



The Content And Structure Of The Concept Of "Creative Approach" In Scientific Discourse

Kasimova Gavhar Islamovna

Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD), Associate Professor,
Turan University
gavharqosimova0909@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines the content and structural characteristics of the concept of "creative approach" in contemporary scientific and pedagogical discourse. The terminological evolution of "approach" in pedagogical literature from the mid-twentieth century to the present is traced, revealing its semantic ambiguity and interdisciplinary complexity. The article identifies the defining attributes of the creative approach, distinguishes it from adjacent concepts such as method, principle, and strategy, and proposes a structured three-component model comprising motivational-value, cognitive-operational, and reflective-evaluative dimensions. The findings contribute to the theoretical clarification of the concept and its application to the preparation of future native language teachers.

Keywords:

creative approach, pedagogical terminology, linguodidactics, native language teaching, conceptual analysis, terminological evolution, creative thinking, methodological competence.

INTRODUCTION

Among the central concepts that shape contemporary educational theory, the notion of "approach" occupies a uniquely contested position. Unlike more precisely delineated terms such as "method" or "technique", the concept of approach carries a broad, often contested semantic range — at once a philosophical orientation, a methodological framework, and a practical disposition. This breadth makes it both indispensable and imprecise, a concept used widely across disciplines yet rarely subjected to rigorous definitional scrutiny.

Within this broad conceptual landscape, the **creative approach** holds particular importance for the preparation of future teachers of native language. The nature of language as both a formal system and a living communicative and cultural practice demands that the teacher who works with it be not merely technically

competent but creatively responsive — capable of designing new instructional pathways, adapting to the specific linguistic needs of learners, and constructing meaning rather than merely transmitting it [1].

Yet the scholarly literature reveals that "creative approach" is itself a problematic designation. Its usage is inconsistent, its boundaries with related concepts — creative method, creative strategy, creative activity — are rarely specified, and its internal structure has not been definitively established. Earlier scholarship has treated aspects of this problem: Deikina [2] documented the terminological instability of "approach" in native language methodology; Shatilov [3] and Tekuchev [4] addressed general methodological concepts without fully elaborating a theory of the creative approach; Qosimova [5] explored the integration of natural science knowledge in primary education, demonstrating the practical

dimensions of creative pedagogical design. The present article builds on and extends this work by proposing a systematic conceptual analysis of the creative approach in the specific context of linguomethodical preparation.

The article addresses three questions: (1) What is the terminological history of "approach" in pedagogical discourse, and what are the sources of its semantic instability? (2) What distinguishes the creative approach from adjacent concepts — method, principle, strategy, and creativity as a personal trait? (3) What structural components constitute the creative approach as a professional disposition in linguomethodical preparation, and how do they function in relation to one another?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employs a **theoretical-analytical methodology** suited to the conceptual character of its research questions. No empirical data collection was conducted; the investigation is a work of theoretical scholarship oriented toward definitional clarification and structural modeling. The following analytical procedures were applied:

Systematic literature review: Methodological literature on native language teaching published in Uzbek and Russian from the 1960s to the present was reviewed, including textbooks, curricula, methodological manuals, and journal articles. International scholarship in applied linguistics, language pedagogy, and the psychology of creativity was additionally examined. A total of 38 sources were surveyed; nine are directly cited in this article.

Definitional analysis: Key terms — approach, method, principle, strategy, creative approach, creative activity, creative thinking — were systematically examined across sources to establish their semantic range and points of overlap or divergence.

Contrastive-comparative analysis: The creative approach was compared with four adjacent concepts — creative method, creative activity, creativity as a personal trait, and the communicative approach — to identify its distinctive defining characteristics.

Structural-functional modeling: The internal architecture of the creative approach was

analyzed to identify its constituent components, their specific characteristics, and their functional relationships. The resulting three-component model was evaluated through review by five experienced specialists in native language methodology at Uzbekistan's pedagogical higher education institutions.

The theoretical grounding of the analysis draws primarily on Amabile's social psychology of creativity [6], De Bono's theory of lateral thinking [7], Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development [8], and Schön's account of the reflective practitioner [9]. These frameworks were selected on the basis of their established relevance to the three dimensions — motivational-affective, cognitive-operational, and metacognitive — identified in the preliminary analysis of the creative approach literature.

RESULTS

Result 1. The terminological history of "approach" and its semantic instability

The systematic review reveals a clear trajectory of terminological development. In the earliest period examined — methodological literature from the 1960s through early 1980s — the word "approach" appeared frequently but without stable terminological value. It functioned as a generic orientation word, used interchangeably with "path", "aspect", and "angle". The work of Gorbunova on individualized teaching, for instance, uses "individual approach" to denote simply the practice of recording individual student errors — a procedural recommendation, not a principled educational orientation [1].

This pattern was retrospectively noted by Deikina [2], who observed that the word "approach" in this period could not be considered a fully established term, given its interchangeable usage with the concept of "aspect". Tekuchev's influential textbook of the same era employs "creative approach" in the sense of "a way of doing things that involves originality" — again a non-technical usage [4]. A process of terminological stabilization is observable from the late 1980s onward, coinciding with broader pedagogical paradigm shifts. However, three sources of semantic

instability persist into the contemporary period:

- the interdisciplinary character of the concept, which carries different emphases in sociology, management, engineering, and pedagogy;
- the coexistence of multiple and sometimes contradictory interpretations within a single discipline, producing what may be termed functional terminological instability;
- the unresolved relationship between "approach" and adjacent terms — method,

principle, strategy, technique — whose boundaries are variably drawn across authors and contexts.

Result 2. Definitional characteristics and boundaries of the creative approach

Contrastive analysis identifies four boundary distinctions that are essential to a precise understanding of the creative approach (Table 1).

Table 1.
The creative approach distinguished from adjacent concepts

| Adjacent concept | Key characteristics | Distinction from creative approach |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Creative method | Procedural and specific; prescribes ordered actions for a defined purpose | Approach is an orientation; method is derived from it but does not define it |
| Creative activity | Form of practice; actual production of original outputs | Approach frames and values activity; can exist independently of any specific act |
| Creativity as a trait | Innate capacity distributed unequally among individuals | Approach presupposes educability of creativity; democratic premise |
| Communicative approach | Prioritizes authentic interaction; functional language use | Different primary orientation; compatible but not equivalent |

Source: compiled by the author.

These distinctions establish the creative approach as a **governing professional orientation**: more general than a method (it does not prescribe specific procedures), more particular than a principle (it is oriented toward a specific domain), and distinct from creativity as a trait (it is teachable and structured rather than innate). An approach orients; it does not prescribe. It is the framework from which

methods are selected and within which activities acquire their educational meaning.

Result 3. A three-component structural model of the creative approach

Structural-functional analysis of the creative approach in the context of linguomethodical preparation yields a three-component model (Table 2). Each component is analytically distinct yet functionally dependent on the others.

Table 2.
Three-component model of the creative approach in linguomethodical preparation

| Component | Core elements | Manifestation in linguomethodical practice |
|-----------|---------------|--|
| | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| I. Motivational-Value | Intrinsic orientation toward language as dynamic practice; positive valuation of originality; tolerance for productive failure [6] | Genuine interest in novel instructional solutions; language experienced as discovery rather than transmission |
| II. Cognitive-Operational | Divergent thinking; structural analogical reasoning; original task construction; adaptive lesson design [7; 8] | Ability to design tasks that reveal language as a system; flexibility in response to learner needs; original methodological combinations |
| III. Reflective-Evaluative | Metacognitive monitoring of own practice; critical self-evaluation; orientation toward continuous refinement [9] | Regular analysis of instructional decisions; portfolio-based self-documentation; productive use of feedback |

Source: compiled by the author based on Amabile [6], De Bono [7], Vygotsky [8], Schön [9].

The three components operate in the following functional sequence: the **motivational-value component** provides the affective energy and axiological orientation without which creative engagement cannot be sustained; the **cognitive-operational component** provides the intellectual capacities and practical skills through which orientation is translated into action — and is the domain most directly trainable through pedagogical intervention; the **reflective-evaluative component** provides the feedback mechanisms through which practice is monitored, evaluated, and refined over time. Without all three operating in coordination, the creative approach remains partial: motivation without skill produces diffuse energy; skill without motivation produces mechanical novelty; both without reflection produce episodic rather than developing creativity.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study have several implications that merit discussion. The first concerns the **practical consequences of conceptual clarity**. The terminological imprecision documented in Result 1 is not merely an academic inconvenience. When teacher educators and curriculum designers invoke the "creative approach" without specifying what it consists of, they cannot

reliably design programs to develop it, construct assessments to measure it, or recognize its presence or absence in student work. The three-component model proposed in Result 3 provides a framework that can ground these practical operations: it specifies what is to be developed, how it can be developed, and how development can be recognized.

The second concerns the **theoretical grounding of the model**. The motivational-value component draws on Amabile's finding that intrinsic motivation is the primary predictor of sustained creative output [6]. The cognitive-operational component draws on De Bono's lateral thinking [7] and the Vygotskian conception of the zone of proximal development [8], which frames productive learning as engagement at the boundary of the known and unknown. The reflective-evaluative component engages Schön's account of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action as the basis of professional expertise [9]. The proposed model is therefore a theoretically grounded synthesis rather than a free construction, with each component anchored in established frameworks.

The third concerns the **specifically linguomethodical character of the creative approach** as theorized here. Creativity in education is a broad theme addressed across

many disciplinary contexts; but the specific creativity required of the native language teacher has distinctive features. It must be simultaneously linguistically informed — grounded in genuine understanding of language as a system — and pedagogically effective — capable of translating that understanding into learning experiences appropriate to specific learners in specific contexts. A teacher who generates original instructional tasks that misrepresent the grammatical or semantic structure of the language is not exercising the creative approach in the relevant sense. Qosimova's work on the integration of natural science knowledge [5; 10] demonstrates analogously that creative pedagogical design must be disciplinarily grounded to be educationally effective.

The study has limitations that should be acknowledged. The three-component model has been developed through theoretical analysis and specialist review; it has not been empirically tested through a full experimental design. Future research should operationalize each component into measurable indicators, develop validated assessment instruments, and subject the resulting framework to experimental evaluation. Longitudinal studies examining the development of the creative approach across the years of teacher preparation programs would also substantially advance the field.

CONCLUSION

This article has addressed a gap in the theoretical literature on linguomethodical teacher preparation through systematic conceptual analysis of the creative approach. The following principal conclusions have been reached:

1. The concept of "approach" entered pedagogical discourse as a technical term only in the late twentieth century; its prior usage was non-technical and semantically diffuse, a residue of which persists in contemporary usage and produces terminological instability.
2. The creative approach is definitionally distinct from creative method, creative activity, creativity as a trait, and the communicative approach; failure to maintain these distinctions

generates conceptual confusion with direct practical consequences for curriculum design and assessment.

3. The creative approach in linguomethodical preparation is most adequately conceptualized as a three-component professional disposition comprising motivational-value, cognitive-operational, and reflective-evaluative dimensions, each with distinctive characteristics and developmental implications.

4. The proposed model provides a theoretical foundation for the development of curricula, instructional strategies, and assessment frameworks specifically oriented toward cultivating linguomethodical creativity in future native language teachers.

As the demands placed on language teachers continue to evolve — toward greater adaptability, more personalized instruction, and more sophisticated engagement with language as a cultural and cognitive practice — the need for a well-grounded understanding of what it means to teach language creatively becomes correspondingly more urgent. The framework proposed here is offered as a contribution toward meeting that need.

REFERENCES

1. Zunnunov A.Z. Ona tili o'qitish metodikasi [Methods of teaching the native language]. — Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2018. — 312 p.
2. Deikina A.D. Metodika prepodavaniya russkogo yazyka [Methodology of Russian language teaching]. — Moskva: Prosveshcheniye, 1996. — 287 p.
3. Shatilov S.F. Metodika obucheniya nemetiskomu yazyku v sredney shkole [Methodology of teaching German in secondary school]. — Moskva: Prosveshcheniye, 1986. — 223 p.
4. Tekuchev A.V. Metodika russkogo yazyka v sredney shkole [Methodology of Russian language in secondary school]. — Moskva: Prosveshcheniye, 1980. — 414 p.
5. Qosimova G.I. Boshlang'ich sinf o'quvchilarida tabiiy-ilmiiy

- dunyoqarashni shakllantirish metodikasini takomillashtirish [Improving the methodology of forming a natural-scientific worldview in primary school students]: dis. ...PhD. — Toshkent, 2022. — 144 p.
6. Amabile T.M. Creativity in Context: Update to the Social Psychology of Creativity. — Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996. — 317 p.
 7. De Bono E. Lateral Thinking: Creativity Step by Step. — London: Penguin Books, 1970. — 301 p.
 8. Vygotsky L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. — 159 p.
 9. Schön D.A. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. — New York: Basic Books, 1983. — 374 p.
 10. Qosimova G.I. Didactic foundations of the integration of natural science knowledge in primary school as a mechanism of systematic cognition of the surrounding world // European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences. — 2020, Vol. 8, No. 4. — P. 1-8.
 11. Shaxmurodova D.A., Qosimova G.I. Umumiy pedagogika [General pedagogy]: darslik. — Qarshi: Big Makro World, 2024. — 155 p.