

Society against creativity

Beata Czerwińska
*Department of Human Development Psychology
Pedagogical University in Bydgoszcz*

SUMMARY: *The aim of the article is the answer of the question, in what way the society destroys creative attitudes. It shows that in particular phases of life the society creates conditions which imprison child's natural creative instincts. Analysis made on four dimensions: school, work, personal life shows why children and in the consequence adults, can not go beyond a schedule, become conformists, follow stereotypes, standardised behaviours and monotony of life. The main interest was of the family input in stimulating creative attitude development of a child. Upbringing in family as the first opportunity to create a proper climate which evokes creativity in a child and has the influence on his development of a personality.*

Introduction

The world changes incredibly quickly. History runs faster distances are reduced, things which are the future now, will become monuments tomorrow. Life conditions are being quickly and rapidly changed and everybody tries to accommodate as well as possible. It is the reason why a new type of a man is being created, the type of a pioneer, discoverer who must enter the new world. The world is open for everybody and needs everybody. It means that human fate depends on a new kind of education, mass education, which doesn't mean collecting knowledge and learning how to gain it but preparing a man to change the world. Acts of changing mean changing a person so he is accommodated to objective conditions or activities to change the world. These changes make men realize that habits, norms, patterns are mean less now (Gloton, Clero 1988).

So, one of the main purposes is to "learn changes" and teaching institutions are -family, school, company where adults work. This education requires long - and short - term goals and actions "To make people develop in developing society, to deepen their participation in life, not only humans but free individuals must emerge,

people who can take initiative, who are able to create, who are responsible" (A. de Peretti 1969).

To reach these goals, factors which are helpful for creative personality must be revealed to give parents and teachers proper tools. It is very important because our society creates conditions which suppress natural creative instincts. Social structure with rigid barriers destroys creative imagination. The aim of article is the answer for the question, in what way the society destroys creative attitudes. It shows that a family and school as products of social and political systems have their influence on conformism, stereotypes, monotony of life with no room, for creating. Why is that so ? The answer can be found in analysis of school and family mechanisms.

1. Family against creativity

First and the most powerful environment for children us(5 10) is a family. That is why it can destroy a lot, more than school. Psychology is popular now and every modern man has some knowledge about its rules. But it is superficial, theoretic only. It is not enough to know that a child is unique and specific, right conclusions must be made. It is possible when parents understand their own limits and don't treat a child as an object. But adults are born and raised in the world of hierarchy, where relations are based on a division: rulers (making decisions) and subjects (executing decisions). Those, who have power use force. When adults become parents they behave in a family exactly as in a society. A parent is a powerful person for a child. A child is somebody to be taken care of, to learn everything from parents. Mutual understanding is possible when parents don't exaggerate with using their power. But the most popular opinion is that the more you control your child the better parent you are. This behaviour blocks a child initiative. He never does what is forbidden, always expects permission to do what is allowed.

He is afraid of misinterpretation of a single act. He becomes a totally different person, who can't learn about himself and organize his own life.

For the sake of order and discipline parents use different methods, which are not to be discussed. "Do this because I want you to" ; blackmailing: "Do this to make me happy", "Don't do this else you hurt me and I love you so much". Locating a child in these pedagogical systems doesn't evoke creative attitude or ability to invent, to use fantasy. A Shy, terrorized by forces and fears child becomes a creature repeating learned gestures, imitating others, conformistic. Musts and mustn't give little hope to have a free and creative person.

So the family climate is often discouraging to act in a creative way. Even if it happens, school will probably suppress those growing abilities.

2. School and creativity

It will be hard to find a person, who can say that our school system is effective and evokes creativity. There are two main points to be criticized.

* The first one is a formal education system. Which includes aspects of knowledge, forms of mental functioning and values.

* The second one is the upbringing system which includes developing abilities of dynamic adjusting and threats connected with a reward and punishment system, expectations etc.

Sociologists of education state that programs and purposes are mirrors of tendencies of particular social groups and that organization of the school system is connected with the structure of dependence in the society (Wall 1986). It gives stabilization and long lasting existence. So, in institutional sense, school doesn't serve a child.

School gives compact knowledge and checked values. It is an element of social conservatism. The purpose of school is to give a child knowledge and abilities according to what society considers useful and possible to learn.

Teaching must be controlled. Success is checked mostly during exams. Gloton and Clero (1988) say that if education is to give knowledge and create general attitudes, the exam can show the effects in the first aspect only. The second one is never checked. Creativity, imagination, personal likes original style are not included in examination. A pupil is expected to say what he had learned. To inspire, discover and meet a child's need to express himself, a teacher must have much time, to wonder, lose way, search. It is a factory, it is a free and joyful experience. But to realize that wasting time, discusting, being a real expert is necessary. Is it a way to prepare an exam ? Isn't it easier to start thinking in a convergentive way?

So the theoretically, if a program is settled, a teacher can decide about a process. But even if he has time to teach creatively, he can meet two obstacles.

a) The first one is a teacher himself. Aggression or other defensive mechanism can be results of difficulties to create a good contact with pupils. Mutual understanding and independent acts of pupils are possible when the difference between authority system and teacher's authority is understood. Authority system means a control with no arguments. Authority means superiority of knowledge and experience used to teach others. Encouraging pupils to identify with a respected person is a available way of introducing the culture. But it must be done carefully not to make a pupil dependent. To avoid this a teacher must give more and more space for responsibility for decisions a child makes. And it is easier to teach and decide what is right or wrong. But when teachers are ready to answer difficult and tricky questions, he can make pupils get rid of dependence (Wall 1986).

b) The second disturbing factor is a rigid, traditional school system. A modern teacher who tries to change it can face parental protest especially when he stimulates actions which differ from the ones accepted in family. He can face misunderstanding of school administration which doesn't like autonomy and fantasy. Other factors are: school program, exams and difficult financial situation.

So, a pupil is expected to give a specific answer when he can hear a specific question, he can't enrich his activity. He is being prepared to gain habits, not to react on changes.

Conclusions

This analysis of school and family functioning confirms Roger's statement that we produce stereotypes, people educated in a closed and scheduled way. Educational actions during first 20 years of life make people unable to be creative when they grow up. For example, free time is usually spend on recreation. In Roger's opinion, social scientists are "routine specialists" and those who can ask questions are in minority (Rogers 1974). Industry doesn't promote creativity either. Mostly, professional life shows lack of possibilities to act in a creative way. The same thing can be observed in everyday life: cloth we wear, book we read, food we eat, opinions we accept. Strong tendency to behave according to stereotypes dominant (Rogers 1962).

If society finds more pleasure in this behaviour, why do we stress creativity in education? If computers take over what do we need creative imagination for? The speed of stepping into the atom age makes a man, feel strong separation and protest against unification which destroys original acts and invention. In opinion of many people the only chance to defend and survive is human creative adaptation which starts in families and schools which will promote education based on development of creative forces in all aspects of life.

References

- Gloton, R. & Clero, C. (1988). *Twórcza aktywność dziecka* (Creative Activity for children). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- de Peretti, A. (1969). *Contradictions de la culture et la pedagogie*. Paris : Ed. de l'Epi.
- Rogers, C. R. (1974). *Lernen in Freiheit zur Bildungsreform in Schule und Universität*. München: Kösel - Verlag.
- Rogers, C. R. (1962). Toward a Theory of Creativity. In Parnes, S. J. & Harding, H. (eds) *A Source Book for Creative Thinking*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Wall, W. D. (1986). *Twórcze wychowanie w okresie dzieciństwa*. (Constructive education for children). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.