

# African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues

Volume 28 Number 3, October/November, 2025 Edition

Founding Editor- in - Chief: Professor Denis C.E. Ugwuegbu  
(Retired Professor of Department of Psychology.  
University of Ibadan.)

Editor- in - Chief: Professor Shyngle K. Balogun.  
Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan.

Associate Editor: Professor. Benjamin O. Ehigie  
Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan.

## **EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD**

|                               |                                     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Professor S. S. Babalola      | University of South Africa          |
| Professor S.E. Idemudia       | University of South Africa          |
| Professor Tope Akinnawo       | Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria |
| Professor O.A Ojedokun        | Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria |
| Professor Catherine O Chovwen | University of Ibadan, Nigeria       |
| Professor. Grace Adejunwon    | University of Ibadan, Nigeria       |
| Professor. A.M. Sunmola       | University of Ibadan, Nigeria       |
| Professor. B. Nwankwo         | Caritas University, Nigeria         |
| Professor. K.O. Taiwo         | Lagos State University, Nigeria     |
| Professor. Bayo Oluwole       | University of Ibadan, Nigeria       |

---

Journal of the African Society for THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF  
SOCIAL ISSUES % DEPT OF Psychology, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

# THE PARADOX OF PROGRESS: HOW CIVILIZATION DULLS HUMAN INGENUITY

<sup>1</sup>Okediji, A. A, <sup>2</sup>Balogun, S.K, <sup>3</sup>Imbur, M.T, & <sup>4</sup>Kanu, I.B

<sup>1,3</sup>*Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.* <sup>4</sup>*Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.*

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Okediji Abayomi A., Department of Psychology or [abayomiokediji@uniuyo.edu.ng](mailto:abayomiokediji@uniuyo.edu.ng) or [okediji\\_abayomi@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:okediji_abayomi@yahoo.co.uk).

We acknowledge the comments of Prof. S.K. Balogun of the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ibadan. Ibadan , Oyo State

## ABSTRACT

*This paper argues that restoring creativity as a central dimension of human thought, behavior, and everyday living is essential to addressing today's interconnected crises and renewing shared humanity. Creativity is not merely a luxury or restricted to artistic and technological endeavors but represents the innate human capacity to generate adaptive and meaningful responses to uncertainty and complexity. As a resource for psychological resilience, social cohesion, and ecological awareness, creativity offers a lifeline for navigating crises and fostering renewal. The paper highlights that creativity is evident in everyday practices such as caregiving, teaching, parenting, organizing, and community problem-solving, where imagination and adaptability persist despite constraints. These often-overlooked forms of creativity contribute significantly to personal fulfillment, collective healing, and social transformation. Yet, prevailing educational, institutional, and economic systems suppress this potential through rigid norms, fear of failure, and excessive focus on control and productivity. In response, the paper critiques such limiting structures and proposes alternatives that prioritize curiosity, empathy, and experimentation. Approaches such as inquiry-based learning, narrative practices, ecological design, and community arts are presented as models that nurture exploration and cultivate creative agency. At the same time, the paper warns of mounting threats to creativity, including technologies that emphasize efficiency over discovery and economies that reduce individuals to consumers rather than creators. These trends undermine the imaginative capacities crucial for addressing complex global challenges. Ultimately, the paper calls for creativity to be recognized as both a civic and ethical imperative*

**Keywords:** *creativity, ingenuity, human condition, technological innovation, Artificial Intelligence, education reforml.*

## INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world is experiencing a profound erosion of human well-being, manifested in widening socioeconomic inequality, escalating levels of anxiety, poverty and depression, accelerating ecological breakdown, and pervasive cultural alienation (Herrington, 2020). Efforts focused solely on policy reforms, technological fixes, or institutional adjustments have repeatedly proved inadequate. This suggests that these crises stem from a deeper and more insidious root: a global crisis of imagination (McDougald, 2018). Modern civilization's relentless prioritization of efficiency, predictability, and economic utility has steadily devalued creativity, empathy, and introspection. As automation and algorithms dictate human behavior and as economic measures supplant intrinsic human value, spaces for imaginative and ethical engagement continue to contract (Koleva, 2025). In this environment, the capacity to envision alternatives- to empathize, question, and imagine meaning in uncertainty- is eclipsed by the imperatives of speed, consumption, and conformity (Medium commentary, 2023). This paper therefore contends that creativity must be restored as a core human faculty- not an indulgence reserved for elites, but the ability to produce meaningful, adaptive responses in complex

circumstances (Zapata-Campos et al., 2023). Creativity extends far beyond art, invention, or scientific discovery- it also influences how people connect, support, and evolve together. In personal relationships, it is reflected in the ability to resolve conflicts, show care, and adapt to each other's needs. Within communities, creativity drives collaborative solutions, allowing groups to tackle shared problems with empathy and resourcefulness. On an individual level, it fuels self-renewal- helping people to heal, reimagine their identities, and cultivate relationships grounded in mutual respect. In this way, creativity serves as a vital thread linking personal growth with collective harmony, strengthening and deepening human bonds (Zawadi, 2024). Despite remarkable technological and material progress, contemporary systems remain fixated on measurable productivity, performance metrics, and short-term gains. Educational institutions valorize conformity over curiosity; workplaces prioritize efficiency over exploration; political systems reward polarization over distinction. In these contexts, creativity is not merely marginalized- it is actively stifled (Huang et al., 2024). What is being lost is not just artistic talent, but the human capacity to imagine humane and sustainable alternatives. Ultimately, reclaiming creativity becomes an ethical and civilizational imperative. To rehumanize society, creativity must be re-centered as a foundational mode of perceiving, engaging, and acting. This shift requires rethinking education, leadership, institutions, and ecological relationships. Creativity is not peripheral- it is essential to bridging divides, restoring social cohesion, and envisioning futures beyond fragmentation and despair.

### **Theories of Creativity and the Human Condition**

Scholars (Amabile, 1983, 1996; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Engeström, 1987; Finke, Ward, & Smith, 1992; Guilford, 1950, 1967; Simonton, 1999, 2003; Sternberg & Lubart, 1991, 1995; Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993) have long emphasized the significance of creativity for human development and functioning, proposing various theories to explain its role. In 1943, American psychologist Abraham Maslow introduced one of the most enduring models of human motivation in his seminal work "*A Theory of Human Motivation*". Central to his theory is the hierarchy of needs, a framework that organizes human drives into a pyramid-shaped structure, ascending from basic survival to the highest forms of psychological growth (Maslow, 1943). At its foundation lie physiological needs such as food, water, and shelter, followed by safety, love and belonging, and esteem. At the very peak of the hierarchy is self-actualization, a state in which individuals strive to realize their full potential and express themselves authentically and creatively. Maslow regarded creativity as a fundamental expression of self-actualization, and he viewed it not merely as an artistic skill but as a way of engaging with the world. In this sense, creativity is not limited to painters or poets; rather, it manifests in problem-solving, relationship building, and adapting to challenges with originality and integrity. A self-actualized individual, according to Maslow, pursues meaningful goals, remains open to experience, and embodies a deep sense of purpose. Creativity, thus, emerges as a natural extension of living fully, rather than as a specialized talent.

Furthermore, Csikszentmihalyi (1990), in *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, advanced this discourse by proposing that creativity thrives when individuals enter a state of "flow". He argued that creativity flourishes when individuals enter a state of "flow," defined as deep immersion in tasks where skills meet challenges in a balanced and meaningful way. Flow states are characterized by timelessness, intrinsic motivation, and peak performance, which in turn foster creative breakthroughs (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Extending this to his systems model, Csikszentmihalyi demonstrated that creativity is not an isolated trait but a socially mediated process involving three elements: the individual (source of ideas), the domain (body of knowledge), and the field (gatekeepers who validate and transmit innovations). In this model, creativity depends not only on individual capacity but also on social structures and cultural recognition. Thus, Csikszentmihalyi's theory highlights both the psychological and social dimensions of creativity, positioning it at the intersection of personal experience and collective validation.

Similarly, Freire (1970), in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, positioned creativity as an indispensable element of human liberation and empowerment. Freire criticized

the “banking model” of education, where knowledge is deposited into passive learners, arguing that such methods suppress critical thought and creative engagement. Instead, he proposed a dialogical model in which teachers and learners co-create knowledge through interaction and reflection. Here, creativity is not only a personal pursuit but a collective act of resistance, transformation, and empowerment. By encouraging critical consciousness (*conscientização*), Freire viewed creativity as a tool for individuals and communities to challenge oppression and reimagine their realities. Creativity, therefore, becomes political and emancipatory, enabling human beings to act as agents of change rather than passive recipients of knowledge.

Taken together, Maslow’s humanistic psychology, Csikszentmihalyi’s positive psychology and systems model, and Freire’s critical pedagogy form an eclectic body of perspectives that illuminate creativity from complementary angles: the intrapersonal, the experiential, and the socio-political. The common thread running through all three theories is the recognition that creativity is not a marginal or peripheral activity but a central expression of the human condition. All three perspectives converge on the notion that creativity flourishes when individuals are empowered—whether through the satisfaction of fundamental needs (Maslow, 1943), immersion in meaningful challenges (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), or engagement in liberating dialogue (Freire, 1970). They each stress that supportive environments—be they psychological, cultural, or educational—are essential for the full flowering of human creativity. In conclusion, these theories collectively suggest that creativity is both an outcome and a driver of human development. It thrives when conditions of freedom, purpose, and recognition are present, and it functions as a bridge between personal fulfillment and collective transformation. Hence, creativity is not only about producing novelty but about nurturing wholeness, agency, and dignity in the human condition.

### **The Crisis of the Human Condition**

Throughout human history, creativity has been a cornerstone of survival and social development. In early societies, the ability to invent tools, adapt to harsh environments, and communicate through language and art was not optional; it was essential. These acts of creativity were organic, arising from necessity and shaped by the immediate demands of life. However, as human civilization advanced, particularly during and after the Industrial Revolution, the nature of creativity changed. What was once spontaneous and survival-driven became increasingly systematized, compartmentalized, and managed by institutions. Creativity, rather than being a daily expression of human adaptability, was increasingly relegated to specialized domains, while most individuals were drawn into rigid routines designed for efficiency, not imagination.

This transformation in the nature of creative expression coincided with the rise of technological innovation. While technology has undeniably enhanced human life in countless ways, it has also ushered in a new form of dependency. Modern society increasingly relies on automation, artificial intelligence, and algorithm-driven platforms to perform tasks that once demanded human ingenuity. From navigation to decision-making, individuals now turn to machines for solutions. This shift has profound implications for our cognitive abilities. As Csikszentmihalyi (1990) argued, creativity flourishes when individuals are immersed in challenging tasks that require their full attention—a state he called “flow.” Yet the omnipresence of convenience culture dulls this potential by reducing the opportunities for deep engagement, promoting a passive mindset where curiosity and initiative give way to instant gratification.

This technological dependency is reinforced by the structural forces of standardization and bureaucracy that govern modern institutions. Education systems, for example, often prioritize test scores, compliance, and memorization over exploration and inquiry. Likewise, corporate workplaces emphasize performance metrics, rigid protocols, and hierarchical roles that reward predictability rather than innovation. In such environments, creativity is not just undervalued; it is actively suppressed, as individuals learn to follow instructions rather than ask questions or propose new solutions. The consequences of this suppression are not merely intellectual but deeply psychological. As Maslow (1943) emphasized, human beings have a hierarchy of needs, culminating in the desire for self-actualization—the drive to realize one’s



fullest potential. However, when individuals are caught in systems that prioritize productivity over purpose, they are often unable to pursue this higher form of personal fulfillment. The result is a growing sense of alienation, a lack of meaning, and even creative burnout. People may feel emotionally disconnected from their work, uninspired in their personal lives, and uncertain about their broader purpose. The rise of mental health issues in technologically advanced societies including anxiety, depression, and burnout- is a reflection of this deeper existential crisis.

This psychological stagnation is compounded by how leisure itself has been transformed. Rather than serving as a space for rest, reflection, or creative play, modern leisure is increasingly shaped by algorithmic entertainment that demands little from its consumers. This undermines the very conditions that Csikszentmihalyi identified as necessary for flow: deep focus, intrinsic motivation, and meaningful challenge. Even moments meant for relaxation are filled with distractions that prevent introspection and drain mental energy, leaving individuals too fatigued to engage in creative or purposeful activity.

### **Creativity Beyond the Arts: A Way of Life**

To live creatively is to engage deeply with existence: to question assumptions, seek meaning, and adapt to uncertainty. This perspective goes beyond conventional notions of creativity as a rare talent or artistic gift. It involves a disposition to live reflectively and responsively, using imagination not only to produce things but to shape how we interpret and navigate the world. Frankl (1984) spoke of "creative values" as one of the paths through which individuals derive meaning- creating something or doing a deed. This form of existential creativity fosters resilience, purpose, and inner strength, particularly in times of suffering or disorientation. In this light, creativity emerges as a deeply human resource that permeates daily life. It is present in the way parents nurture children, teachers inspire curiosity, neighbors resolve conflict, and communities respond to crises. These actions exemplify what Richards (2010) calls "everyday creativity," which reflects the ability of ordinary people to respond to life challenges with flexibility and imagination. Such creativity is not about artistic performance or technological invention but about emotional intelligence, perspective-taking, and problem-solving. It is this form of creativity that sustains human relationships, strengthens communities, and enables adaptation in uncertain environments. Everyday ingenuity provides tangible examples of this broader view of creativity. Parents who develop unique strategies to educate and entertain their children while juggling multiple jobs, or community organizers addressing food insecurity through local initiatives, embody creativity rooted in empathy, adaptability, and problem-solving. These actions may not be celebrated in galleries or scientific journals, but they require no less imagination or innovation. In scientific and technical contexts, creativity manifests in unconventional solutions designed to improve lives- for example, developing affordable prosthetics using recycled materials or inventing solar-powered water purification systems. Similarly, farmers in drought-prone regions often devise low-tech irrigation methods such as clay pot watering or rainwater harvesting to conserve water. Street vendors in crowded cities design portable kitchens out of bicycles and recycled carts, blending efficiency, economy, and innovation. These examples illustrate that creativity emerges not just in extraordinary settings but as a practical and adaptive response to everyday challenges. Healthcare and education also showcase striking forms of everyday creativity. During the COVID-19 pandemic, doctors and nurses in resource-constrained settings improvised makeshift personal protective equipment (PPE) using plastic sheeting and household materials when supplies were scarce. Teachers and students in under-resourced communities have adapted to disruptions by turning to handwritten materials, community radio, or even outdoor learning under trees with chalk and stones as tools. In the informal economy, individuals repurpose discarded materials into new products- furniture from shipping pallets, handbags from plastic waste, or toys from scrap metal- demonstrating innovation driven by necessity, environmental awareness, and cultural expression. In the digital age, end-users also play a role: young people repurpose old phones or circuit boards to create makeshift radios or drones, while social media users creatively remix language, humor, and media to

comment on pressing social issues. Csikszentmihalyi (1990) reminds us that such acts of creativity flourish when personal skills align with meaningful challenges and environments provide opportunities for focus and engagement. However, the development and expression of creativity depend significantly on the environments in which people live and work. Institutions play a crucial role in either promoting or stifling creative engagement. When institutions are designed to support the creative agency of individuals and groups, they become engines of cultural vitality and societal transformation. In this sense, creativity is not a rare phenomenon but a way of life- a capacity available to all, embedded in the human condition, and vital for directing uncertainty in the contemporary world.

### **Possible Barriers to Creative Revitalization**

Bureaucracy, surveillance capitalism, and exploitative labor systems limit opportunities for creativity by emphasizing control and efficiency (Zuboff, 2019). In such environments, human spontaneity and imaginative thinking are treated as risks rather than assets. Bureaucratic structures enforce rigid protocols, reward predictability, and discourage divergence from established norms. This results in an institutional culture that prioritizes procedural compliance over exploratory thinking, making it difficult for new ideas to surface or flourish. Creativity, in these systems, becomes subordinate to productivity metrics and risk-averse planning.

These structures reduce individuals to passive consumers rather than active creators. Modern economic systems, deeply entrenched in consumerist ideologies, often equate personal worth with consumption rather than creation. This reinforces a culture in which people are more likely to follow trends than generate alternatives. As creative engagement is outsourced to professionals and corporations, everyday people lose confidence in their capacity to innovate or contribute meaningfully beyond consumption.

Widespread myths depict creativity as a rare gift possessed only by artists or geniuses. This perception, often reinforced through media, education, and societal messaging, marginalizes the creative potential of the broader population. People come to view creativity as exclusive rather than inclusive- something either innate or inaccessible. Moreover, fear of failure and perfectionism- often instilled through formal education- further inhibit creative experimentation (Dweck, 2006). When mistakes are punished rather than used as opportunities for growth, learners internalize a reluctance to try new approaches or think outside the box.

Automation and artificial intelligence threaten to displace human creativity by prioritizing predictive efficiency over imaginative exploration. As machines become more capable of generating text, images, and solutions based on past data, there is a growing risk that the creative process itself will be automated, reducing opportunities for human-led innovation. While these technologies can augment creativity, they must not replace the uniquely human capacity to envision the unknown (Florida, 2005). The challenge, therefore, is to ensure that digital tools serve as catalysts for human imagination, not substitutes for it.

### **Reclaiming Creativity as a Lifeline**

Educational transformation must emphasize inquiry-based learning, interdisciplinary curricula, and student-led exploration. Robinson (2011) argues that schools should be restructured to become ecosystems of creativity where learners are encouraged to take intellectual risks and develop unique perspectives. A reimagined educational paradigm would empower students to become co-creators of knowledge, thereby promoting a lifelong capacity for innovation and reflective action. Such learning environments would prioritize process over product, exploration over perfection, and diversity of thought over uniformity. Creative expression has long been recognized as a therapeutic tool. Art therapy, journaling, and narrative storytelling allow individuals to explore identity, heal trauma, and regain agency (Malchiodi, 2005). These practices enable people to externalize internal conflicts and make sense of complex emotional experiences, offering a safe space for healing and self-discovery. In mental health contexts, creative activities can reduce anxiety, enhance emotional

regulation, and strengthen a sense of coherence. When integrated into therapeutic models, the arts do not merely serve as expressive outlets- they become transformative means through which individuals reclaim voice, dignity, and wholeness in the aftermath of distress. Beyond individual healing, community art programs and culturally embedded creative practices can enhance psychological resilience and collective healing. In many societies, creativity is deeply woven into rituals, festivals, and communal life. These traditions serve not only aesthetic purposes but also social, spiritual, and healing functions. Participatory art initiatives such as community murals, storytelling circles, and performance workshops foster dialogue, inclusion, and social cohesion. They offer spaces for marginalized voices to be heard and for communities to confront shared histories and envision hopeful futures. In contexts of social fragmentation or post-conflict recovery, such creative interventions can help rebuild trust and foster a renewed sense of belonging.

Creativity can also reinvigorate civic life through participatory practices like urban gardening, community murals, and deliberative forums that use storytelling and art. These initiatives encourage active citizenship and democratic engagement by making abstract political issues tangible and emotionally resonant. Environmental renewal, too, depends on creative strategies such as biomimicry, ecological design, and integration of Indigenous ecological knowledge (Capra & Luisi, 2014). These approaches challenge extractive and mechanistic paradigms, offering instead regenerative models that align with natural systems. Whether in education, mental health, civic engagement, or ecological stewardship, reclaiming creativity as a lifeline is not a romantic ideal- it is a practical, urgent, and transformative necessity.

### **Toward a Culture of Re-Creation**

Redefining progress to include indicators of well-being, creativity, and ecological harmony is essential. In a world increasingly strained by environmental collapse, mental health crises, and social fragmentation, the traditional metrics of growth such as GDP and material accumulation are insufficient. These economic indicators fail to capture the full spectrum of human experience and often obscure the systemic harm they perpetuate. Instead, societies must prioritize regenerative development, cultural vitality, and participatory governance (Raworth, 2017), aligning with a holistic vision of human flourishing that integrates environmental sustainability and social cohesion. Marginalized communities often exhibit high levels of adaptive creativity through informal economies, oral traditions, and communal resilience. These communities, while often excluded from formal systems of innovation, demonstrate extraordinary ingenuity in response to resource scarcity and systemic neglect. Their cultural practices and survival strategies represent living reservoirs of alternative knowledge. Recognizing and integrating these practices into mainstream innovation can decentralize knowledge and diversify problem-solving approaches (Escobar, 2018), helping to reshape global narratives around who contributes to progress and how innovation is defined.

Furthermore, embracing these diverse forms of creativity challenges dominant models that privilege technical or elite knowledge. It allows for a broader understanding of innovation rooted in lived experience, interdependence, and relational ethics. This shift can foster more inclusive institutions and policies that are responsive to real-world complexity. Supporting local storytelling, community organizing, traditional ecological knowledge, and grassroots experimentation becomes key to building creative ecosystems that empower citizens across class, race, and geography. The future demands creative leadership that combines visionary thinking with deep empathy and narrative intelligence. In a time of volatility and uncertainty, leaders must be capable of imagining alternatives and inspiring collective hope. Beyond administrative competence, they must be equipped to facilitate dialogue, foster curiosity, and reframe crisis as an opportunity for transformation. Leaders must be able to craft inclusive stories of belonging and transformation while fostering cultures of imagination

(Kegan & Lahey, 2009). It is through such leadership that societies can transition from systems of extraction and control to ones of care, co-creation, and renewal.

## **Toward a Culture of Re-Creation**

A redefinition of progress- one that includes indicators of well-being, creativity, and ecological harmony- is essential. In a world increasingly strained by environmental collapse, mental health crises, and social fragmentation, the traditional metrics of growth such as GDP and material accumulation are insufficient. These economic indicators fail to capture the full spectrum of human experience and often obscure the systemic harm they perpetuate. Instead, societies must prioritize regenerative development, cultural vitality, and participatory governance (Raworth, 2017), aligning with a holistic vision of human flourishing that integrates environmental sustainability and social cohesion. Marginalized communities often exhibit high levels of adaptive creativity through informal economies, oral traditions, and communal resilience. These communities, while often excluded from formal systems of innovation, demonstrate extraordinary ingenuity in response to resource scarcity and systemic neglect. Their cultural practices and survival strategies represent living reservoirs of alternative knowledge. Recognizing and integrating these practices into mainstream innovation can decentralize knowledge and diversify problem-solving approaches (Escobar, 2018), helping to reshape global narratives around who contributes to progress and how innovation is defined.

Furthermore, embracing these diverse forms of creativity challenges dominant models that privilege technical or elite knowledge. It allows for a broader understanding of innovation rooted in lived experience, interdependence, and relational ethics. This shift can foster more inclusive institutions and policies that are responsive to real-world complexity. Supporting local storytelling, community organizing, traditional ecological knowledge, and grassroots experimentation becomes key to building creative ecosystems that empower citizens across class, race, and geography.

The future demands creative leadership that combines visionary thinking with deep empathy and narrative intelligence. In a time of volatility and uncertainty, leaders must be capable of imagining alternatives and inspiring collective hope. Beyond administrative competence, they must be equipped to facilitate dialogue, promote curiosity, and reframe crisis as an opportunity for transformation. Leaders must be able to craft inclusive stories of belonging and transformation while encouraging cultures of imagination (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). It is through such leadership that societies can transition from systems of extraction and control to ones of care, co-creation, and renewal.

## **Recommendations and the way Forward**

In confronting these challenges, the revitalization of human creativity demands **a conscious cultural shift**, supported by changes in education, work, and societal values. The following pathways propose a vision for reclaiming ingenuity in an age of over-systematization:

### **i. Reimagining Education as Exploration**

Education should transcend content delivery by fostering curiosity, inquiry, and creativity. Approaches such as project-based learning, interdisciplinarity, and open-ended questioning encourage critical thinking, while teachers serve as facilitators of discovery rather than mere conveyors of knowledge.

### **ii. Encouraging Slow Thinking and Deep Work**

Amidst multitasking and digital overstimulation, practices like mindfulness, journaling, and immersive reading promote focused attention and presence. Schools and workplaces can support this by creating protected spaces-



such as deep work hours or creativity labs- where sustained concentration is valued.

**iii. Redefining Success and Failure**

Success should be understood not only in terms of outcomes but also as process, experimentation, and learning through failure. Since creativity often depends on trial and error, individuals need the freedom to explore without fear of stigma or consequence.

**iv. Creating Collaborative and Open Systems**

Creativity flourishes in open, diverse ecosystems where ideas are shared and tested. Collaborative innovation, community projects, and open-source platforms can democratize creativity and extend it beyond elite institutions.

**v. Valuing Imagination in Public Discourse**

Imagination should be recognized as a civic virtue, requiring investment alongside infrastructure and industry. Support for the arts, cultural expression, and future-oriented practices- such as storytelling, design, and vision-building- can strengthen society's collective imaginative capacity.

**vi. Integrating Human and Technological Creativity**

Technology should be seen not as a substitute for human thought but as a catalyst for it. Fields like creative coding, digital storytelling, and AI-assisted design highlight how human intuition and computational power can combine to generate new forms of innovation.

**Conclusion**

The human species stands at a critical threshold. Our survival and flourishing depend not just on technological solutions or political reforms, but on a fundamental reawakening of the human spirit. The crises of our age- rising inequality, widespread psychological distress, ecological devastation, and cultural alienation- signal not only systemic failures but a deeper erosion of our collective imagination. Creativity- understood as a way of seeing, engaging, and transforming the world- is our most vital and renewable resource. It is through creative insight that societies have historically reinvented themselves during times of upheaval. Now, more than ever, we must embrace creativity not as luxury or entertainment, but as an existential necessity.

According to Okediji et al. (2017) and Okediji (2019), reversing the course of social disintegration, psychological distress, and environmental decline requires deliberate investment in systems, cultural frameworks, and practices that cultivate curiosity, spark imagination, and safeguard the freedom to create. This begins with educational reform that places inquiry, critical thinking, and interdisciplinary exploration at its core. Schools must become incubators of imagination where failure is seen as a stepping stone to discovery. Beyond formal education, lifelong learning opportunities should be accessible to all, fostering creative confidence in individuals across all ages and walks of life. Policymakers must integrate creative and cultural dimensions into developmental agendas, ensuring that infrastructure, funding, and governance support innovation not only in science and technology but in arts, culture, and community-building.

Technological innovation must also be harnessed ethically and imaginatively. Rather than replacing human faculties with automation, technology should amplify human creativity, empathy, and problem-solving capacity. Platforms must be redesigned to encourage depth, authenticity, and collaboration rather than superficiality and conformity. Additionally, public and private institutions must support creative workspaces that prioritize psychological safety, autonomy, and experimentation. Culturally, we need narratives that celebrate diversity of thought, valorize the unknown, and honour those who dare to imagine otherwise. Creativity must no longer be confined to elite spaces or commodified for profit- it must become

embedded in everyday life, from neighborhood initiatives to national policymaking.

In reclaiming creativity, we reclaim our shared humanity. The future will not be built merely by experts, algorithms, or economists- but by communities willing to dream differently, care deeply, and act boldly. We must be committed to cultivating a global culture of re-creation that is inclusive, imaginative, and regenerative. This calls for collaboration across sectors: educators must nurture divergent thinking; policymakers must support participatory innovation; technologists must design with empathy and foresight; and citizens must reclaim their role as active creators of culture and society. Only through a collective recommitment to creativity as a way of life can we navigate the uncertainties ahead and construct a world that is not only more sustainable but more meaningfully human.

## REFERENCES

- Amabile, T. M. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A Componential conceptualisation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 357-376.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision*. Cambridge University Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). *Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity*. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 313–335). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press.
- Finke, R. A., Ward, T. B., & Smith, S. M. (1992). *Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Florida, R. (2005). *The flight of the creative class*. Harper Business.
- Frankl, V. E. (1984). *Man's search for meaning* (Rev. ed.). Washington Square Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hawken, P. (2017). *Drawdown: The most comprehensive plan ever proposed to reverse global warming*. Penguin.
- Herrington, G. (2021). *Update to Limits to Growth: Comparing the World3 model with empirical data*. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 25(3), 614–626. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.13084>
- Herrington, G. (2020). *Update to limits to growth: Comparing the World 3 model with empirical data*. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 25(3), 614-626.
- Huang, M., Jin, M., & Li, N. (2024, December 5). *Augmenting minds or automating skills: The differential role of human capital in generative AI's impact on creative tasks* [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.03963>.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Harvard Business Press.

- Koleva, P. (2025, April 22). *Beyond automation: The importance of human creativity and innovation*.
- Malchiodi, C. A. (2005). *Expressive therapies*. Guilford Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- McDougald, P. (2018). Has the operating system for the Western world crashed? *New York Magazine*.
- Medium commentary (2023). *AI creativity between fascination and devaluation*. Medium.
- Okediji, A.A., Fagbohunge, O.B., & Akintayo, O.A. (2017). Creativity research in Nigeria. A research agenda for the study of organisational creativity. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, 20(1), 104-118.
- Okediji, I. A. A. (2019). *Dispositional factors as predictors of organisational creativity in selected tertiary educational institutions in Nigeria* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Lagos.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing. .
- Richards, R. (2010). Everyday creativity: Process and way of life-Four key issues. Cambridge Handbook of Creativity. 189-215. 10.1017/CBO9780511763205.013.
- Robinson, K. (2011) *Out of Our Minds: Learning to be Creative*. Revised and Updated Edition, Capstone Publishing Ltd., Chichester. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780857086549>
- Simonton, D. K. (1999). *Origins of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simonton, D. K. (2003). Scientific creativity as constrained stochastic behavior: The integration of product, person, and process perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 475–494.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1991). An investment theory of creativity and its development. *Human Development*, 34(1), 1–31.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. New York: Free Press.
- Woodman, R.W., Sawyer, J.E., & Griffin, R.W. (1993). Toward a theory of organisational creativity. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(2), 293-321.
- Zapata-Campos, M. J., Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2023). *Nothing to lose: the rationales of grassroots financial innovations in contexts of extreme scarcity*. *Social Enterprise Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-08-2022-0074>
- Zawadi, N. K. (2024). *Exploring the role of creativity in psychological resilience*. *Research Invention Journal of Research in Education*, 4(2), 62–65.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs.