

Creativity in Word Formation and Word Interpretation

There are many ways in which we, as speakers, are creative in how we form and interpret new words. Working across the interfaces of psychology, linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics, this book presents cutting-edge interdisciplinary research, showing how we manipulate the range of linguistic tools at our disposal to create an infinite range of words and meanings. It provides both a theoretical account of creativity in word formation and word interpretation, and an experimental framework with the corresponding results obtained from more than 600 participants. Data drawn from this vast range of speakers show how creativity varies across gender and age, and demonstrate the complexity of relationships between the examined variables. Pioneering in its scope, this volume will pave the way for a brand new area of research in the formation and interpretation of complex words.

Lívía Körtvélyessy is a professor in the Department of British and American Studies, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia. Her research has focused on the typology of word formation and evaluative morphology. Recent publications include *Derivational Networks across Languages* (co-authored with Štekauer and Bagasheva).

Pavol Štekauer is a professor in the Department of British and American Studies, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia. Recent publications include *Derivational Networks across Languages* (co-authored with Körtvélyessy and Bagasheva).

Pavol Kačmár is a research assistant in the Department of Psychology, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia. His research interests include psychology of time, goal-directed behaviour, self-regulation, social priming, and meta-research. Recent publications include “To Which World Regions Does the Valence–Dominance Model of Social Perception Apply?” (2021).

Creativity in Word Formation and Word Interpretation

Creative Potential and Creative Performance

Livia Körtvélyessy

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice

Pavol Štekauer

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice

Pavol Kačmár

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-05442-3 — Creativity in Word Formation and Word Interpretation
Lívía Körtvélyessy, Pavol Štekauer, Pavol Kačmár
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781009054423

DOI: 10.1017/9781009053556

© Lívía Körtvélyessy, Pavol Štekauer, and Pavol Kačmár 2022

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2022

First paperback edition 2024

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Names: Körtvélyessy, Lívía, author. | Štekauer, Pavol, author. | Kačmár, Pavol, author.

Title: Creativity in word formation and word interpretation : creative potential and creative performance / Lívía Körtvélyessy, Pavol Štekauer, Pavol Kačmár.

Description: Cambridge, UK ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 2021. |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021030244 (print) | LCCN 2021030245 (ebook) |

ISBN 9781316511695 (hardback) | ISBN 9781009054423 (paperback) |

ISBN 9781009053556 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Grammar, Comparative and general—Word formation. |

Creativity (Linguistics)

Classification: LCC P245.K63 2021 (print) | LCC P245 (ebook) | DDC 415/.92—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021030244>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021030245>

ISBN 978-1-316-51169-5 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-009-05442-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> vi
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xvii
1 Introduction	1
2 On the Notion of Creativity	9
2.1 Creativity from the Psychological Point of View	10
2.2 Linguistic Creativity	22
3 Theoretical Foundations of Our Research	37
3.1 Complex Word Formation	37
3.2 Complex Word Interpretation	45
4 Methodological Principles	53
4.1 Torrance Test of Creative Thinking	53
4.2 Word Formation Test	62
4.3 Word Interpretation Test	65
4.4 Sample of Respondents and Data Collection	68
4.5 Research Hypotheses	74
5 Research	78
5.1 Creativity and Word Formation	78
5.2 Creativity and Word Interpretation	158
5.3 Creativity and Gender in Complex Word Formation and Complex Word Interpretation	224
6 Conclusions: Creativity, Word Formation, and Word Interpretation	288
<i>References</i>	296
<i>Author Index</i>	312
<i>Subject Index</i>	314

Figures

3.1 Scales of transparency and economy (OTs that occurred in our research)	<i>page</i> 45
3.2 An integrated onomasiological model of complex words	46
4.1 A sheet of paper with a sticker as an illustration of a stimulus material for the first task	56
4.2 A sheet of paper with incomplete figures as an illustration of a stimulus material for the second task	57
4.3 A sheet of paper with circles as an illustration of a stimulus material for the third task	58
4.4 Illustration of (a) a less versus (b) a more creative drawing	59
4.5 An illustration of (a) less versus (b) more fluent answers	60
4.6 An illustration of (a) lower versus (b) higher flexibility	61
4.7 An illustration of (a) lower versus (b) higher elaboration	61
4.8 A drawing for Task 3.1	65
4.9 A drawing for Task 3.2	66
4.10 A drawing for Task 3.3	67
5.1 Descriptive plots for Elaboration and semantic transparency	95
5.2 Descriptive plots for Elaboration and economy of expression	97
5.3 Descriptive plots for Fluency and semantic transparency	98
5.4 Descriptive plots for Fluency and economy of expression	99
5.5 Descriptive plots for Flexibility and semantic transparency	100
5.6 Descriptive plots for Flexibility and economy of expression	101
5.7 Descriptive plots for Originality and semantic transparency	103
5.8 Descriptive plots for Originality and economy of expression	104
5.9 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths and semantic transparency	105
5.10 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths and economy of expression	107
5.11 Descriptive plots for Composite Score and semantic transparency	108
5.12 Descriptive plots for Composite Score and economy of expression	109

List of Figures	vii
5.13 Descriptive plots for Originality and semantic transparency	131
5.14 Descriptive plots for Originality and economy of expression	133
5.15 Descriptive plots for Elaboration and semantic transparency	134
5.16 Descriptive plots for Elaboration and economy of expression	135
5.17 Descriptive plots for Flexibility and semantic transparency	137
5.18 Descriptive plots for Flexibility and economy of expression	138
5.19 Descriptive plots for Fluency and semantic transparency	139
5.20 Descriptive plots for Fluency and economy of expression	141
5.21 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths and semantic transparency	142
5.22 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths and economy of expression	144
5.23 Descriptive plots for Composite Score and semantic transparency	145
5.24 Descriptive plots for Composite Score and economy of expression	147
5.25 Descriptive plots for Elaboration	171
5.26 Descriptive plots for Fluency	172
5.27 Descriptive plots for Originality	173
5.28 Descriptive plots for Flexibility	175
5.29 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths	176
5.30 Descriptive plots for Composite Score	177
5.31 Descriptive plots for Originality	201
5.32 Descriptive plots for Elaboration	202
5.33 Descriptive plots for Flexibility	204
5.34 Descriptive plots for Fluency	205
5.35 Descriptive plots for Creative Strengths	206
5.36 Descriptive plots for Composite Score	208
5.37 Differences between males and females regarding semantic transparency among secondary school students	233
5.38 Differences between males and females regarding economy of expression among secondary school students	234
5.39 Differences between males and females regarding semantic transparency among university students	245
5.40 Differences between males and females regarding economy of expression among university students	246
5.41 Differences between males and females regarding word interpretation among secondary school students	265
5.42 Differences between males and females regarding word interpretation among university students	280

Tables

5.1 Low Originality	<i>page</i> 80
5.2 High Originality	80
5.3 Low Elaboration	81
5.4 High Elaboration	82
5.5 Low Flexibility	82
5.6 High Flexibility	83
5.7 Low Fluency	84
5.8 High Fluency	84
5.9 Low Creative Strengths	85
5.10 High Creative Strengths	85
5.11 Low Composite Score	86
5.12 High Composite Score	87
5.13 Comparison of the total percentages of failed answers	88
5.14 Comparison of the L-cohort and the H-cohort with regard to the use of OT1	90
5.15 Comparison of the percentages of OT3	92
5.16 Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration and semantic transparency	95
5.17 Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration and economy of expression	96
5.18 Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency and semantic transparency	97
5.19 Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency and economy of expression	98
5.20 Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility and semantic transparency	100
5.21 Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility and economy of expression	101
5.22 Mann–Whitney U test for Originality and semantic transparency	102
5.23 Mann–Whitney U test for Originality and economy of expression	103
5.24 Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths and semantic transparency	105
5.25 Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths and economy of expression	106

List of Tables	ix
5.26 Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score and economy of expression	107
5.27 Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score and economy of expression	109
5.28 Correlation matrix among all variables	112
5.29 Correlation matrix among all variables	113
5.30 Low Originality	116
5.31 High Originality	116
5.32 Low Elaboration	117
5.33 High Elaboration	118
5.34 Low Flexibility	119
5.35 High Originality	119
5.36 Low Fluency	120
5.37 High Fluency	120
5.38 Low Creative Strengths	121
5.39 High Creative Strengths	122
5.40 Low Composite Score	123
5.41 High Composite Score	123
5.42 Comparison of the total percentage of failed answers	124
5.43 Comparison of the L-cohort and the H-cohort with regard to the use of OT1	127
5.44 Comparison of the L-cohort and the H-cohort with regard to the use of OT3	128
5.45 Mann–Whitney U test for Originality and semantic transparency	131
5.46 Mann–Whitney U test for Originality and economy of expression	132
5.47 Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration and semantic transparency	134
5.48 Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration and economy of expression	135
5.49 Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility and semantic transparency	136
5.50 Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility and economy of expression	138
5.51 Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency and semantic transparency	139
5.52 Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency and economy of expression	140
5.53 Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths and semantic transparency	142
5.54 Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths and economy of expression	143
5.55 Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score and semantic transparency	144
5.56 Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score and economy of expression	146
5.57 Correlations among variables	150

x	List of Tables	
5.58	Strength of evidence for the alternative hypothesis	151
5.59	Comparison of OT1 percentages in the SS and UU – L-cohorts	153
5.60	Comparison of OT1 percentages in the SS and UU – H-cohorts	153
5.61	Comparison of OT3 percentages in the SS and UU groups – L-cohorts	155
5.62	Comparison of OT3 percentages in the SS and UU groups – H-cohorts	155
5.63	Prevalence of use of OT1 and OT3 – L-cohorts	156
5.64	Prevalence of use of OT1 and OT3 – H-cohorts	156
5.65	The ranking of readings by indicator/subscore, cohort, and PR value	159
5.66	Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>baby book</i>	161
5.67	Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>flower hat</i>	161
5.68	Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>to boy</i>	161
5.69	Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>to tulip</i>	161
5.70	Comparison of PR values of creativity indicators/subscores by most predictable readings across cohorts	163
5.71	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Originality	165
5.72	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Elaboration	165
5.73	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Flexibility	165
5.74	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Fluency	166
5.75	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Creative Strengths	166
5.76	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Composite Score	166
5.77	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Originality	167
5.78	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Elaboration	167
5.79	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Flexibility	168
5.80	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Fluency	168
5.81	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Creative Strengths	168

List of Tables	xi
5.82 Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and H-cohort – Composite Score	168
5.83 Average differences between the H-cohort and L-cohort in the average number of readings proposed by a cohort member	169
5.84 Average differences between the H-cohort and the L-cohort in terms of the average number of proposed readings	169
5.85 Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration	170
5.86 Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency	172
5.87 Mann–Whitney U test for Originality	173
5.88 Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility	174
5.89 Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths	175
5.90 Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score	176
5.91 Correlation matrix among variables	179
5.92 Calculations based on the Bayes factor	181
5.93 Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences	182
5.94 Number of HL-to-many occurrences of the proposed readings – comparison of the cohorts	186
5.95 Hapax legomena versus zero occurrences – comparison of the cohorts	187
5.96 Many occurrences versus hapax legomena	187
5.97 Hapax legomena versus zero occurrences	188
5.98 Indicators/subscores with significant (S) or partial (P) support for the hypotheses	190
5.99 Indicators/subscores contradicting the hypotheses	190
5.100 Ranking of readings by indicator/subscore, cohort and PR value	192
5.101 Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>baby book</i>	194
5.102 Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>flower hat</i>	194
5.103 Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>to boy</i>	194
5.104 Predictability rates for the most predictable reading of <i>to tulip</i>	194
5.105 Comparison of PR values in two cohorts by creativity indicator/subscore – most predictable readings	195
5.106 Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Originality	196
5.107 Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Elaboration	196
5.108 Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Flexibility	196
5.109 Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Fluency	196
5.110 Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Creative Strengths	197

xii	List of Tables	
5.111	Comparison of OPR values in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Composite Score	197
5.112	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Originality	198
5.113	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Elaboration	198
5.114	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Flexibility	198
5.115	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Fluency	198
5.116	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Creative Strengths	199
5.117	Comparison of the average number of proposed readings per respondent in the L-cohort and the H-cohort – Composite Score	199
5.118	Average difference between the H-cohort and L-cohort in the average number of readings proposed by a cohort member – evaluation by indicators/subscores	199
5.119	Average differences between the H-cohort and the L-cohort in terms of the average number of proposed readings	200
5.120	Mann–Whitney U test for Originality	201
5.121	Mann–Whitney U test for Elaboration	202
5.122	Mann–Whitney U test for Flexibility	203
5.123	Mann–Whitney U test for Fluency	204
5.124	Mann–Whitney U test for Creative Strengths	206
5.125	Mann–Whitney U test for Composite Score	207
5.126	Correlation matrix among variables	210
5.127	Calculations based on the Bayes factor	211
5.128	Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences	212
5.129	Number of HL-to-many occurrences of the proposed readings – comparison of the cohorts	216
5.130	Hapax legomena versus zero-occurrences – comparison of the cohorts	217
5.131	Many occurrences versus hapax legomena	217
5.132	Hapax legomena versus zero-occurrences	217
5.133	Indicators/subscores with significant (S)/partial (P) support for the hypotheses	219
5.134	Indicators/subscores contradicting the hypotheses	219
5.135	Comparison of the female and the male groups in terms of the strongest OTs – L-cohort (%)	227

List of Tables	xiii
5.136 Comparison of the female and male groups in terms of the strongest OTs – H-cohort (%)	228
5.137 Comparison of the female and the male groups for subtask 1.1 (%)	230
5.138 Comparison of the female and the male groups for subtask 1.2 (%)	231
5.139 Inferential statistics regarding gender differences in word formation among secondary school students	232
5.140 Descriptives concerning gender differences in word formation among secondary school students	235
5.141 Comparison of failed answers in the female and the male groups (%) – L-cohort	235
5.142 Comparison of failed answers in the female and the male groups (%) – H-cohort	236
5.143 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency towards semantic transparency – L-cohort	237
5.144 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency towards semantic transparency – H-cohort	237
5.145 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency for failed answers – L-cohort	238
5.146 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency for failed answers – H-cohort	238
5.147 Comparison of the female and the male groups in terms of the strongest OTs – L-cohort (%)	240
5.148 Comparison of the female and the male groups in terms of the strongest OTs – H-cohort (%)	241
5.149 Comparison of the female and the male groups for subtask 1.1 (%)	243
5.150 Comparison of the female and the male groups for subtask 1.2 (%)	244
5.151 Inferential statistics regarding gender differences in word formation among university students	245
5.152 Descriptives concerning gender differences in word formation among university undergraduates	247
5.153 Comparison of failed answers in the female and the male groups (%) – L-cohort	247
5.154 Comparison of failed answers in the female and the male groups (%) – H-cohort	248
5.155 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency in semantic transparency – L-cohort	248
5.156 Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency in semantic transparency – H-cohort	249

xiv	List of Tables	
5.157	Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency for failed answers – L-cohort	249
5.158	Indicators/subscores relative to the tendency for failed answers – H-cohort	250
5.159	Average values of OT1: comparison of the female and male groups of SS and UU respondents – L-cohorts	251
5.160	Average values of OT1: comparison of the female and male groups of SS and UU respondents – H-cohorts	251
5.161	Average number of failed answers: comparison of the female and male groups of SS and UU respondents – L-cohorts (%)	253
5.162	Average number of failed answers: comparison of the female and male groups of SS and UU respondents – H-cohorts	253
5.163	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Originality	255
5.164	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Originality	255
5.165	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Elaboration	256
5.166	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Elaboration	256
5.167	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Flexibility	256
5.168	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Flexibility	256
5.169	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Fluency	257
5.170	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Fluency	257
5.171	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Creative Strengths	257
5.172	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Creative Strengths	257
5.173	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, L-cohort – Composite Score	258
5.174	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Objectified Predictability Rate, H-cohort – Composite Score	258
5.175	Lower OPR values – male versus female, L-cohort	259
5.176	Lower OPR values – male versus female, H-cohort	259
5.177	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Originality	260
5.178	Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Originality	260

List of Tables	xv
5.179 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Elaboration	260
5.180 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Elaboration	261
5.181 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Flexibility	261
5.182 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Flexibility	261
5.183 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Fluency	261
5.184 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Fluency	261
5.185 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Creative Strengths	262
5.186 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Creative Strengths	262
5.187 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Composite Score	262
5.188 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Composite Score	262
5.189 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort	263
5.190 Comparison of the male and the female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort	263
5.191 Average number of readings by individual indicators/subscores for all four experimental words	264
5.192 Inferential results regarding gender differences in word interpretation among secondary school students	264
5.193 Descriptives concerning gender differences in word interpretation among secondary school student	265
5.194 Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>baby book</i>	266
5.195 Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>flower hat</i>	266
5.196 Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>to boy</i>	267
5.197 Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>to tulip</i>	268
5.198 Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Originality	271
5.199 Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Originality	271
5.200 Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Elaboration	271
5.201 Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Elaboration	271
5.202 Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Flexibility	271
5.203 Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Flexibility	272
5.204 Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Fluency	272
5.205 Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Fluency	272

xvi List of Tables

5.206	Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Creative Strengths	272
5.207	Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Creative Strengths	272
5.208	Objectified Predictability Rates in L-cohort – Composite Score	273
5.209	Objectified Predictability Rates in H-cohort – Composite Score	273
5.210	Lower OPR values – male versus female: L-cohort	274
5.211	Lower OPR values – male versus female: H-cohort	274
5.212	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Originality	275
5.213	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Originality	275
5.214	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Elaboration	275
5.215	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Elaboration	275
5.216	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Flexibility	276
5.217	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Flexibility	276
5.218	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Fluency	276
5.219	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Fluency	276
5.220	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Creative Strengths	277
5.221	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Creative Strengths	277
5.222	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, L-cohort – Composite Score	277
5.223	Comparison of the male and female groups: Average number of proposed readings, H-cohort – Composite Score	277
5.224	Average number of readings by individual indicator/subscore with regard to four experimental words	278
5.225	Inferential results regarding gender differences in word interpretation among university students	279
5.226	Descriptives concerning gender differences in word interpretation among university students	279
5.227	Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>baby book</i>	280
5.228	Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>flower hat</i>	281
5.229	Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>to boy</i>	281
5.230	Hapax legomena versus zero/multiple occurrences: <i>to tulip</i>	282

Acknowledgements

There are many to thank for their invaluable help with this project. First and foremost, we are indebted to Milana Kovaničová for her expertise, supervision, and overall contribution to the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT) evaluation.

We are especially grateful to Ivana Antoniová and all the teachers who were involved in the organization of the process of testing at the secondary comprehensive schools of Milana Rastislava Štefánika, Park Mládeže 5, Poštová 9, Trebíšovská 12, and Opatovská cesta 7, and to Vesna Kalafus Antoniová, Bernadett Bodnárová, Lýdia Desiatniková, Zuzana Eperiesiová, Lukáš Lukačín, Dominika Mohňanská, Veronika Nogolová, Zuzana Solejová, and Alena Tomková, who helped us with testing the undergraduates at Pavol Jozef Šafárik University and the Technical University in Košice as well as with the evaluation of the tests.

It should be stressed that this book would not come into existence without the participation of the students of the aforementioned secondary schools and of the two universities in Košice who kindly agreed to take part in three tests.

Special thanks go to Anthony Wright for his excellent and careful proof-reading job.

We also owe a great deal to Helen Barton and Isabel Collins for their encouragement and support throughout the whole reviewing and publishing process, and to all anonymous referees whose comments helped us improve the original manuscript.