Assessment of future primary school teachers' development of creative competence: A case study
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Abstract
The aim of this study is to assess future primary school teachers' learning outcomes, their achievement goals, support for the development of their creative competence and the appropriate methodological and technological processes that take place. The data was analyzed using a mixed research approach. The participants of the study are 160 students from Abai University and Auezov University (Kazakhstan). The results showed that students found their university education mostly uncreative indicating the need to determine a new and effective way to form students' creative competence. The research findings suggest that special training improved the creative capacity of the aspiring participants in the study and had an effect on the experimental group. The findings of this study have implications for policy to transform higher education, further research as well as methodological and technological approaches for the assessment of primary school teachers' development of creative competencies in Kazakhstan.
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1. Introduction

Fundamental changes are taking place in all spheres of Kazakh society. Responding to modern realities, the national education system is also changing which requires a creative and professional approach in the preparation of future specialists (Nagima et al., 2023). One of the most critical issues is establishing a new pedagogical foundation for the professional and personal development of the modern teacher (Ospankulov, Nurgaliyeva, Kunai, Baigaliev, & Kaldyhanovna, 2022). According to research conducted at Kazakh universities, aspiring teachers lack sufficient experience in independent creative behavior in the field of professional activity (Iskakovna et al., 2021). It has been found that some of the specialists are less motivated to further their education, advance their careers and they feel disappointed with their professional choices (Zhusupbayev et al., 2023). The researchers noted the problems and shortcomings of education in Kazakhstan which focused on the transfer of knowledge as part of the legacy of Soviet education. This fact has led to the acknowledgment that higher education institutions need to change their objectives and replace the concept of a knowledge-based approach with that of a competency-based approach (Amirova, Iskakovna, Zakaryanovna, Nurmakhanovna, & Elmira, 2020; Zhumash et al., 2021). This makes it necessary to re-evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of using the competency-based approach in the educational space in Kazakhstan with a focus on international requirements and the multi-subject nature of educational programs.

Studying the problem of the formation and development of the potential primary school teachers’ capacity for creativity in the current education system made it possible to identify several contradictions.

1. Between the dynamism of social, economic and technological transformations in society and the inertia of the vocational education system which does not have time to respond to these changes in a timely and adequate manner.
2. Between society’s need for a creative personality and the unwillingness of the educational system to satisfy it due to the lack of teachers who are creative and competent in the creative development of students.
3. Between the modern possibilities of vocational education in the development of the necessary competencies that make up the creative personality of the teacher and the predominance of traditional forms of organization of student training.
4. Between the need to organize an educational space that ensures the formation and development of the capacity for the creativity of the future teacher and the insufficient development of methodological support and conditions for the implementation of the innovative pedagogical process. The factors above determine the importance and relevance of the selected research topic.

1.1. Research Questions

Q1: What are the perceptions of students about creative competence?
Q2: What is the actual level of the creative ability of future teachers?
Q3: What are the dynamics of the level of development of creative competency in the first stages of professional training?

1.2. Objectives

The purpose of the study is to evaluate various ways to increase the creative capacity of aspiring primary school teachers while at the same time determining their current level of competency.

2. Research Content

2.1. Literature Review

Students’ creative competence is the most important aspect of modern education for professional activities. It is necessary to introduce new teaching methods. The study shows that professional and competency issues are considered in terms of research preparation, creativity, innovation etc. When analyzing research on competency-based learning models it was revealed that in terms of ability, the most important thing is the experience of the student and the readiness to set goals (Açkığöz & Babadoğan, 2021; Nihishova & Kryvonosova, 2021).

Most research (Fernández-Villardón, Valls-Carol, Melgar Alcantud, & Tellado, 2021; Ritter, Gu, Crijns, & Biakens, 2020) concurs that universities need to foster students’ creative abilities. However, there is no proper definition of creativity in education (Perry & Collier, 2018; Sidek, Halim, & Buang, 2022) and academic institutions have not established methods for measuring its development or tools specifically designed to monitor student progress.

If educators take creativity more seriously, we must be more specific about what creativity is Bloom and VanSlyke-Briggs (2019). Additionally, we must develop an assessment strategy that is trustworthy and simple enough for teachers to use with their busy schedules (Clarke & Basilio, 2018; Wyse & Ferrari, 2018). Creativity for this task contains the following components.

In our view, creativity is:

- Creativity is a specific ability due to the presence and combination of various personal qualities (Akkanat & Gökdere, 2018; Beaumont, 2022).
- Creativity is the general ability to transform previous experiences (Acar, Tarakci, & Van Knippenberg, 2019; Fredagsvik, 2021; Mazzone & Elgammal, 2019).
- Creativity is an integral quality of personality, combining cognitive and personal spheres (Kavanaugh, Tuncer, & Wexler, 2019; Smid, Karbach, & Steinbeis, 2020).

Creativity is a specific form of mental activity, a complex multidimensional phenomenon with its own structure (Dietrich, 2019; Gu et al., 2018).
Creativity is also identified with the maximum level of development of mental (intellectual) abilities (Chen & Padilla, 2022; Gubbels, Segers, & Verhoeven, 2018).

The term “creativity” was first introduced by Guilford (1950). The creativity of the teacher is considered in the works of Gamino, Frost, Riddle, Koslovsky, and Chapman (2022) as a certain system of expression of his individual, professional and personal qualities as a result of which he reproduces himself in his essence as a person and a professional. Agreeing with the opinions of researchers, we believe that educational activity contains both aspects and is a creative activity because by acting on their inclinations, independently solving their problems and creating and transforming the conditions of their existence, the teacher simultaneously transforms himself and his activity. Teachers' creative abilities are considered an essential feature of professional development.

After analyzing the above sources in the context of our problem, we took as our basis the concept of creativity as an activity in which a person changes, combines, transforms and creates something new.

What is creative competence?

In our view, creativity competence is:
• Knowledge and skills are the basis of competence.
• Special psychological qualities and properties.
• The new personal properties.
• The acquisition and assimilation of professional skills.

In the proposed interpretation, the teacher's creative competence is a professional and personal characteristic that requires a complex approach to its study. It includes moral and humanistic orientations, motivations, goals, value orientations and a set of knowledge, abilities, skills, forms and ways of application by teachers in the context of creative interaction in elementary schools.

Currently, the scientific and theoretical basis for the development of future teachers' professional competence in all aspects of the university study process is actively being developed.

Evaluation and creativity are significant topics with substantial literature. As challenging as the task is, it's easy to see the potential benefits of trying to measure or track the creative growth of aspiring elementary school teachers. They consist of:
• Giving teachers a means of expressing their perspective on creativity (Kim, Raza, & Seidman, 2019), enables them to better comprehend various aspects of future primary school teachers' development and to successfully promote their creative competency (Altinyelken & Hoeksm, 2021).
• Assisting educators and future primary school teachers in understanding creative competence.
• Giving future primary school teachers constructive criticism so they can improve their creative competence (Shen, Wang, Qi, Wang, & Yan, 2021).
• Provide feedback to teachers and future primary school teachers and direct their attention to this dimension.
• Establishing a consensus on the definition of creative competence.
• Learning more about personal progressions and trajectories in creative learning.

The problem is that there is disagreement about the creative capacity of aspiring elementary school teachers. Hence, the following are some difficulties with the assessment of students' creativity competence:
• Have the potential to be misinterpreted as pejorative terms, for example, the character of a primary school teacher being unimaginative.
• If we assume that comparing the creativity of aspiring primary school teachers on a summative basis is not an appropriate goal, there is also a chance that assessment "scores" may be applied improperly for summative purposes.

Any assessment activity's goal has a significant impact on the methods used. According to Martínez, Mon, Álvarez, Fueyo, and Dobarro (2020), there are two fundamentally distinct goals for assessment: one is to certify accomplishments and the other is to promote learning. Hence, evaluation can be summarized, compared and formed to assist primary school teachers.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

A mixed research approach was chosen to explore the perceptions, ratings and experiences of a group of university students that can be used together in the survey to provide comprehensive results. The methods of collecting, processing and analyzing data are different in the two strategies chosen. As a part of the quantitative strategy, methods of data formalization were used. In qualitative strategies, the methods of data collection, collecting, processing and analyzing data are different in terms of creative interaction in elementary schools.

3.2. Research Sample

The research was carried out at the Kazakhstan National Pedagogical University named after Abai and the South Kazakhstan University named after Auezov in Kazakhstan. The researcher used non-probability sampling as a sampling technique. Incredible sampling is a method by which researchers select samples for research based on certain criteria. The researchers did not select participants at random but selected a specific subset based on factors such as location or age. The researchers used this method because time and cost are important considerations in a study or when they are looking for participants with similar characteristics. In total, 160 students participated in the pilot study (3rd-year students of the 8B013-pedagogical course "specialization"), 81 in the experimental group and 79 in the control group.

3.3. Research Instruments and Procedures

Tools were developed to collect survey data and answer survey questions. The measurement tool used for the study consists of two parts: a questionnaire, 7 subtests for the battery of verbal tests and a "visual-figurative test battery".
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3.3.1. Questioning

The questionnaire developed by the authors was used as the main instrument and as a guide for data analysis indicating relationships between concepts and variables. The questionnaire presented modules of themes and nine questions related to each theme. The group of respondents was previously informed about the goals and objectives of the study, the timing and procedure for its implementation.

3.3.2. The Verbal, Imaginative and Verbal-Sound Tests (Torrance's Battery).

When diagnosing creative thinking, it was necessary to perceive the creative abilities of participants in different types of mental activity: visual-figurative and verbal. A wide variety of carefully selected tasks provide respondents with opportunities to demonstrate their creative abilities. This idea significantly increases the reliability of the results obtained using the E. Torrens test compared with the results of other tests for creativity. The selection of tasks for subtests was carried out based on factor analysis which made it possible to include tasks that correlate with each other in the battery. The verbal part of the methodology consists of seven subtests aimed at measuring various aspects of verbal creativity.

The tests are carried out in groups that consist of 15 participants depending on the size of the group. Hence, the participants in the study were divided into several groups for testing. The researcher prevented participants in the study who had already been tested from providing information. During group testing, each subject received stimulus material and subtest instructions as well as answer sheet on which he would record his thoughts. It takes 45 minutes to conduct a verbal battery (figuratively - 30 minutes) without taking into account the time for instructions. Verbal and figurative batteries were carried out on different days.

The verbal battery consists of seven subtests:
- Subtest #1. Questions.
- Subtest #2. Causes.
- Subtest #3. Consequences.
- Subtest #4. Make things better.
- Subtest #5. Special use.
- Subtest #6: Ask specific questions.
- Subtest #7. Special situation.

For the oral subtest, it was planned that students would have 45 minutes and an additional 15 minutes to distribute and gather the necessary materials.

The "visual-figurative test battery" consists of three subtests:
- Subtest #1. "Creating a new image by drawing".
- Subtest #2. "Unfinished figures".
- Subtest #3. "Repeat Lines"

Special forms for fixing the results for verbal and figurative batteries are used when processing test data.

3.4. Data Analysis

While collecting the data, the phases of accessing the documents, checking their authenticity, understanding and interpreting the documents and using the data were followed. The data were examined, tabulated, interpreted and presented accordingly in the study.

4. Findings and Discussion

The data on the first question of the study is presented in Table 1. The data in Table 1 shows that there were 4 students at the "very high" level on the "certain" scale (5.02%); 8 students at the "high" level on the "yes" scale (10.06%) ; 27 students at the "average" level on the "sometimes" scale (39.2%); and 42 students at the "low" level on the "difficult to answer" scale (52%).

Table 1. The indicators of the results of the author’s survey of future primary school teachers about their perceptions of creative competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high level</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average level</td>
<td>Low level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have trouble answering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certainly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the experiment of determining the results of the author's survey in the control group, there were 5 students at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale (61.7%); 4 students at the "flexibility" scale (5%) and 4 students are on the "original" scale (5%). There were 3 students at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale; 5 students at the "high" level on the "fluency" scale; 17 students at the "low" level on the "fluency" scale; 36 students or 5% on the "original" scale. 15 students scored 19% on the scale of "fluency" at the "high" level, 16 students scored 20.2% on the "flexibility" scale and 17 students scored 21.5% according to the "original" scale.

According to the data given in Table 2, there are 5 students in the experimental group who are at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale (61.7%); 4 students are on the "flexibility" scale (5%) and 4 students are on the "original" scale (5%).

7 students or 21% are on the "fluency" scale at the "high" level. On the "flexibility" scale, 17 students are on the "original" scale (21%).

29 students are at the "average" level (35.8%); 44 students are on the "flexibility" scale (29.6%). 29 students are on the "original" scale.

30 students or 37.03% are on the "fluency" scale at the "low" level; 36 students or 44.4% are on the "flexibility" scale and 31 students are on the "original" scale.

During the experiment of determining the results of "verbal subtests," four students in the control group were at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale (5%); 4 students were on the "flexibility" scale (5%) and 3 students were on the "original" scale.

15 students scored 19% on the scale of "fluency" at the "high" level, 16 students scored 20.2% on the "flexibility" scale and 17 students scored 21.5% according to the "original" scale.

30 students are at the "medium" level scored 38%; 25 students on the "flexibility" scale scored 31.6% and 30 students scored 37.9% on the "original" scale.

30 students or 38% are on the scale of "fluency" at the "low" level, 34 students show 43.1% on the "flexibility" scale and 29 students make 36.7% according to the "original" scale.

Table 3. The results of the level of creative competence evaluate the types of "visual-figurative test battery".

During the performance of the "visual-figurative test battery," it can be seen that students' visual/figurative thinking characteristics, creativity, and creativity converge to the same level (see Table 3 and Figure 1).

Figure 1 presents a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the results of the "visual-figurative test battery".

During the experiment to determine the indicators of the results of the "visual-figurative test battery" in the experimental group, there were 3 students at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale which is 3.7%; 3 students on the "flexibility" scale which is 6.17% and 5 students score 6.2% on the "original" scale.
31 students on the scale of "fluency" are at the "average" level (38.3%); 32 students are on the "flexibility" scale (39.5%) and 31 students score 38.4% on the "original" scale.

32 students score 39.5% on the scale of "fluency" at the "low" level and 29 students on the "flexibility" scale score 35.8%. According to the "original" scale, 29 students score 35.7%.

During the experiment to determine the results of the "visual-figurative test battery" in the control group, there were 4 students at the "very high" level on the "fluency" scale scored 5%; 4 students on the "flexibility" scale scored 5% and 3 students in the "original" class score 3.8%. 17 students scored 21.5% on the scale of "fluency" at the "high" level, 15 students on the "flexibility" scale scored 16.6%. According to the "original" scale, 14 students scored 17.7%.

30 students are at the "average" level scored 38%; 33 students on the "flexibility" scale scored 41.7%. According to the "original" scale, 32 students scored 40.5%.

On the "fluency" scale, 28 students scored 35.5% at the "low" level and 29 students scored 36.7% on the "flexibility" scale. According to the "original" scale, 30 students scored 38%.

The primary goal of developing the creative abilities of future primary school teachers is to develop creative personalities.

The study's objectives were to develop in students the capacity to think for themselves, acquire knowledge and develop cognitive, research and creative activities; to identify novel approaches to any new problems that might arise and to cultivate an interest in engaging in creative endeavors.

The study identifies a set of organizational and pedagogical requirements to guarantee and validate the effectiveness of future primary school teachers' creative development complexes in addressing these issues.

The results of the experimental work show that the developed process is a useful tool for cultivating students' creative abilities.

The influence of experiential learning on a student's creative approach in non-standard conditions has a positive dynamic: motivation for creative self-development; own creativity; professional development, the concentration of creative efforts, perseverance; courage and independence in judgment; leadership, initiative; independence; a positive self-perception and readiness for innovation.

As shown in Table 4, the results of the repeat questionnaire used as the main instrument also serve as a guide for data analysis indicating relationships between this concept and variables. The results are shown in Tables 4 and 5 as well as in Figure 2.

### Table 4. The indicators of the results of the repeat survey of future primary school teachers about their perceptions of creative thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the experiment</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the experiment</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. The levels of the results of the repeat survey of future primary school teachers about their perceptions of creative thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the experiment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the experiment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 presents the data obtained in response to the repeat survey of future primary school teachers about their perceptions of creative thinking.
It is clear that everyone's opinion is "very good," and creativity increased by 5.04% - 17.5%. This metric indicates that study participants have completed the elective course "fundamentals of teaching creative literacy."

The "high" level shows an increase in creativity from 10.06% to 21.7%. Consequently, the knowledge about the creative competence of the study participants is expanding and will be used in future seminars.

The activity level indicator "average" decreased by 32.3% - 15.5%. During learning and practice, ideas about the effectiveness of creative task use and participants' abilities to perform creative tasks are systematized.

The "low" level decreased by 52.6% - 26.3%. We note that the students who completed the elective course have improved their creative competence.

According to the given data, future elementary school teachers are making progress in fostering creativity.

To test the difference in level between the control and experimental groups, we used Pearson's chi-squared test ($\chi^2$) and got the following result.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum \left( n_i Q_{i2} - n_i Q_{i1} \right)^2 / Q_{i1} + Q_{i2}$$

Where $n_1$ is the number of students in the experimental and control groups and $n_2$ is the number of students in the control and experimental groups. The frequency of symptom 1 in the control and experimental groups is $Q_{i1}$ and $i$ is the number of symptoms $Q_{i2}$.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{1}{81 \times 79} \left[ \frac{(81 \times 4 - 79 \times 4)^2}{8} + \frac{(81 \times 8 - 79 \times 8)^2}{16} + \frac{(81 \times 26 - 79 \times 27)^2}{53} + \frac{(81 \times 43 - 79 \times 40)^2}{83} \right]$$

$$\chi^2 = \frac{1}{6399} \left[ 8 + 16 + 13.7 + 1256.9 \right] = \frac{1249.6}{6399} \approx 0.02$$

Significance level $q = 0.05$, number of degrees of freedom $\nu = 4 - 1 = 3$

$$x^2_l = 0.02$$

$$x^2 = 7.82$$

$$\chi^2 > x^2_l \approx 7.82$$

At this level of significance, there were no significant statistical differences between the control and experimental groups which meant that these groups were considered eligible for the study (see Table 6).

**Table 6. The initial level and final indicators of the development of creative ability in the experimental group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental group - 81 students</th>
<th>Before the experiment</th>
<th>After the experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>High level</td>
<td>Average level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After applying the proposed methodological system and determining the statistical significance of the results, we used the Pearson $\chi^2$ (chi-square) test to verify the correctness of our conclusion about the increase in the percentage and methodological efficiency of the experimental group of students.

To do this, we will check the hypothesis that the creative competencies of students are formed during the performance of practical tasks.

$$x^2 = \sum \left( f_i^0 - f_i^n \right)^2 / (f_i^0 + f_i^n)$$

Index calculation formula, where $f_i^0$ and $f_i^n$ are the frequency of the comparison index.

$$x^2 = \frac{(5.04 - 17.5)^2}{22.54} + \frac{(10.06 - 31.7)^2}{41.76} + \frac{(32.3 - 24.5)^2}{56.8} + \frac{(52.6 - 26.3)^2}{78.9} = 155.2 + 4682 + 60.84 + 691.69$$

$$x^2 = 6.8 + 112 + 1.07 + 87 = 27.77$$

For a given significance level $q = 0.05$ and the number of degrees of freedom $\nu = k - 1 = 4 - 1 = 3$, we determine the critical value according to the optional table.

$$\chi^2 > \chi^2_{0.05}$$

(27.77 > 7.82) $q = 0.05$ the hypothesis is rejected.

Consequently, students through practical tasks acquire knowledge and skills aimed at the effectiveness of the formation of their creative competence.

In the following table, a final test is carried out to determine the level of the experimental group and the control group and it is calculated by the student's T-test. The control group results are shown in Table 7.

Before the experimental group, 5 students (6.17%) were at a "very high" level on the "fluency" scale, after 12 students; (19.8 %); before 4 students; 3% on the "flexibility" scale after 10 students (12.3%) + 4 students (5%) are on the "originality" scale after 9 students (11.1%). Consequently, after the elective course, the indicators of students' creative competence at a "very high" level increased by 22.03%.

Before the experiment, the "high" level on the "fluency" scale in the experimental group was 17 students (21%), and after -38 students (46.9%); before the experiment, 17 students (21%) had a "high" level on the "flexibility" scale and after - 38 students (46.9%); the "high" level on the "originality" scale was 17 students (21%) and after -
Before the experiment, the "average" level on the "fluency" scale in the experimental group was 29 students (37.9%), and after it was 5 students (6.32%); before the experiment, 4 students (5.06%) on the "flexibility" scale and after it was - 4 students (5.1%); 3 students (3.9%) on the "originality" scale and after it was 5 students (6.3%).

Before the experiment, the "high" level on the "fluency" scale in the control group was 30 students (38%); before the experiment, 16 students (20.2%) had a "high" level on the "flexibility" scale, and after it was - 17 students (21.5%); before the experiment, 16 students (20.2%) had a "high" level on the "flexibility" scale, and after it was - 17 students (21.5%); the "high" level on the "originality" scale was 17 students (21%); and it was - 19 students (24.1%).

Before the experiment, the "average" level on the "fluency" scale in the control group was 30 students (38%), and after it was - 30 students (38%); before the experiment, 25 students (31.6%) had a "high" level on the "flexibility" scale, and after it was - 26 students (32.9%); a "high" level on the "originality" scale up to 30 students (37.9%) and after it was - 27 students (34.2%).

Before the experiment, a "low" level on the "fluency" scale in the control group was 5 students (6.32%); before the experiment, 54 students (63.1%) had a "high" level on the "flexibility" scale and after it was - 52 students (60.5%); a "high" level on the "originality" scale was 29 students (36.7%) and after it was - 28 students (35.4%). Hence, these indicators show no change in the control group. The following mathematical and numerical indicators are given below:

Calculations revealed conflicting hypotheses (H₀, H₁) about significant differences in the levels of creative ability between the experimental and control groups. To do this, we first use the student's T-test for each indicator separately and then for all indicators together.

If $t < t_0$

Then - $H_0$ has a zero value, and if $t < t_0$ then the opposite hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted.

Here $t = \frac{x-y}{m_1^* m_2^*}$

And $x$ is the mean value of the experimental group.

$x = \frac{\sum f x_i}{n}$

And $y$ is the mean value of the experimental group.

$m_1 = \frac{S_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} \text{ and } m_2 = \frac{S_2}{\sqrt{N_2}}$, $S = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 - x_{\text{mean}}^2 f}{N-1}}$

Experimental group – 81 students.
If \( t < t_0 \) then - \( H_0 \) has a zero value, there were no significant differences in the levels of creative ability among the groups. If \( t > t_0 \) then the hypothesis \( H_1 \) is accepted, there are significant differences in the level of creativity among groups.

\[
x = \frac{2.30 + 3.20 + 4.17 + 5.00 \times 5}{81} = \frac{240}{81} = 2.96
\]

\[
S = \sqrt{(2 - 2.96)^2 \times 30 + (3 - 2.96)^2 \times 29 + (4 - 2.96)^2 \times 5 + (5 - 2.96)^2 \times 5}
\]

\[
S = \sqrt{27.6 + 0.466 + 18.36 - 20.8} = \sqrt{66.8} = \sqrt{0.33} = 0.9
\]

\[
y = \frac{2 + 18 + 3 + 18 + 4 + 33 + 5 + 12}{81} = \frac{90}{81} = 0.9
\]

\[
ym_1 = \frac{0.97}{\sqrt{0.97}} = 0.9
\]

\[
t = \frac{-0.97}{0.02 + 0.01} = 0.22
\]

\[
f = 1.984 \text{ was, } t < t_0 \text{, so the hypothesis } H_0 \text{ is accepted.}
\]

### 5. Conclusion

This study confirmed the predominance of the problem of the lack of holistic knowledge at the university about regular connections and methodological foundations of professional training that contribute to the formation of future primary school teachers' creative competence; about an adequate creatively developing educational sphere and ways to create it in the current situation of modernization of professional pedagogical education; about the scientifically based logical sequence of the development of the creative competence of the students and about the appropriate methodological and technological support for this process. The content of the elective course “fundamentals of teaching creative literacy” was developed by the study's objectives and practiced in the university's educational process. Experimental results increased creativity. These findings allowed for the modification of the country's existing training structure as well as the development of new models and options.
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