CREATIVITY AS TRANSACTUALIZATION:
THE WILL TO POWER

"CONSCIOUS CONTROL AS
AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF MASTERY"

By Robert A. Broenen, Psy.D.

50th Annual Convention
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF PSYCHOLOGISTS
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
July 17, 1992
I. TAYLOR'S VIEWS OF CONTROL AS ESSENTIAL TO CREATIVITY

Dr. Dudek has introduced us to Dr. Irving A. Taylor's compelling model of creativity to provide a conceptual platform for our explorations today of creativity as transactualization—the will to power. She has then further stimulated our thinking by reviewing traditional forms of creativity as forces of change. Taylor's diagram of "creative transactualization" captures the dynamic of this process, and hopefully is instructive in our pursuit today of a richer understanding of his model (Figure 1).

I will now explore the role of conscious control in the creative process, hopefully to add another dimension to our understanding.

A. POWER IS EXPRESSED VIA CONTROL

Taylor's theory of creativity as springing from the "will to power" necessarily involves "control." "Power" is the capacity to control, and "control" characterizes the expression of power. Thus, to express one's "will to power" in the creative process involves control.

In his explorations of creativity, Taylor identified the role of control in creativity both in theory and in practice. In theory, he conceptualized control as rooted in the origins of creativity. In practice, he realized that control is expressed in creative behavior.

In his theoretical inquiries, Taylor speculated about the source of creativity. He was concerned as to its nature, its "location", if you will, and its volitional quality. Thus, he asked: Is its nature unitary or multiple? Is its nature endemic to the organism or extrinsic and alien--residing in the environment? And in either case, is its intentionality under the control of the organism or not?
Figure 1. Taylor’s Model of Creative Transactualization
B. CONTROL IS EMBEDDED IN THE SOURCES OF CREATIVITY

After reviewing the several possibilities, he came to these conclusions about the source of creativity. First, whether unitary or multiple, Taylor conceptualized it as complex, involving transactions between the organism and the environment. As to its "location," he saw that creativity is, indeed, intrinsic to the organism, but not necessarily restricted to it, because it finds expression in reference to the environment. And finally, as to intentionality, he concluded that creativity is, in fact, under the volitional control of the organism. The organism activates its "will to power" in a creative expression that shapes the environment.

1. "Directed Behavior" Involves Control in Selection of Action

Thus, Taylor viewed creativity as "transactional" or residing in the directed behavior of an organism operating within a particular milieu. In this case, he saw control as an essential ingredient of creative action to shape the external environment. He observed that creativity embodies "organismically directed behavior in which the organism has both control and responsibility and for which there are internal loci of control imbedded in the biological and experiential makeup of the organism" (Taylor, 1976, p. 197).

He wrote: "My central thesis is that the essential nature of the organism is to shape or design its environment rather than to be shaped or designed by it. . . . When not interrupted, this . . . shaping force articulates in one or more psychological dispositions" (Taylor, 1959, p. __). One of those "psychological dispositions" may well be the "will to power" that drives creative behavior.
2. Control Involves Selection of Aspects of the Environment

The creative impulse, then, this "directed behavior" can be selectively focused upon specific aspects of the environment under the volitional control of the individual. As Taylor put it, "environmental stimulation can be considered as an origin of creativity, or at least as a facilitating agent for transactional motivation" (Taylor, 1976, p. 199). However, the decision as to which aspects of the environment will be selected as stimuli or as instruments for creative expression resides within the creative individual—not within the environment. Persons and things external to the individual who is creating do not determine if or how that individual will react. They don't decide—he or she does. Again, control comes into play. As Taylor noted, environmental stimulation "can be considered to be within the control and responsibility of the creative person since he or she may select or gravitate to environments that are stimulating (Ibid.). The environmental stimulation is seized upon by an individual and intentionally exploited to, as he put it, "trigger transactional motivation" (Ibid.).

Taylor saw both transactional motivation emanating from within the individual and environmental stimulation selectively drawn from outside the organism as "anchor points of a system that might be called creative transactualization" (Taylor, 1975, p. ___), and in both cases he explicitly specified the role of conscious volitional control in the creative process.

I use this premise as the foundation for presenting a model of control as an essential element of mastery.
II. A CONTROL PARADIGM APPLICABLE TO THE CREATIVE PROCESS

Dr. Deane H. Shapiro, Jr., a psychologist who is Associate Professor in the School of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine at the University of California, has devoted more than a decade of his life to studying human control. He began his inquiries into control as a student of meditation. He sought to develop a holistic model of optimal psychological functioning.

A. SEARCHING FOR A DEFINITION OF CONTROL

As an American who felt that the Western perspectives relative to control were not exhaustive, he developed a great curiosity about what specific roles control could play in oriental cultures, which as we know differ greatly from North American and northern European cultures in this regard. Unlike industrial society cultures based on Western rationalism, which elevate "autonomy" and "self-actualization" to the highest pinnacle of psychological health, the Eastern philosophical and spiritual traditions seem, in stark contrast to this model, to idealize a more passive and accepting approach. So, speculated Dr. Shapiro, which is a "truer" vision of an extraordinarily high level of psychological functioning?

Shapiro then spent some ten years searching the literature of psychology for references to "control, "self-control" and any of its identifiable analogues for control, whether in either a positive or a negative sense. These included, of course, Rotter's "locus of control" (Rotter, 1966), Bandura's "self-efficacy" (Bandura, 197?), and Seligman's "learned helplessness" (Seligman, 1987), to name only a few of the more familiar control-related concepts found in a wonderfully rich but confusing array throughout the psychological literature.
The more he explored, the more Shapiro realized the semantic confusion regarding the idea of human control. He decided that, in order to advance the scientific inquiry into control, what is first needed is some standardized "language of control" upon which to base a "precise, multifaceted" yet integrated model of control which could serve as a basis for future research, discussion and clinical application. In fact, he later became convinced that an essential vehicle for application and refinement of this model would be a standardized assessment instrument which would incorporate all known perspectives on control, which could be then be systematically applied to various populations of psychological interest (Shapiro, 19__?).

B. COMPILING A MULTIDIMENSIONAL MODEL OF CONTROL

In compiling the results of his research on the way to design of his instrument (certainly a creative act in itself), Shapiro noted that the various perspectives on control in the literature tended to fall into five categories, which he labeled as follows: 1) "species" of control; 2) "agent/object" of control, 3) "domains" of self-control; 4) "dimensions" of control; and 5) "modes" of control. He describes them as follows.

A. Species of Control

The "species" of the genus of "control" are those characteristics of control which describe the dynamic link between the agent which initiates the controlling behavior and the object which receives the causal effects of that behavior. Examples of species of control would include such factors as "gaining control," "needing control," and "losing control."
B. Agent/Object of Control

As Taylor had noted, one's "sense of control" can derive from various sources: the self, another, or the environment. In examining human perceptions of control, it is relevant to determine from which of these potential sources an individuals perceives control emanating. Also, to complete this particular analysis, one should determine which object receives the effects of that causality. Again, that may be the self, others or the environment.

C. Domains of Control

Most inquiries into the nature and dynamics of human control do not discriminate the multiple specific arenas of human perception and functioning in which control can be identified or activated. For example, Rotter's instrument for measuring "locus of control" (Rotter, 1966) implicitly accepts a single milieu, a "general" domain in which one seeks to locate the origin of the perceived control: either within the individual or without. A later instrument discriminated the arena of "health" as a specific domain.

Shapiro's examination of the literature yielded seven specific "domains" in which control--and particularly, self-control--can be perceived and exercised. These are: body, mind, self, relationships, career, environment, and "other" (primarily encompassing addictive behaviors).

4. Dimensions of Control

The "dimensions" of control are its component elements. In the literature, Shapiro was able to identify six. They are: choice, goal, awareness, effort/discipline, skill and responsibility. The extent to which an individual can exercise these components impacts the focus and personal integration of the controlling behavior.
5. Modes of Control

Finally, Shapiro identified what he calls the "modes" of control. These are the behavioral styles one employs to attain and maintain control. Ultimately, they all tended to fall with four types, which were characterized by different pairs of opposing variables. These are:

- Active vs. passive, and
- Positive vs. negative.

This typology yields a total of four broad categories of control style, as follows:

I. Positive assertive. This is an active, altering mode of control. It indicates instrumental activity positively directed toward the accomplishment of something. A psychological healthy "doing" mode.

II. Positive yielding. This suggests peaceful acceptance, gentleness and nurturing--psychologically healthy "being" rather than "doing."

III. Negative assertive. This style implies exaggerated control to the point of overcontrol and agitation. This control is seen as not self-potentiating, but instead, actively destructive.

IV. Negative yielding. This characterizes too little control, overpassivity, and even helplessness--an unhealthy way to yield control.

Graphically, these four modes can be shown in a quadrant model, as seen in Figure 2. The mutually exclusive category names and the four-cell graphic depiction might suggest that each mode is discrete and absolute. However, knowing how fluid and wide-ranging human behavior actually is, we can readily see that each of an individual's "modes of control" can vary incrementally across a spectrum. Furthermore, since modes of control can be states as well as traits, they can presumably vary widely dependent on circumstance as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
<th>Quadrant 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE ASSERTIVE</td>
<td>POSITIVE YIELDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active Control)</td>
<td>(Letting-go Control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
<td>Quadrant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE ASSERTIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE YIELDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overcontrol)</td>
<td>(Too Little Control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Shapiro's "Modes of Control"
C. THE SHAPIRO MODEL APPLIED TO CREATIVE TRANSACTUALIZATION

I offer to this symposium the Shapiro model of control as a possible way to investigate the modalities of control in the creative process.

1. ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL APPLICABLE TO TRANSACTUALIZATION

In examining the Shapiro model for its potential relevance to creative transactualization, several conclusions seem evident.

First, relative to "species" of control, that is, the dynamic or "approach vector" of agent and object, we appear to be looking at a positive vector, that of "gaining" rather than "losing" control.

Second, in creative activity, the agent of control is the self and causal power flows from it to its object.

Third, all domains of human existence seem to be appropriate arenas for creative expression.

Fourth, the "dimensions" of control--choice, goal, awareness, effort/discipline, skill and responsibility--may all have application to the creative process. For example, awareness, choice, and goal suggest well directed creative action. Effort/discipline and skill imply well executed creativity. And responsibility denotes consciously intentional directed behavior.

And finally, I believe the modes of control can be useful instruments of inquiry into the dynamics of creative transactualization. Presumably, we should direct our attention only to the two positive modes of control, since the negative modes characterize uncreative--actively destructive or passive self-devaluing--behavior. Of the two positive modes, the "positive assertive" is clearly the most at home in the realm of creativity as conceptualized by Taylor. It implies active, positive movement by the
creative individual, reaching outward into the environment to shape in it an enhancing, self-potentiating manner.

Shapiro's positive assertive mode of control seems to offer an obvious and comfortable fit with Taylor's paradigm of creative transactualization.

However, having reached such obvious conclusions, I don't believe that the exploration of the correlations between these two models has been completed. The comparison raises at least two interesting possibilities for additional speculation regarding the role of conscious control in creative mastery.
IV. AREAS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION
IN COMPARING THE TAYLOR AND SHAPIRO PARADIGMS

Let's briefly consider two "cases" or situations that can arise within the Shapiro paradigm of control which challenge Taylor's view. The first is to consider the self as both agent and object of control. The second is to consider positive acceptance of a situation as a form of adaptive and self-potentiating control, even though it does not flow active change-producing energy into the environment.

A. SELF AS AGENT AND OBJECT OF CONTROL?

In Taylor's frame of reference, "transactualization" contrasts with "self-actualization." In "self-actualization," positive energy is contained within the self, leading to a state of heightened perception and functioning, as characterized by Maslow (19__) and Rogers (19__). Although Taylor did not expressly indicate, the implication was that self-actualization did not constitute creative behavior, because it did not shape the environment.

In Shapiro's multidimensional model, the "self" can be a source or agent of control. This does not, in his schema, rule out the possibility of an individual also perceiving the "self" as object of that same control. Thus, "self-control."

In my mind, the question therefore arises why this species of control, with the self acting upon the self in an enhancing and potentiating manner, does not also constitute creative behavior. The self, if you will, "transactualizing" some particular aspect of the same individual. Shapiro's specific-domain model may contribute some insights to this speculation, because it identifies not only the self domains which relate to the
individual's being and doing (body, mind, etc.), but also encompass 25 discrete parameters within the seven-domain rubric (e.g., __________, ____________), all of which could be appropriate "objects" for creative directed behavior.

I offer this possibility for your speculation.

B. POSITIVE YIELDING BEHAVIOR AS CREATIVE TRANSACTUALIZATION?

The second possible area for speculation, as I noted above, is based on a deeper examination of Shapiro's "Quadrant 2" mode of control, that of positive acceptance. A typical exemplification of a Quadrant 2 style of attaining and maintaining control would be, as noted in the popular prayer, "to accept the things that I cannot change" and to do so with a certain philosophical and spiritual attitude of positive resignation—in fact, even peace and joy. As that same prayer indicates, this mode is positively associated with wisdom. (The prayer exemplifies, in a nice, condensed way, psychological health and well-being characterized by Shapiro as Quadrants 1 and 2 modes of control.)

As I compare the Taylor and Shapiro models, here, too, I inquire as to whether Shapior's positive accepting mode of control is not possibly a creative act which would somehow qualify as "creative transactualization" according to the Taylor paradigm. True, in this mode one is not reshaping the external environment, but I submit that such a style of behavior certainly requires rearranging one's internal psychological furniture.

A positive accepting mode of control is not comfortably at home within the Western ethic and the Western view of psychological health. As we know, the Western view favors autonomous, active shaping of the environment. However, in the Eastern view, positive acceptance of reality
rather than active efforts to change it may well represent the highest order of human functioning, approaching a super-human or supernatural serenity resembling that of a deity. Could this not be a higher creative act than bull-dozing the landscape? Again, I offer this possible paradox for your consider while you explore the canals and museums of Amsterdam.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, I want to mention that Dr. Shapiro has completed development of his Shapiro Control Inventory (SCI). It is available for selected research applications. Should you have an interest, please contact me or Dr. Shapiro.

Thank you for your interest.
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