthologized. Second, content analyses were performed that assessed the sonnets on four attributes, two stylistic and two more thematic in nature. The first two were the ratio of the number of different words to the number of total words in each sonnet, and the number of unique words that appear but once in all 154 sonnets. The two others were measures of primary and secondary process content: whether the text favours words with primitive sensual and emotional meanings (primary process) or with cerebral, abstract, rational, and objective meanings (secondary process). These indicators were calculated for each sonnet and for each of the four units in the sonnet (three quatrains and one couplet). Third, associations between sonnets’ attributes and the objective criterion of their aesthetic success were examined.

Sonnets’ popularity correlates positively with the ratio of different words, the count of unique words (indicating novelty of the vocabulary and greater linguistic complexity), and the presence of primary process imagery, but negatively with the intrusion of secondary process imagery. The index of secondary process content comes from an inventory of those words that can be taken to designate such categories as Abstraction, Social Behaviour, Instrumental Behaviour, Restraint, Order, Temporal References, and Moral Imperatives. Where the primary process concerns the primal, asocial, and even autistic vocabulary related to Drives, Sensation, Defensive Symbolization, Regressive Cognition, the secondary process regards more mature, articulate, pragmatic, and socially responsible lexicon.

After examining the dynamics within the sonnets, it was concluded that the most successful poems were most likely to introduce unique words in the first two units of the sonnet. They also tend to contain a greater variety of words overall: the association between total number of used words and the number of distinct words is greater for them. In addition, this linguistic diversity increases in the couplets: “for the best sonnets in the collection, the couplet actually tends to feature a greater profusion of distinct words” (Simonton 1990: 261).

Simonton (1990; 2009) discussed these results from the perspective of enlightening Shakespeare’s way to design his sonnets and in the context of the discovered contrasts between the popular and the unpopular products of Shakespeare’s poetic expression. He also underlined the considerable potential of this study as an investigative paradigm in the exploration of literature and its creative impact.

3.3. Identifying Torrance’s creative thinking skills in Salinger’s short story

A new, original psychological analysis of the creative properties of a literary text has been recently proposed by Stoycheva (2018). This approach draws implications from an existing theory of creativity for a new domain of creative outcomes (literary works) and its usefulness is demonstrated through a concrete example. In this particular case, through the analysis of the Salinger’s short story “De Daumier - Smith’s blue period”. Paul Torrance’s process definition of creativity which outlines the kind of products that would result from the successful operation of the process and describes the creative thinking skills that have been shown to be important in producing creative results, provides the methodological background. The analysis identifies, in a systematic way, the creative thinking skills embodied in the text of the story and illustrates their various manifestations.

Let’s consider an example. According to Torrance, the elaboration of the chosen alternatives is an important skill in the creative problem-solving process. Successful creative problem solving requires that after choosing a relevant alternative that is itself of value, it should be elaborated: setting up plans for its implementation, creating organization, working out details. Selling of and expanding ideas require elaboration too, even more so when new and original ideas are concerned. How alternatives are elaborated in Salinger’s story? The analysis focuses on the descriptions given to characters, places, settings, events, actions, and experiences and looks at the details, nuances, precisions, and specifications which they contain. An interesting feature of the text emerged out of this analysis - that its elements are often elaborated by specifying what is missing or has been taken away.

As diverging as they are, the two approaches presented above - those of Arieti (1976) and Simonton (1990; 2009) - share important similarities. They both rely on established psychological conceptions (e.g., primary and secondary processes), focus on eminent creators and their production, use analyses of the texts instead of their interpretation and subjective appreciation, and test

their findings against a working theory of creativity that serves as a conceptual framework for their investigation. How the proposed new method fits into this group of studies?

The conceptual approach adopted by Stoycheva (2018) is similarly grounded in a popular theory of creativity, uses indicators of the creative thinking which are standardized and validated in empirical studies, and performs a reading of the literary text as close as possible to the work itself, examining each indicator in a systematic way across the whole text. The methodological usefulness of this approach is demonstrated upon a literary masterpiece created by a renowned author as Salinger. Stoycheva's (2018) work effectively combines the reliability of empirically grounded analysis of the text with the power of using a validated conceptual framework for carrying out the analysis and articulating its outcomes.

Conclusion

The proposed overview of the psychological studies of creativity in the domain of literature does not aim to be exhaustive or conclusive. The limitations of the present paper prevented the inclusion of all available publications in the field and the results of the reported studies could not be fully described. The text gives a general description of the research work on literary creativity and outlines the main directions in the investigation of the creative person, the creative process and the creative product in the domain of literature.

Still, the reviewed studies reveal a diversity of ways to approach literary creativity. While some theoretical perspectives attract greater interest (as the integration of primary and secondary processes in the creative act), the compilation demonstrates that much of the research conducted on creativity as a general issue can be easily adapted to the narrower topic of literary creativity, and is used in inventive ways to help answer important research questions.

These research efforts have also recognized specific methodological concerns. To mention an example: Rothenberg's reflection upon using published commentaries of the creative persons as a source of information: "I have tried only to use material that was authentic within a total context of the person's life and work, rather than an incidental, or a highly dramatic, or a seemingly revealing statement. To the extent possible, I exercised the same caution about motivation and indirect meanings in assessing public material as I did with the private material of interviews" (Rothenberg 1979/2016: 10).

The proposed overview does not cover studies about the dark side of creativity, madness and genius, creativity and mental health. The debate around the higher rates of affective disorders found in groups of writers and the methodological issues related to the identification of mental illnesses, sample selection, and the use of comparison groups have been largely discussed (McKay, Kaufman 2014; Rothenberg 1979/2016, for example), so the interested reader can easily inform themselves. This is a debate with a long history of arguments and findings, and their inclusion in the limited space of the present article, if possible at all, would be counterproductive for the purpose of the text to draw

and examine the general picture of the research taking place at the intersection between literature and psychology of creativity.

Finally, this paper does not consider creative writing as educational or therapeutic issue, nor the computer programmed story-writing. While some authors appear to use creative writing to designate the field of literature as a domain specific form of creative endeavor (e.g., Kaufman 2002), and the transfer of knowledge about the mechanism of creative work in writers into conditions of improving creative writing seems worthwhile (e.g., Perry 2009), the present paper keeps with the differentiation between literature (as public symbolic domain) and the notion of creative writing as an individual manifestation, designating one's more or less creative way of writing.

There is no study of the creative person or the creative process in literature that does not show awareness of the embeddedness of the person or the process in the larger context of the creative activity, taking place in time and space. It is the raise of research on the literary geniuses that prompted the development of systems view of creativity, for example (Gardner, 1993; Gardner 1997; Csikszentmihalyi 2014). And it is the interest in the inner dynamics of the creative process that encourages the exploration of the phenomenological perspective in the analysis of writers' experience while writing (e.g., Doyle 1998, Bindeman 1998). These approaches open up for greater interdisciplinary communication, as now psychological research can more easily translate its findings into the languages of other social sciences and humanities.

References

- Arieti 1976:** S. Arieti. *Creativity: The Magic Synthesis*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Barron 1969:** F. Barron. *Creative Person and Creative Process*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Bindeman 1998:** S. Bindeman. Echoes of silence: A phenomenological study of the creative process. - *Creativity Research Journal*, 11, 1998, 1, 69-77.
- Carey, Flower 1989:** L. J. Carey, L. Flower. Foundations for creativity in the writing process: Rhetorical representations of ill-defined problems. - In: J. A. Glover, R. R. Ronning, C. R. Reynolds (eds.). *Handbook of Creativity*. New York: Springer, 1989, 283-304.
- Cassandro 1998:** V. J. Cassandro. Explaining premature mortality across fields of creative endeavor. - *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1998, 5, 805-833.
- Cox 1926:** C. Cox. *Genetic Studies of Genius: The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1926.
- Csikszentmihalyi 1996:** M. Csikszentmihalyi. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.
- Csikszentmihalyi 2014:** M. Csikszentmihalyi. Society, culture, and person: A systems view of creativity. - In: *The Systems Model of Creativity*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2014, 46-67.
- Doyle 1998:** C. L. Doyle. The writer tells: The creative process of writing literary fiction. - *Creativity Research Journal*, 11, 1998, 1, 29-37.
- Gardner 1993:** H. Gardner. *Creating Minds: An Anatomy of Creativity Seen through the Lives of Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Ghandi*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

- Gardner 1997:** H. Gardner. *Extraordinary Minds: Portraits of Four Exceptional Individuals and an Examination of Our Own Extraordinariness*. Basic Books, 1997.
- Ghiselin 1952:** B. Ghiselin. *The creative process*. New York: Mentor, 1952.
- Kaufmann 2002:** J. Kaufmann. *Dissecting the golden goose: Components of studying creative writers*. - *Creativity Research Journal*, 14, 2002, 1, 27-40.
- McKay, Kaufman 2014:** A. S. McKay, J. C. Kaufman. *Literary geniuses: Their life, work, and death*. - In: D. K. Simonton (ed.). *The Wiley Handbook of Genius*. Wiley, 2014, 473-487.
- Piirto 1998:** J. Piirto. *Themes in the lives of successful contemporary U.S. women creative writers*. - *Roeper Review*, 21, 1998, 1, 60-70.
- Piirto 2018:** J. Piirto. *The creative process in writers*. - In: T. Lubart (ed.). *The Creative Process Perspectives from Multiple Domains*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 89-121.
- Perry 2009:** S. K. Perry. *Writing in flow*. - In: S. B. Kaufman, S. C. Kaufman (eds.). *The Psychology of Creative Writing*. Cambridge University Press, 2009, 213-224.
- Raina 1997:** M. K. Raina. "Most dear to all the Muses": Mapping Tagorean network of enterprises - A study in creative complexity. - *Creativity Research Journal*, 10, 1997, 2-3, 153-173.
- Roe 1970:** A. Roe. *The making of a scientist*. - In: P. E. Vernon (ed.). *Creativity*. Penguin Books, 1970.
- Rothenberg 1979/2016:** A. Rothenberg. *The Emerging Goddess: The Creative Process in Art, Science, and Other Fields*. University of Chicago Press, 1979 (e-Book 2016 International Psychotherapy Institute).
- Simonton 1990:** D. K. Simonton. *Lexical choices and aesthetic success: A computer content analysis of 154 Shakespeare sonnets*. - *Computers and the Humanities*, 24, 251-264.
- Simonton 2009:** D. K. Simonton. *The literary genius of William Shakespeare: Empirical studies of his dramatic and poetic creativity*. - In: S. B. Kaufman, J. C. Kaufman (eds.). *The Psychology of Creative Writing*. Cambridge University Press, 2009, 131-145.
- Simonton 2014:** D. K. Simonton. *Historiometric studies of genius*. - In: D. K. Simonton (ed.). *The Wiley Handbook of Genius*. Wiley, 2014, 87-106.
- Stoycheva 2018:** K. Stoycheva. *De Daumier-Smith and the Creative Thinking*. Sofia, Bulgaria: Paradigma Publishing House, 2018.
- Wallace et al. 1989:** D. B. Wallace, H. E. Gruber (eds.). *Creative People at Work: Twelve Cognitive Case Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Prof. Katya Stoycheva, PhD
 Institute for Population and Human Studies
 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
 Acad. G. Bonchev Str., Bl. 6
 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
 Email: kstoycheva@iphs.eu