CREATIVITY
Theories—Research—Applications
Vol. 11, Issue 2, 2024
sciendo

Assessing Creativity in a Greek Sample: Reliability and Validity of Two Predictors and Two Criteria

Mark A. Runco[1], **Vaitsa Giannouli**[2], **Alaa Eldin A. Ayoub**[3], and **Ahmed M. Abdulla Alabbasi**[4]

1 Southern Oregon University, Ashland, USA; Radical Creativity, Aalto University, Finland, ORCID: 0000-0002-5043-7900
2 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, ORCID: 0000-0003-2176-8986
3 Aswan University, Egypt, ORCID: 0000-0002-3506-4835
4 Arabian Gulf University, Manama, Bahrain, orcid: 0000-0002-4773-4955

ABSTRACT

The present investigation assessed the reliability and predictive validity of four creativity measures with a Greek sample ($N = 433$). Two of the measures were predictors of creativity. One of these was the *How Would You Describe Yourself* (HWYDY) and the other *Creative Attitudes and Values* (CA&V). The other two measures were criteria of creativity. One of these was *Creative Activities and Accomplishments Checklist* and the other the *Runco Ideational Behavior Scale*. Versions of these measures have previously demonstrated good psychometric properties in other samples, but these may not apply to a Greek sample. Indeed, the present analyses uncovered an idiosyncrasy. Correlational analyses indicated that three of the measures were reliable in the Greek sample but one—the HWYDY—was not, at least initially. When the contraindicative items in the HWYDY were removed, reliability was high. Interestingly, the descriptor "originality" lowered reliability of the measure. Several explanations for this are discussed. Regression and confirmatory factor analyses also indicated that the predictive validity of the HWYDY and the CA&V measures were well within the range that is usually interpreted as acceptable. Their predictive validity was also supported by canonical analyses using all four measures, and in regression analyses testing each criterion individually. Future research is recommended, given some limitations in the present effort, but the current results are largely supportive of the use of these four creativity measures in Greek samples.

KEYWORDS:

reliability, creativity, validity, creative activity and accomplishment, ideation

Article history:

Received: April 29, 2024
Received in revised form: December 21, 2024
Accepted: December 30, 2024

ISSN 2354-0036
DOI: 10.2478/ctra-2024-0014

Corresponding author at:

Ahmed M. Abdulla Alabbasi
E-MAIL: ahmedmda@agu.edu.bh

Two tenets of the creativity research hold that (a) creativity is best viewed as a complex or syndrome (MacKinnon, 1965; Mumford & Gustafsson, 1988; Runco, 2023; Runco & Abdulla, 2014) and (b) the various dimensions of this complex are probably widely distributed in the human population. Very likely, everyone has the potential to produce new ideas, for example, and to shift perspectives, identify pressing problems, and produce insights, just to mention some of the key dimensions. Although creative potentials are widely distributed, they are only expressed if certain conditions are met. This is apparent in the group and individual differences manifest in creative activity and achievement. The influential conditions vary from family to family (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2021; Jankowska & Karwowski, 2019), region to region (Cabra & Guerrero, 2022), and culture to culture (Shao et al., 2019). One implication is that background must be taken into account when defining or measuring creativity. Cultural background is particularly important (Kharkhurin, 2014).

Not surprisingly, psychometric theory recommends taking background into account. It recognizes group and individual differences and suggests that estimates of reliability and validity are most meaningful when they are based on local samples. In other words, it is best to avoid generalizing from one sample to another, especially if the sample represents different cultures (Ercikan & Lyons-Thomas, 2013; Hambleton & Lee, 2013). This is true of many research findings, but it applies very directly to reliability and validity, where generalizations should be avoided. A sample from a Western culture might produce meaningfully original ideas when given a test of divergent thinking and when asked to be creative, for instance, while an Eastern sample might respond in an unreliable way when given the same tests with the same directions (Kharkhurin, 2014). All of this underscores the position that culture is a very important consideration when measuring creativity.

Giannouli (2017) uncovered specific attitudes about creativity in Greek samples, confirming that there is idiosyncrasy and that findings from other countries about tests probably do not apply to Greek samples. Another clear reason to develop measures that can be used in Greece is suggested by a very large international study that showed Greek students to perform significantly below the mean of all 61 countries involved. Greek students scored 27 on the PISA creativity test, with the maximum being 60. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which conducted the study with 690,000 students, also concluded that the Greek students performed "below what could be expected based on their performance in reading" (OECD, 2022)." There is a clear need for and keen interest in measuring and supporting creativity in Greece.

Previous research has reported specifics for creativity tests administered to samples from all around the world, including Turkey, Bahrain, Korea, China, and Thailand (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024b; Tep et al., 2021; Yoon, 2017; Zhang et al., 2023). The present research examined four tests from the *Runco Creativity Assessment Battery* of creativity tests (rCAB; http://creativitytestingservice.com), which were administered to a Greek sample. These four tests have previously suggested adequate reliability and validity in various cultural groups, but not in a Greek sample. One of the measures, the *Runco Ideational Behavior Scale* (RIBS), has been validated in Bahrain, Thailand, Canada, USA, and South Korea (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024a; Paek et al., 2016; Richards et al., 2017; Runco et al., 2016a; Tep et al., 2021). The reliability reported in these studies ranged between .82

and .95. Moreover, a meta-analysis on the reliability generalization of the RIBS was conducted by Sen (2022), where the average coefficient alpha was .89. Different methods for estimating the validity of the RIBS have been reported, including those focused on discriminant validity (Runco et al., 2001; Runco et al., 2016a), concurrent validity (Paek et al. 2016), and factor analysis (Tep et al., 2021), all supporting the usefulness of the RIBS.

The *Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist* (CAAC) has been extensively used since the 1960s in different countries, including the USA, South Korea, the United Kingdom, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024c; Agnoli et al., 2019; Paek & Runco, 2017; Richards et al., 2017; Runco et al., 1990; Runco & Albert, 1985; Runco et al., 2023). The CAAC can be interpreted as having good reliability in samples from different counties and with different age groups (.81 < rs < .93). The validity of the CAAC has previously been estimated with different methods, including predictive validity (Runco & Abdulla Alabbasi, 2024; Runco et al., 2016b), convergent validity (Runco & Albert, 1985), and factor analysis (Paek & Runco, 2017). The interpretation of reliability and validity follows guidelines described by Reynolds, Altmann, and Allen (2021).

Creative Attitudes and Values (CA&V) has also been administered in different cultures, including USA, Canada, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Turkey (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024b; Al-Hassan, 2024; Richards et al., 2017; Runco et al., 2017; Runco et al., 2022; Runco et al., 2023). The CAAC was reportedly reliable in these samples of different cultures and different age groups (.68 < rs < .90). The validity of the CA&V has been estimated with several methods, including predictive validity (Acar & Runco, 2015; Richards et al., 2017) and factor analysis (Al-Hassan, 2024).

The *How Would You Describe Yourself* (HWYDY) focuses on traits often associated with creativity. It too has been administered in different cultures and with different age groups, including USA, Canada, and Kuwait (Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024b; Richards et al., 2017; Runco et al., 2016b). Here again, research supported the use of the measure, with reliability ranging from .60 to .78. Richards et al. (2017) and Runco et al. (2016b) reported the predictive validity of the HWYDY.

The objectives of the present investigation were to determine whether or not two predictors of creativity and two criteria of creativity, which have been interpreted as demonstrating validity and reliability in those other samples (e.g., Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024a; Acar & Runco, 2015; Richard et al., 2017; Runco et al., 2023; Sen, 2022), are also psychometrically useful in a Greek sample. In addition to the psychometric implications concerning the utility of these particular creativity tests, there are several broader implications. These follow from the fact that predictors are indicative of creative potential, while criteria tend to be indicative of actual creative performances (Runco, 2024). The reasoning here is that criteria, including the two used here, ask examinees about what they have done in the past. As the name indicates, the *Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist* asks examinees about what they have previously accomplished and their involvement in domain-specific activities. Predictors, on the other hand, assess current tendencies and capacities in an effort to understand what the examinee is capable of doing. This in turn is deemed to be especially important when predicting actual creative performances. The present investigation approached

this question specifically within a Greek sample. Relationships between two predictors of creative potential and two criteria of creative performance are explored below.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited from several cities in Northern Greece, including Thessaloniki (the second largest city in Greece), Drama, Serres, and Florina. Older adults were community-dwelling participants who took part in social events. Younger participants were mainly university students. Oral and poster announcements invited participation. There was no compensation of any sort. IRB protocol number for their approval is 30-17/01/2022, University of Western Macedonia. A convenience sample (Yang et al., 2019; Zysberg & Schenk, 2013) consisted of 433 participants (43.6% males and 56.4% females). 155 participants (35.8%) were 65 years old, and 278 (64.2%) were younger than 65 years old ($M_{age} = 45.40$; $SD_{age} = 22.85$).

Measures

The *Creative Attitudes and Values* (CA&V) survey is a Likert self-report with 25 items. Various versions of it, in different languages, have demonstrated reliability in the research of Runco et al. (2023), Runco et al. (2017), and Richard et al. (2017), each conducted with different cultures. Acar and Runco (2015) found the CA&V to be particularly informative about creative potential. Attitudes represent an important part of the creativity complex in that they are sensitive to experience. Thus, education and intervention may dramatically change attitudes such that individuals are more open to and likely to express creativity (Davis, 1999). The CA&V uses a five-level Likert scale. The directions for the CAAC were as follow:

> Use the scale below to tell us how much you agree or disagree with questions 1 to 25. You may need to approximate. Please indicate how you really think and behave, not how you would like to. Remember—no names are used. Your responses are confidential. Again, you may need to approximate. For each item, circle the response option that is THE CLOSEST to being accurate. Here are the options:
>
> (a) = totally DISAGREE
> (b) = mostly disagree
> (c) = neutral
> (d) = mostly agree
> (e) = totally AGREE

How Would You Describe Yourself? (HWYDY) is a self-report with five Likert options, which asks respondents to indicate the degree to which 12 descriptors are in fact self-descriptive. These 12 items were taken from various reviews of the creative personality research (e.g., Abdulla Alabbasi et al., 2024b; Feist, 1998; Runco et al., 2023). Eight of the descriptors are indicative of creativity (Flexible,

Original, Nonconformist, Creative, Authentic, Different, Spontaneous, and Self-Conscious), while four (e.g., Habitual, Conventional, Typical, and Unoriginal) were contraindicative. The HWYDY is used as a measure of creative potential because the presence of any or all of the traits named by the descriptors does not guarantee actual creative behavior (Runco, 2024). The directions for the HWYDY were as follow:

> There are 12 items that may or may not fit with how you view your own behavior. Use the scale below (*Never* = 1 to *Always* = 5) to rate yourself on each of the 12 descriptors. It is important that you use your own opinion to rate yourself. Don't think about what other people think of you. Focus on what YOU think. No one will know your ratings—your name is not on this page. Don't compare items; it does not matter how they fit together or contradict one another. In fact, work quickly, no need to give any single item much thought! Here are the options:
>
> (a) = Never
> (b) = Rarely
> (c) = Occasionally
> (d) = Often
> (e) = Always

The *Runco Ideational Behavior Scale* (RIBS) is also a Likert self-report measure. The current study used the short version of the RIBS, containing 20 items, each with five response options. The original was developed by Runco et al. (2001) as a criterion for studies of divergent thinking, which is expressed in ideation. Abdulla Alabbasi et al. (2024a) and Tep et al. (2021) reported good reliability and validity for the RIBS with Arab and Thai samples. Recently, Sen (2022) found an alpha coefficient of .89 for the RIBS in his reliability generalization meta-analysis. The directions for the RIBS are as follows:

> Use the 1–5 scale (given below) to indicate how often each of the phrases describes your thinking and behavior. You may need to approximate. Please indicate how you really think, not how you believe you should act. Remember—no names are used. Your responses are confidential. Again, you may need to approximate. For each item, circle the response option that is THE CLOSEST to being accurate. Here are the options:
>
> (a) = Never
> (b) = approximately once a year
> (c) = once or twice each month (approximately)
> (d) = once or twice each week (approximately)
> (e) = Just about every day, and sometimes more than once each day.

The *Creative Activities and Accomplishments Check List* (CAAC) has been used as a criterion of manifest creativity since it was developed by Holland (1961). A recent literature search found more than 150 studies using the CAAC. Paek and Runco (2017) presented an overview. The CAAC used in the present research was adapted from an investigation of workplace creativity (Runco et al., 2022). It contained 35 questions. In the current research, respondents were not directed to the workplace. Because the sample contained adults, many probably had jobs, and thus some of the CAAC items, which did refer to creativity at work, were retained. Example items: *How often have you*…

"… found a way to work with people who have different expertise or background from your own? "…found a new way to replace a previous process or method?" "…designed a new apparatus or tool?" "…applied math in an original way to solve a problem?" "…prepared a report in a new and creative way?" "…contributed to an organizational newsletter, blog, or social media page," "…wrote captions for images or graphics?" "…tried out different tasks at work to add variation to your routine?" The response options ranged from *Never* (0) to *Often* (4). Directions for the CAAC tell respondents that it is a list of activities and accomplishments, and they are to estimate, as accurately as possible, and based on actual experience, how often or how they had been involved with or accomplished each activity.

Procedure

Two independent bilingual native speakers of Greek translated all measures from English to Greek. They were blind to the purpose of this research. Data were collected with paper-and-pencil versions of the tests. The university students received the measures in their classes. The older adults received the measures in rooms near the venues of the social events in which they participated. All groups (regardless of age) were 5–10 individuals, and all testing was completed in one session. Data collection was not timed, but took less than one hour.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. In addition to checking the distributions with these descriptive statistics, a principal components factor analysis was conducted, as recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003), as a check of the possibility of a method variance bias. All measures were self-reports, so bias was possible, but the results of the factor analysis, which included all items from all measures, confirmed that only 19% of the variance was shared. This is well below the 50% critical value recommended by Podsakaff et al. (2003). Shared variance above 50% would suggest a method variance/self-report problem.

Reliability

Given that the overarching objective of this investigation was to determine whether or not the four creativity measures were useful with Greek samples, the first set of analyses examined the internal consistency (reliability) of the measures. Cronbach's alpha for the CA&V measure was .83. Examination of the "alpha if item deleted" (AIID) output indicated that there would be negligible improvement by removal of any one item. The highest AIID was .86. Cronbach's alpha for the RIBS was .72. Here again, the AIID coefficients suggested that negligible improvement would result from the removal of any single item. The highest AIID was .74. The Cronbach's alpha for the CAAC was .870. No significant improvement was suggested by AIID. The highest alpha was .874. The Cronbach's alpha for the HWYDY was only .57. When all of the contraindicative items were removed, it improved to

.72. Interestingly, if "originality" (one of the indicative items) was also removed, the alpha improved to .80. Subsequent analyses (of predictive validity) used a HWYDY composite calculated from the average of the indicative items (see Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities of the Creativity Measures

Variable	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*M*	*SD*	Alpha	AIID
CAAC	.37	3.58	1.86	.75	.87	.87
RIBS	1.55	4.55	2.69	.41	.72	.74
CA&V	1.92	4.44	3.08	.48	.83	.86
HWYDY	1.83	4.17	2.87	.47	.72	.80

Note. CAAC= Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist; RIBS = Runco Ideational Behavior Scale; CA&V = Creative Attitudes and Values; HWYDY = How Would You Describe Yourself; AIID = Alpha if item deleted

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted with LISREL software to verify the predicted factor structure of the CA&V, CAAC, HWYDY, and RIBS. This analysis was carried out on the total sample (N = 433) students. The results presented a sustainable model constituted by one identified factor for each scale. The fit indices of the scales were above the minimum threshold of 0.90 for CFI and NFI and below the maximum threshold for RMSEA and SRMR 0.10 (see Table 2).

Table 2. Goodness-of-fit Indices for the Study Instruments

Scale	χ2	df	χ2/ df	RMSEA 90% CI	CFI	SRMR	NFI
AV	835.57	275	3.04	.069 [.063, .074]	.92	.061	.91
CAAC	5304.25	2015	2.63	.061 [.059, .063]	.95	.062	.90
HWYDY	146.56	54	2.71	.063 [.051, .075]	.94	.052	.91
RIBS	549.48	170	3.23	.072 [.065, .079]	.95	.062	.93

Note. CI, confidence interval; RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation; CFI, comparative fit index; NFI, Normed Fit Index

Predictive Validity

The first check of predictive validity calculated a canonical correlation using the *Creative Activities and Accomplishments Check List* and the RIBS as criteria and the *Creative Attitudes and Value*s (CA&V) and the personality (HWYDY) measures as predictors. The results indicated a significant correlation ($R_c = .62$, $p < .001$). Bivariate correlational analyses are presented in Table 3.

Next, a hierarchical regression analysis indicated that the CA&V and HWYDY predictors were significantly related to the CAAC ($R = .43$, $R^2 = .19$, $p < .001$). Both were entered in one step of the regression. Examination of the weights indicated that the HWYDY was a significant contributor to that equation (beta = .44, $t(424) = 4.14$, $p < .001$). The CA&V beta weight was not statistically significant (beta = -.05).

Table 3. Correlations Between Study Variables (N = 433)

	CAAC	RIBS	CA&V	HWYDY
CAAC	1	.45**	.012	.26**
RIBS		1	.27**	.26**
CA&V			1	.30**
HWYDY				1

Note. CAAC= Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist; RIBS = Runco Ideational Behavior Scale; CA&V = Creative Attitudes and Values; HWYDY = How Would You Describe Yourself.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

A similar regression analysis with the RIBS as criterion and the same two predictors was also statistically significant ($R = .35$, $R^2 = .12$, $p < .001$). However, in this case, an examination of the weights indicated that both the HWYDY and the CA&V contributed in a statistically significant way (betas = .23 and .22, respectively, $ts(424) = 4.89$ and 4.74, $ps < .001$). The final regression equations are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Results for Total CAAC Scores and RIBS Without Age

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	β	*t*	*p*	*R*2	*ΔR*2	*Δ*F	VIF
					.17	.19	8.57	
	Constant		.74	.460				
CAAC	HWYDY	.44	4.14	< .001				1.02
	CA&V	-.05	-.52	.602				1.02
					.12	.12	29.75	
	Constant		12.26	< .001				
RIBS	HWYDY	.23	4.89	< .001				1.05
	CA&V	.22	4.74	< .001				1.05

Note. CAAC= Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist; RIBS = Runco Ideational Behavior Scale; CA&V = Creative Attitudes and Values; HWYDY = How Would You Describe Yourself; VIF = variance inflation factor.

The next regression analysis added a step. Given that both older adults and university students participated in this research, it was reasonable to control age and determine whether or not the associations just reported held up once age was controlled. With this in mind, the same regression analyses were run again, this time with age (a continuous scaled variable) entered in the first step, by itself, before the creativity predictors (i.e., CA&V and HWYDY), which were both added in the second step. One of these indicated that age did not account for a significant amount of variance in the CAAC ($R = .037$, $R^2 = .001$), and after it was controlled, the step with the CA&V and the HWYDY (entered together in the second step of the regression) was still statistically significant ($R = .44$, $\Delta R^2 = .190$, $p < .001$). Again, the HWYDY had the only statistically significant weight in this equation (beta = .45, $t(424) = 4.13$, $p < .001$). Age did account for a significant amount of variance in the

hierarchical regression that used the RIBS as the criterion ($R = .19$, $R^2 = .04$, $p < .001$). The CA&V and HWYDY still contributed a significant amount of variance when entered in the second step of the regression, after age was controlled ($R = .35$, $\Delta R^2 = .09$, $p < .001$). The weight given to age in the final solution was negative but not statistically significant (beta = -.06), but the weights for the CA&V and HWYDT remained statistically significant (betas = .20 and .22, respectively, $ts(424) = 4.03$ and 4.63, $ps < .001$; see Table 5 for the final regression equations).

Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Results for Total CAAC Scores and RIBS With Age

Dependent Variable	Steps	β	*t*	*p*	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	VIF
CAAC	Step 1				.00	.00	.10	
	Constant		8.05	< .001				
	Age	-.04	-.32	.747				1.00
	Step 2				.19	.19	8.51	
	Constant		.58	.566				
	Age	.05	.45	.655				1.040
	HWYDY	.45	4.12	< .001				1.024
	CA&V	-.06	-.52	.606				1.064
RIBS	Step 1				.03	.03	15.38	
	Constant		64.78	< .001				
	Age	-.18	-3.92	< .001				1.00
	Step 2				.13	.09	22.04	
	Constant		10.55	< .001				
	Age	-.06	-1.91	.235				1.20
	HWYDY	.22	4.63	< .001				1.08
	CA&V	.20	4.03	< .001				1.19

Note. CAAC= Creative Activity and Accomplishment Checklist; RIBS = Runco Ideational Behavior Scale; CA&V = Creative Attitudes and Values; HWYDY = How Would You Describe Yourself; VIF = variance inflation factor.

Subsample Analyses

Recall here that the version of the CAAC used in this investigation was adapted from an investigation of workplace creativity (Runco et al., 2022). For this reason, a decision was made to check reliability and validity in a subsample. It was comprised of individuals for whom data on years of work experience were available ($n = 78$). The reliability of the CAAC in this subsample was .94. The canonical correlation between the two predictors and the two criteria for this subsample was .63 ($p < .001$). When the two predictors were entered into a regression with the CAAC as the criterion, the result was still statistically significant ($R = .43$, $R^2 = .18$, $p < .001$). Here again, only the HWYDY contributed significantly to this equation (beta = .44, $t(77) = 4.14$, $p < .001$). Perhaps most important was the analysis in which both age and years of work experience were included in the regression using the CAAC as the criterion. Neither age nor experience explained a significant amount of variance; the first step was not significant ($R = .10$, $R^2 = .01$). The step with the HWYDY and the CA&V was again significant ($\Delta R^2 = .19$, $p < .001$) and, as before, only the HWYDY was significant in the final solution ($R = .45$, beta = .45, $t(77) = 4.12$, $p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

The primary finding of this investigation was that in the present Greek sample each of the four creativity assessments showed good internal consistency, which is a common index of reliability. Analyses using alpha-if-item deleted (AIID) indicated that three of the measures were reliable when used as they have been with other samples. The fourth measure, the HWYDY, was reliable only when indicative traits (which theory has found to be positively related to creativity) were included. When the contraindicative traits (e.g., Conventional, Traditional, Typical, Habitual) were included, internal consistency was low. These items had of course been recoded before reliability was calculated. Low reliability may point to something that is unique about the assessment of creativity in a Greek sample. One possibility is that the low reliability of the contraindicative items is a measurement artifact. Contraindicative items were randomly distributed in the HWYDY, so perhaps the Greek individuals had trouble shifting from indicative to contraindicative and back. Then again, if that were the case, you would expect the indicative items to also be unreliable, which was not the case.

Along the same lines, it is intriguing that the descriptor "originality" in the HWYDY seemed to be problematic. Originality is central to creativity, at least according to the standard definition (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). Some earlier cross-cultural reports have questioned the centrality of originality for creativity, but these focused on the meaning of originality in Asian samples. The present results indicate that further research should be conducted to examine originality more closely. The measure used here only had one item explicitly concerning originality. Future research could examine originality using some of its near synonyms (e.g., novelty) or with additional originality measures.

There was evidence for predictive validity of the creativity measures in the Greek sample. The correlation matrix in Table 3 does contain one coefficient of .12 for the CA&V and CAAC relationship, but this is not surprising, given what we said at the beginning of the introduction to this paper, that creativity is a complex. Creative attitude is one thing, and creative activity and accomplishments something else. Much more important than bivariate coefficients values are the regression and —even more meaningful—results from canonical analyses. Recall here that the canonical correlation, which included both predictors and both criteria, was .66. It remained high in the subsample, as well. The regression coefficient, when the CAAC was the criterion, was .43. The regression coefficient when the RIBS was the criterion was .35. These are all moderately good, relative to other predictive validity coefficients reported in the creativity literature (cf. Runco & Acar, 2024). They are also statistically significant, but this is not a critical concern in psychometric research. Tests of significance are important for hypothesis testing, but psychometric research uses the absolute value of reliability and validity coefficients instead (Nunnally, 1972; Runco & Acar, 2024). The regression using the CAAC might be the more meaningful of the two criteria, given its good reputation (e.g., Hocevar, 1981; Paek, 2020). Hocevar (1981) once suggested that the CAAC was the best available measure of creativity. The RIBS focused on ideation and is more of a measure of problem solving than the CAAC. Another perspective of these findings is that they are indicative of what has been

called the value-action gap (Essiz et al., 2023). The CA&V is certainly indicative of values, but not action, while the RIBS and the CAAC are about action and not values.

There was a hint of a relationship with age in one regression analyses, where the RIBS was the criterion and the CA&V and the HWYDY were entered into the predictive equation after age was controlled. The regression (beta) weight given to age was negative, which would imply that younger examinees had higher scores than older participants, but this beta weight was not statistically significant in the final regression solution, and its absolute value was quite small (-.06). Nonetheless age might be examined in future research with Greek samples.

Relatedly, there are limitations to the research reported here, in addition to the fact that only two age groups were sampled. The research participants were, for example, found through convenience rather than random sampling. Also, the CAAC used here did not include all possible domains of creative performance, and all measures were self-reports. Note that these were both measures of creative potential and measures of actual creative performance. Also, the principal components analysis demonstrated that method variance resulting from the self-reports was well below the 50% shared variance that would have indicated a problem. Still, other measures of creativity could be used in future research.

Future research might also extend this line of work with a larger Greek sample. Such research could collect data simultaneously from a different sample (e.g., some other European country). That would address a different question than that posed in the present investigation. Here, we were interested in the reliability and validity of four creativity measures in a Greek sample. There are also cross-cultural issues that could be explored. The present results confirm that the four creativity measures examined here could be included in research with other Greek samples. The present results support their reliability and predictive validity.

References

Assessing creative potential. In M.A. Runco & S. Acar (Eds.), *The handbook of creativity assessment*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M., Runco, M.A., & Ayoub, A. (2024c). Creative activity and accomplishment as indicators of polymathy among gifted and nongifted students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1255508

Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M., Runco, M.A., Acar, S., & Aljasim, F.A. (2024a). Validation of Arabic version of Runco Ideational Behavior Scale. *Creativity Research Journal*, *36*(2), 263–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2022.2110731

Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M., Runco. M.A., & Ayoub, A. (2024b). Is creativity expressed at home related to creativity expressed at school? A re-examination of the creativity gap with gifted and nongifted students. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, *58*(3), 356–369. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.656

Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M., Tadik, H., Acar, S., & Runco, M.A. (2021). Birth order and divergent thinking: A meta-analysis. *Creativity Research Journal*, *33*(4), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2021.1913559

Acar, S., & Runco, M.A. (2015). Thinking in multiple directions: Hyperspace categories in divergent thinking. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *9*(1), 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038501

Agnoli S., Mastria S., Kirsch, C., & Corazza G.E. (2019) Creativity in the advertisement domain: The role of experience on creative achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1899, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01899

Al-Hassan, T. (2024). Validation of Arabic version of the Creative Attitudes and Values Scale in two different cultures [unpublished master's thesis]. Arabian Gulf University.

Cabra, J.F., & & Guerrero, C.D. (2022). Regional creativity: Cultural and socio-economic differences. *Journal of Creativity*, *32*(2), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2022.100022

Davis, G. (1999). Barriers to creativity and creative attitudes. In M.A. Runco & S. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of creativity* (1st ed., pp. 165–174). Academic Press.

Ercikan, K., & Lyons-Thomas, J. (2013). Adapting tests for use in other languages and cultures. In K.F. Geisinger, B.A. Bracken, J.F. Carlson, J.-I. C. Hansen, N.R. Kuncel, S.P. Reise, & M.C. Rodriguez (Eds.), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology, Vol. 3. Testing and assessment in school psychology and education* (pp. 545–569). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14049-026

Essiz, O., Yurteri, S., Mandrik, C., & Senyuz, A. (2022). Exploring the value-action gap in green consumption: Roles of risk aversion, subjective knowledge, and gender differences. *Journal of Global Marketing*, *36*, 67–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2022.2116376

Essiz, O., Yurteri, S., Mandrik, C., & Senyuz, A. (2023). Exploring the value-action gap in green consumption: Roles of risk aversion, subjective knowledge, and gender differences. *Journal of Global Marketing*, *36*(1), 67–92. publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2022.2116376

Feist G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *2*(4), 290–309. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0204_5

Giannouli, V. (2017). Creativity and giftedness: A study of attitudes. In Nava R. Silton (Ed.), *Exploring the benefits of creativity in education, media, and the arts* (pp. 179–197). IGI Global.

Hambleton, R.K., & Lee, M.K. (2013). Methods for translating and adapting tests to increase cross-language validity. In D.H. Saklofske, C.R. Reynolds, & V.L. Schwean (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of child psychological assessment* (pp. 172–181). Oxford University Press.

Hocevar, D. (1981). Measurement of creativity: review and critique. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *45*(5), 450–464. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4505_1

Holland, J.L. (1961). Creative and academic performance among talented adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *52*(3), 136–147. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044058

Jankowska, D.M., & Karwowski, M. (2019). Family factors and development of creative thinking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *142*, 202–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.030

Kharkhurin, A.V. (2014). Creativity.4in1: Four-criterion construct of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *26*(3), 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2014.929424

Mackinnon, D.W. (1965). Personality and the realization of creative potential. *American Psychologist*, *20*(4), 273–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022403

Mumford, M.D., & Gustafson, S.B. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application, and innovation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*(1), 27–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.1.27

Nunnally, J.C. (1972). *Psychometric theory* (2nd Ed.). McGraw-Hill.

OECD (2024), PISA 2022 Results (Volume III): Creative Minds, Creative Schools, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/765ee8c2-en

Paek, S. (2020). Criterion problem. In M.A. Runco & S. Pritzker (Eds.), Encyclopedia of creativity (3rd ed., pp. 281-285). Academic Press.

Paek, S.H., & Runco, M.A. (2017). Dealing with the criterion problem by measuring the quality and quantity of creative activity and accomplishment. *Creativity Research Journal*, *29*(2), 167–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2017.1304078

Paek, S.H., Park, H., Runco, M.A., & Choe, H.S. (2016). The Contribution of Ideational Behavior to Creative Extracurricular Activities. *Creativity Research Journal*, *28*(2), 144–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2016.1162547

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Reynolds, C.R., Altmann, R.A., Allen, D.N. (2021). The problem of bias in psychological ssessment. In *Mastering Modern Psychological Testing*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59455-8_15

Richard, V., Abdulla, A.M., & Runco, M.A. (2017). Influence of skill level, experience, hours of training, and other sport participation on the creativity of elite athletes. *Journal of Genius and Eminence*, *2*(1), 65–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.18536/jge.2017.04.02.01.07

Runco, M.A. (2023). *Creativity: Research, development, and practice* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Runco, M.A. (2024). Assessment of creative potential: Measures, methods, and theories. In M.A. Runco & S. Acar (Eds.), *Handbook of creativity assessment* (pp. 40–63). Cheltenham, UK: Elgar.

Runco, M.A. & Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M. (2024). Interactions among dimensions of divergent thinking as predictors of creative activity and accomplishments. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 53(September). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2024.101583

Runco, M.A., & Abdullah, A.M. (2014). Why isn't creativity being supported? Distressing analyses of grants and awards for creativity research–or lack thereof. *Creativity Research Journal, 26*(2), 248–250. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2014.901100

Runco, M.A., & Acar, S. (2024). *Handbook of creativity assessment*. Elgar.

Runco, M.A., & Albert, R.S. (1985). The reliability and validity of ideational originality in the divergent thinking of academically gifted and nongifted children. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *45*(3), 483–501. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448504500306

Runco, M.A., & Jaeger, G.J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *24*(1), 92–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092

Runco, M.A., Abdulla Alabbasi, A.M., Acar, S., & Ayoub, A.E.A. (2023). Creative potential is differentially expressed in school, at home, and the natural environment. *Creativity Research Journal*, *35*(1), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2022.2031437

Runco, M.A., Abdulla, A.M., Peak, S., Aljasim, F.A., & AlSuwaidi, H.N. (2016a). Which test of divergent thinking is best? *Creativity. Theories—Research—Applications*, *3*, 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1515/ctra-2016-0001

Runco, M.A., Acar, S., & Cayirdag, N. (2017). A closer look at the creativity gap and why students are less creative at school than outside of school. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *24*, 242–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2017.04.003

Runco, M.A., Acar, S., Campbell, W.K., Jaeger, G., McCain, J., & Gentile, B. (2016b). Comparisons of the creative class and regional creativity with perceptions of community support and community barriers. *Business Creativity and the Creative Economy*, *2*, 83–92. https://doi.org/10.18536/bcce.2016.10.2.1.08

Runco, M.A., Noble, E.P., & Luptak, Y. (1990). Agreement between mothers and sons on ratings of creative activity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *50*(3), 673–680. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164490503025

Runco, M.A., Plucker, J.A., & Lim, W. (2001). Development and psychometric integrity of a measure of ideational behavior. *Creativity Research Journal*, *13*(3-4), 393–400. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326934CRJ1334_16

Runco, M.A., Shepard, A., & Tadik, H. (2022). How much creative potential is expressed at work? *Journal of Creativity*, *32*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2021.100016

Sen, S. (2022). A reliability generalization meta-analysis of Runco Ideational Behavior Scale. *Creativity Research Journal*, *34*(2), 178–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2021.1960719

Shao, Y., Zhang, C., Zhou, J., Gu, T., & Yuan, Y. (2019). How does culture shape creativity? A mini-review. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 1219, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01219

Tep, P., Maneewan, S., & Chuathong, S. (2021). Psychometric examination of Runco Ideational Behavior Scale: Thai adaptation. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, *34*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-020-00170-9

Yang, K.-K., Hong, Z.-R., Lee, L., & Lin, H.-S. (2019). Exploring the significant predictors of convergent and divergent scientific creativities. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *31*, 252–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2019.01.002

Yoon, C.-H. (2017). A validation study of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking with a sample of Korean elementary school students. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *26*, 38–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2017.05.004

Zhang, S., Zhong, L., Zhang, Y., Ren, J., & Zhang, J. (2023). Development and validation of the Kaufman domains of creativity scale-Chinese short version (K-DOCS-CSV). *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *1–9*, 48. https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101268

Zysberg, L., & Schenk, T. (2013). Creativity, religiosity, and political attitudes. *Creativity Research Journal*, *25*(2), 228–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2013.783761