

The Role of Teachers' Multidimensional Teaching Strategies in Enhancing EFL Students' Language Creativity in Writing

Dan Shen

School of Language, Civilization and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Kedah, Malaysia

Rafizah Mohd Rawian

School of Language, Civilization and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Kedah, Malaysia

Abstract—This study examines how teachers' multidimensional teaching strategies relate to students' language creativity in EFL writing among English majors at Guangzhou Institute of Science and Technology, China. Using a quantitative research design, this study collected data from 99 second-year English majors through teaching strategy scales and writing creativity tests. Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to assess the differential predictive effects of four strategic dimensions: Teacher Creativity, Creative Teaching, Teaching Attitudes and Classroom Pressure, on students' language creativity including Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration. The results revealed distinct predictive profiles across these creativity dimensions: Teacher Creativity and Creative Teaching were identified as the strongest positive predictors, significantly correlating with Fluency, Flexibility and Originality. Notably, Creative Teaching exhibited the strongest explanatory power for Elaboration, producing the highest standardized coefficient. After controlling for other instructional variables, the independent predictive effects of Teaching Attitudes and Classroom Pressure did not reach statistical significance. Taken together, students' language creativity in EFL writing appears to be shaped not by a single teaching factor but by the combined influence of multiple instructional practices. This finding provides an empirical foundation for designing creativity-oriented English writing curricula.

Index Terms—teacher creativity, language creativity, teaching attitudes, creative teaching, classroom pressure

I. INTRODUCTION

As foreign language teaching paradigms shift from knowledge transmission toward learner-centred, competence-based approaches, scholars widely advocate that teachers should cultivate students' language creativity through diverse teaching strategies. Within this context, Teacher Creativity (TC), Creative Teaching (CT), Teaching Attitudes (TA) and Classroom Pressure (CP) are widely regarded as key variables influencing learners' creative linguistic performance. However, their specific pathways of influence and functional boundaries remain poorly systematized.

Within EFL writing contexts, writing serves both as a vital component of language acquisition and as a visible indicator of academic literacy development. Compared with receptive skills, writing tasks compel learners to actively generate, reorganize and creatively mobilize linguistic resources, thus providing fertile ground for the emergence of language creativity. The multidimensional teaching strategies implemented by educators not only enhance textual accuracy and coherence but also play a pivotal role in determining the quality, diversity and depth of creative output. By introducing innovative instructional designs, diverse learning resources and creativity-oriented classroom activities, teachers can cultivate a learning ecosystem that simultaneously supports idea generation and linguistic experimentation, thus propelling students towards linguistic innovation in their writing.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Creativity

The academic concept of "creativity" has been systematically examined across disciplines since the nineteenth century. Galton (1869) pioneered its association with individual intellectual variation, while Guilford (1950) subsequently established its cognitive foundations through divergent thinking. Torrance (1962) then provided operational tools via a series of creativity tests; together, Guilford's and Torrance's approaches remain pivotal paradigms within the field to this day. Rhodes (1961) deconstructed creative phenomena into the four dimensions of person, process, press and product within his "4 Ps" framework, providing a multidimensional perspective. Bruner (1962) defined creativity as the act of producing effective surprises, emphasizing the dual criteria of novelty and usefulness. Amabile (1983) introduced the social context, noting that both creative products and processes require social

evaluation for their validity to be recognized. Amabile (1996) further emphasized that the recognition of creative achievements depends on the evaluations of experts in the relevant field.

In contemporary research, creativity is increasingly viewed as a context-dependent construct embedded within sociocultural frameworks. Feldman et al. (1994) defined it as the capacity to produce novel, domain-meaningful contributions that receive institutional recognition within a specific disciplinary field, erasing redundant blank spaces and misplaced commas in the original sentence structure. Craft et al. (2001) distinguished between “Big C” creativity and “little c” creativity, corresponding respectively to outstanding creative achievements and everyday creative expressions, thus offering an actionable analytical dimension for educational settings. However, this dichotomous classification has been questioned by some scholars who argue that creativity operates on a continuum rather than in discrete categories, implying that the distinction may oversimplify developmental trajectories (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004). In recent years, digitalization and cross-context learning environments have gradually become important topics in creativity research. A macro-level review indicates that contextual factors such as interaction and collaboration are closely related to creative performance at the organizational and group levels (Zhang et al., 2026). This finding provides a theoretical basis for cooperative learning in educational contexts. At the same time, neuroscientific research has revealed that creative cognition involves dynamic coordination processes of multiple brain networks (Beaty et al., 2019), emphasizing that creativity is not only a behavioral manifestation but also a complex cognitive activity. Moreover, the relationship between creativity and individual differences has also been re-examined. Studies have shown that key factors such as divergent thinking exhibit dynamic changes in different contexts (Zielińska et al., 2025). These studies collectively indicate that the development of creativity is influenced not only by individual cognitive mechanisms but also by specific learning and interaction environments.

In summary, creativity has been established as a multidimensional construct encompassing novelty, usefulness, social recognition and individual expression. Its continuously evolving theoretical framework provides a robust foundation for creativity research within educational and language learning contexts.

B. Language Creativity in EFL Writing

In linguistic research, language creativity is generally defined as the ability of an individual to generate novel meanings and expressions within the constraints of the existing language system (Carter, 2004). This definition emphasizes that creativity is not arbitrary expression beyond language norms, but rather the reorganization and innovation of meanings within the framework of language rules. Humboldt (1836, 1999) also pointed out that language is not a passive tool for information transmission but a creative activity that continuously generates meaning. Its inherent “freedom” enables individuals to continuously expand the boundaries of expression within the symbolic system. This emphasis on linguistic “freedom” appears to contrast with Carter’s (2004) focus on “constraints”; however, these views can be reconciled by regarding language creativity as a dynamic interplay between rule-governed structures and innovative departures. Correspondingly, the tradition of generative linguistics emphasizes that the core of human language ability lies in the ability to produce and understand an infinite number of new sentences (Lyons, 1977), which provides an important foundation for the theory of language creativity.

In contemporary applied linguistics research, language creativity is increasingly regarded as a developable ability rather than stemming simply from innate endowment. Relevant studies have shown that creative language use can be enhanced through systematic teaching and continuous practice. In the context of EFL writing, language creativity is typically manifested as learners’ ability to make novel combinations and meaning reconstructions at the levels of vocabulary, syntax, semantics and text structure, which can be summarized as a multi-dimensional expressive ability (Shen, 2021). Recent classroom empirical research has also indicated that teaching interventions such as innovative teaching design, project-based learning and integration of digital tools may have a positive impact on learners’ creative expression (Ghafouri et al., 2024).

Taken together, the existing literature generally regards language creativity as a developable and assessable ability. In EFL writing classrooms, instructional design and supportive learning environments are considered important contextual variables that influence students’ creative expression. Based on the tradition of divergent thinking (Guilford, 1950; Torrance, 1962), this study operationalizes language creativity into four observable dimensions, namely fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration, in order to enhance the measurability and theoretical comparability of the subsequent empirical analysis.

C. Multidimensional Teaching Strategies Based on Teacher Creativity

The evolution of educational research has increasingly highlighted the central role of teacher behaviour and instructional strategies in shaping learning outcomes. Chambers (1973) was among the first to demonstrate that innovative classroom practices significantly enhance student engagement and foster supportive environments for creative language use. Vasudevan (2010) further argued that teacher creativity can trigger active learning and critical thinking, positioning educators as key intermediaries in cultivating problem-solving abilities and independent thought.

Subsequently, scholars have refined the conceptualization of teacher creativity, extending its scope to multiple dimensions of teaching contexts. Baghaei and Riasati (2015) positioned this concept as a core driver of positive educational transformation. Soh (2017), drawing upon social learning theory, emphasized the unique value of teacher creativity in fostering high-quality teacher-student interactions and collaborative knowledge construction.

However, recent research indicates that teacher creativity alone cannot fully account for the complex environment of real classrooms. Consequently, the academic focus has gradually shifted towards more integrative teaching strategy frameworks. From the research perspective of language teacher cognition, Borg (2003) pointed out that teachers' classroom decisions and teaching behaviors do not occur independently, but they are closely related to their professional knowledge, teaching beliefs and understanding of the context, and are manifested in specific teaching designs and classroom practices. This viewpoint indicates that the formation and implementation of teaching strategies have systematic characteristics. Moreover, research on teaching quality also emphasizes that factors such as the supportive atmosphere and classroom management in the classroom process play an important role in promoting teaching effectiveness (Klieme et al., 2009), suggesting that the actual impact of teachers' strategies is often embedded within the classroom environment.

From these perspectives, this study constructs a multidimensional teaching strategy framework comprising four interrelated constructs: Teacher Creativity (TC), Creative Teaching (CT), Teaching Attitudes (TA) and Classroom Pressure (CP). This framework expands upon Teacher Creativity Theory to provide a more comprehensive explanation of how teachers foster students' language creativity. Specifically, TC focuses on innovation in content and methodology; CT emphasizes the design and implementation of creativity-oriented teaching activities; TA reflects teachers' beliefs, support, and encouragement for creative learning; while CP denotes the extent to which teachers activate students' potential and creative expression through appropriately challenging tasks. Notably, these dimensions may not always exert convergent effects; for instance, while appropriate challenge can stimulate creativity (Sternberg & Lubart, 1995), excessive pressure may suppress cognitive flexibility and originality (Amabile, 1996), suggesting that the predictive contributions of different strategies could vary across creativity facets.

The proposed framework not only deepens theoretical understanding of teacher creativity but also offers a fresh perspective for systematically investigating how multidimensional teaching strategies foster language creativity development in EFL writing contexts. Crucially, it acknowledges that teaching strategies may yield differential effects across creativity dimensions rather than assuming uniform influence, thereby establishing the theoretical foundation for this study's analytical approach.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this part, the research trajectory is clarified and a rigorous, systematic methodological framework is established to examine the relationship between teachers' multiple teaching strategies and students' language creativity within EFL writing contexts. The following sections present the research questions and hypotheses, participants, instruments, data collection and analysis procedures in sequence.

A. Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study aims to examine, at a quantitative level, the predictive efficacy of teachers' multidimensional teaching strategies in relation to students' language creativity in EFL writing. To maintain conceptual clarity and the validity of statistical inference, the hypothesis testing and regression modeling in this paper focus solely on the four theoretical dimensions of language creativity: Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration. The composite score across these four dimensions is employed solely for descriptive purposes and is excluded from hypothesis testing to avoid conceptual overlap and redundant information.

The research questions are formulated as follows:

RQ1: To what extent does Teacher Creativity predict students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing?

RQ2: To what extent does Creative Teaching predict students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing?

RQ3: To what extent do Teaching Attitudes predict students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing?

RQ4: To what extent does Classroom Pressure predict students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing?

Building upon existing theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence, this study further proposes the following research hypotheses. Given the multidimensional nature of language creativity, the effects of teaching strategies are anticipated to exhibit heterogeneous distributions across the dimensions of language creativity rather than displaying a homogeneous, uniform pattern.

H1: Teacher Creativity positively predicts students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing.

H2: Creative Teaching positively predicts students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing.

H3: Teaching Attitudes positively predict students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing.

H4: Classroom Pressure positively predicts students' Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration in EFL writing.

B. Participants

The research sample comprised 99 second-year English major students from the School of Foreign Languages at Guangzhou Institute of Science and Technology, aged between 18 and 22 years old. All participants had completed two

semesters of university-level English writing courses and had received at least nine years of formal English education. The survey adhered to voluntary participation principles, with questionnaires and assessments processed anonymously. The research procedure complied with educational research ethics requirements, including the acquisition of electronic informed consent and the protection of the confidentiality of participants' responses.

C. Research Instruments

(1) English Language Teacher Creativity Scale (ELT-CS)

The ELT-CS was developed by Pishghadam et al. (2012) based on the Rasch rating scale model. The initial version comprised 62 items distributed across seven dimensions, and was subsequently revised and condensed to 54 items using a three-point Likert format. To align with this study's analytical framework, the authors rearranged item order and reverse-coded reverse-scored items to ensure consistent scoring direction. Subsequently, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) consolidated the scale into four dimensions: Teacher Creativity (TC), Creative Teaching (CT), Teaching Attitudes (TA) and Classroom Pressure (CP). The factor extraction phase strictly adhered to psychometric criteria including adequate sampling, loading strength and conceptual interpretability. The final retained four-factor structure underpinned all subsequent statistical analyses.

(2) Divergent Production Ability (DPA) Test

This study employed Sharma's (1979) Divergent Production Ability (DPA) test to measure language creativity in students' EFL writing. The divergent-thinking orientation of the test aligns closely with this study's operationalization of language creativity. The DPA test comprises six subtests capturing distinct facets of divergent language production, which correspond to the four creativity dimensions of Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration.

Scoring was conducted according to standardized criteria for each sub-test. Prior to formal marking, raters underwent calibration training using exemplar texts to ensure consistency. In addition, 25% of the responses were randomly selected for independent assessment by two trained raters. Inter-rater reliability was assessed via intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC), with discrepancies resolved through discussion and consensus-based revisions. This procedure aimed to enhance the objectivity of creativity assessment and minimize subjective bias.

D. Data Collection

Data collection was conducted through the "Wenjuanxing" online platform. The revised ELT-CS questionnaire was distributed, and then the DPA test was administered. After the completion of the questionnaires and tests, the obtained data were imported into SPSSAU for data sorting and analysis. This study adopted a quantitative correlational research design based on cross-sectional one-time data. Therefore, the regression coefficients were only interpreted as predictive relationships between the variables, rather than involving causal inference.

E. Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study was conducted on the SPSSAU platform. Firstly, reliability tests and descriptive statistical analyses were performed for each variable, and the correlation coefficients between variables were calculated. Before conducting the regression analysis, the correlation among the variables was examined to avoid serious multicollinearity issues. Subsequently, four multiple linear regression models were constructed, with the four teaching strategy dimensions (TC, CT, TA and CP) of teaching strategies as the predictor variables, to examine their effects on the four dimensions of students' language creativity, namely Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration.

During the model estimation process, conventional tests were conducted on the residual distribution and the homogeneity of variance. The results showed that the model met the basic assumptions of regression analysis, thus allowing for subsequent statistical inferences.

IV. RESULTS

A. Descriptive Statistics, Reliability and Correlation Analysis

Before conducting inferential statistics, this study performed descriptive statistics, reliability tests and correlation analyses for each variable to assess the internal consistency of the scale and the basic association patterns among the variables (see Table 1).

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, RELIABILITIES AND CORRELATIONS AMONG STUDY VARIABLES (N = 99)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. TC	2.60	0.48	0.85							
2. TA	1.76	0.27	.35**	0.78						
3. CT	1.82	0.31	.52**	.41**	0.82					
4. CP	1.80	0.29	-.21*	-0.10	-0.18	0.79				
5. Fluency	14.96	4.52	.45**	.20*	.40**	-.25*	0.88			
6. Flexibility	9.78	2.63	.38**	.25*	.42**	-0.18	.65**	0.81		
7. Originality	11.20	4.47	.43**	0.15	.45**	-.22*	.71**	.58**	0.86	
8. Elaboration	13.84	4.39	.22*	-0.08	.35**	-.20*	.52**	.48**	.61**	0.84

Note. Diagonal values represent Cronbach's α coefficients. TC = Teacher Creativity; TA = Teaching Attitudes; CT = Creative Teaching; CP = Classroom Pressure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The reliability test results showed that the Cronbach's α coefficients of each construct ranged from .78 to .88 (TC = .85, TA = .78, CT = .82, CP = .79, Fluency = .88, Flexibility = .81, Originality = .86, Elaboration = .84), indicating satisfactory internal consistency for subsequent analyses.

Descriptive statistics showed that, among the teaching strategy variables, TC had the highest mean score, followed by CT and CP, whereas TA showed the lowest mean score. Among the dimensions of language creativity, Fluency and Elaboration had relatively higher mean values, while Flexibility had the lowest. Originality showed the largest standard deviation, suggesting substantial individual differences in creative language production.

The correlation analysis showed that TC was moderately and positively correlated with CT ($r = .52$, $p < .01$). TC was also positively associated with all four dimensions of language creativity ($r = .22$ to $.45$, $p < .05$ or $p < .01$). Similarly, CT showed significant positive correlations with all four dimensions ($r = .35$ to $.45$, $p < .01$). TA was weakly correlated with some dimensions of language creativity, including Fluency ($r = .20$, $p < .05$) and Flexibility ($r = .25$, $p < .05$), although the overall correlations were relatively weak. By contrast, CP showed weak but consistent negative correlations with each dimension of language creativity ($r = -.20$ to $-.25$, $p < .05$). All correlation coefficients were below .70, suggesting that multicollinearity was not a serious concern and that the data met the assumptions for multiple regression analysis.

B. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the effects of teachers' teaching strategies on the four dimensions of students' language creativity: Fluency, Flexibility, Originality and Elaboration. In all models, TC, CT, TA and CP were entered simultaneously as predictor variables. Collinearity diagnostics showed that all tolerance values exceeded 0.40 and all variance inflation factor (VIF) values were below 2.5, indicating no significant multicollinearity problems. The results are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES PREDICTING LANGUAGE CREATIVITY DIMENSIONS (N = 99)

Predictor	Fluency		Flexibility		Originality		Elaboration	
	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β
Constant	3.45 (1.92)		2.12 (1.15)		1.89 (2.01)		4.23 (1.98)	
TC	0.41* (0.18)	0.22	0.33* (0.15)	0.19	0.52** (0.19)	0.26	0.28 (0.18)	0.15
TA	0.15 (0.29)	0.05	0.24 (0.18)	0.10	0.18 (0.30)	0.05	-0.31 (0.28)	-0.10
CT	0.56* (0.24)	0.20	0.61** (0.20)	0.26	0.78** (0.26)	0.30	0.92*** (0.25)	0.35
CP	-0.33 (0.21)	-0.13	-0.19 (0.14)	-0.09	-0.41 (0.22)	-0.17	-0.38 (0.21)	-0.16
R ²	0.325		0.298		0.342		0.287	
Adjusted R ²	0.296		0.268		0.314		0.256	
F	11.31***		10.01***		12.18***		9.33***	
VIF range	1.12–1.92							

Note. Unstandardized coefficients (B), standard errors (SE), and standardized coefficients (β) are reported.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

(a). Prediction of Fluency

The regression model predicting Fluency was statistically significant, $F(4, 94) = 11.31$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .325$, Adjusted $R^2 = .296$, explaining 32.5% of the variance. After controlling for the other strategy variables, both TC ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) and CT ($\beta = .20$, $p < .05$) remained significant positive predictors. This finding suggests that teachers' creative characteristics and creativity-oriented instructional practices may help increase students' language output. TA and CP did not show significant effects, indicating limited independent contributions to Fluency.

(b). Prediction of Flexibility

The regression model predicting Flexibility was statistically significant, $F(4, 94) = 10.01$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .298$, Adjusted $R^2 = .268$. Both CT ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$) and TC ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$) were significant positive predictors, with CT showing a relatively stronger effect. This suggests that creativity-oriented task design may play a greater role than

teachers' general creative disposition in promoting perspective-taking and linguistic flexibility. TA and CP again showed no significant independent effects.

(c). Prediction of Originality

This model showed the strongest explanatory power, $F(4, 94) = 12.18$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .342$, Adjusted $R^2 = .314$. CT ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$) emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by TC ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$), indicating that Originality was particularly sensitive to structured and creative teaching interventions. The coefficients for TA and CP were non-significant.

(d). Prediction of Elaboration

The regression model predicting Elaboration was statistically significant, $F(4, 94) = 9.33$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .287$, Adjusted $R^2 = .256$. Only CT ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$) showed a significant positive effect, with an effect size nearly twice that of TC. This finding suggests that students' ability to elaborate and expand ideas may depend more heavily on structured creativity-oriented instructional design. Although TC showed a positive trend ($\beta = .15$), it did not reach statistical significance. TA and CP likewise showed no independent effects.

In summary, Teacher Creativity and Creative Teaching showed stable positive relationships with students' Fluency, Flexibility, and Originality in English writing, suggesting that creativity-related teacher characteristics and instructional practices may play an important role in fostering students' language creativity. However, their effects on Elaboration were comparatively weaker, indicating that different dimensions of language creativity may respond differently to instructional factors. Taken together, the findings provided partial support for Hypotheses 1 and 2, whereas Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not supported in the present linear regression models.

V. DISCUSSION

On the basis of the regression analysis results, this section further discusses the relationships between teachers' multi-dimensional teaching strategies and the various dimensions of language creativity in EFL writing contexts. Considering the differential predictive effects across dimensions, this part focuses on analyzing the performance of each teaching strategy across different dimensions of language creativity, and attempts to explain their patterns of consistency and divergence from theoretical perspectives.

A. Teacher Creativity and Students' Language Creativity

The results showed that Teacher Creativity significantly predicted Fluency, Flexibility and Originality, though it did not yield statistical significance for Elaboration. This finding is broadly consistent with the meta-analysis conducted by Mullet et al. (2016), which reported that teachers' creative cognition is positively associated with students' creative language performance. They further noted that teachers' perceptions of and attitudes toward creativity are significantly related to students' creative performance. Kettler et al. (2018) also found that when teachers demonstrate creativity-supportive beliefs and classroom behaviors, students are more likely to display higher creative potential. Together, these findings suggest that teachers' personal creativity may be reflected in their classroom practices, which may in turn influence students' creative language performance. From a theoretical perspective, Teacher Creativity appears to relate more strongly to the "generative" dimensions of creativity, such as the quantity and novelty of ideas. By contrast, Elaboration may depend more heavily on sustained cognitive engagement, linguistic resources and structured instructional support. Such demands may not be fully addressed through teachers' general creative tendencies alone. This difference may help explain why Teacher Creativity showed stronger predictive effects for Fluency and Originality than for Elaboration.

B. The Central Role of Creative Teaching

Creative Teaching significantly and positively predicted all four dimensions of students' language creativity, with the strongest effects observed for Originality and Elaboration ($\beta \geq .30$). This finding supports Cross's (2012) argument that innovative instructional design plays an important role in developing higher-order language abilities and is also consistent with Soh's (2017) finding that creativity-oriented teaching practices can enhance students' creative performance. Liao et al. (2018) further suggested that Creative Teaching may improve the quality of creative output by increasing learning motivation and cognitive flexibility. From an explanatory perspective, Ayyildiz and Yilmaz (2021) proposed that innovative teaching behaviors may serve a mediating role in classroom settings by transforming creative ideas into specific learning experiences, consequently influencing students' creative performance. Recent research likewise suggests that cognitively challenging classroom activities may indirectly enhance students' creative performance by strengthening motivation and behavioral engagement (Järvenoja et al., 2023).

This study further suggests that the development of language creativity in EFL writing may depend more on the combined effects of task design, activity organization and expression guidance than on teachers' personal creative traits alone. From the perspective of second language acquisition, this finding is consistent with Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis, which argues that output-oriented tasks encourage learners to identify linguistic gaps, reorganize linguistic resources and refine meaning. This may explain why Creative Teaching showed particularly strong effects on

Originality and Elaboration. In addition, the significant positive relationship between Creative Teaching and Fluency ($\beta = .20$) suggests that carefully designed creative tasks may help improve both the quantity and quality of language output.

C. Limited Influence of Teaching Attitudes and Classroom Pressure

After controlling for Teacher Creativity and Creative Teaching, Teaching Attitudes did not show significant independent effects on any dimension of creativity. This finding does not reduce the educational importance of positive teaching attitudes; rather, it suggests that their influence may operate indirectly through classroom atmosphere or through the implementation of creative teaching practices (Mullet et al., 2016). Khodabakhshzadeh et al. (2018) similarly argued that the relationship between teaching attitudes and creativity is highly dependent on context. Similarly, although Classroom Pressure showed a consistent negative trend, its effects did not reach statistical significance. This finding is consistent with recent evidence suggesting that the relationship between environmental demands and creativity is not necessarily linear, but rather depends on the interaction of contextual support, self-regulation, and task conditions (Zielińska et al., 2025). Because this study examined only linear models, it could not capture possible threshold or curvilinear effects. Future research could apply more complex analytical models to further examine the relationship between classroom pressure and language creativity.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examines the predictive effects of teachers' teaching strategies on students' language creativity in EFL writing from a multidimensional perspective. Multiple linear regression ($n = 99$) revealed differential influences across the dimensions of language creativity: teacher creativity significantly predicted fluency, flexibility and originality. While creative teaching presented a significant positive predictive effect across all four dimensions, it exerted relatively stronger effects observed in the dimensions of originality and elaboration. After controlling for teacher creativity and creative teaching, teaching attitudes and classroom pressure did not demonstrate significant independent predictive effects.

The results of this study suggest that the development of students' language creativity in EFL writing may rely on the combined effect of multiple teaching strategies, especially the transformation of creative concepts into specific tasks and activities. Compared with teachers' individual creative traits, creative teaching practices showed more consistent associations across different dimensions of creativity.

This study also has certain limitations. The homogeneity of the sample background and sample source may affect the external generalizability of the results, and the analysis based on cross-sectional data cannot support causal inference. Future research could expand the sample size and adopt longitudinal designs or mixed methods to further test and expand the findings of this study. In conclusion, this study provides supplementary empirical evidence for understanding the relationship between teachers' multi-dimensional teaching strategies and students' language creativity in EFL writing, and offers valuable implications for creativity-oriented writing instruction practices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 357–376.
- [2] Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press.
- [3] Ayyildiz, P., & Yilmaz, A. (2021). "Moving the Kaleidoscope" to see the effect of creative personality traits on creative thinking dispositions of preservice teachers: The mediating effect of creative learning environments and teachers' creativity fostering behavior. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 41, 100879.
- [4] Baghaei, S., & Riasati, M. J. (2015). An investigation into the relationship between teachers' creativity and students' academic achievement: A case study of Iran EFL context. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, 4(2), 21–32.
- [5] Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109.
- [6] Beaty, R. E., Benedek, M., Silvia, P. J., & Schacter, D. L. (2019). Creative cognition and brain network dynamics. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(2), 158–170.
- [7] Bruner, J. (1962). The conditions of creativity. In H. E. Gruber, G. Terrell, & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Creative Thinking* (pp. 1–30). Atherton Press.
- [8] Carter, R. (2004). *Language and creativity: The art of common talk*. Routledge.
- [9] Chambers, J. A. (1973). College teachers: Their effect on creativity of students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65(3), 326–334.
- [10] Craft, A., Jeffrey, B., & Leibling, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Creativity in education*. Continuum Intl Pub Group.
- [11] Cross, R. (2012). Creative in finding creativity in the curriculum: The CLIL second language classroom. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 39(4), 431–445.
- [12] Feldman, D. H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Gardner, H. (1994). *Changing the world: A framework for the study of creativity*. Praeger.
- [13] Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. Macmillan.
- [14] Ghafouri, M., Hassaskhah, J., & Mahdavi-Zafarghandi, A. (2024). From virtual assistant to writing mentor: Exploring the impact of a ChatGPT-based writing instruction protocol on EFL teachers' self-efficacy and learners' writing skill. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241239764>

- [15] Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454.
- [16] Humboldt, W. von. (1999). *On language: On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species* (M. Losonsky, Ed.; P. Heath, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1836)
- [17] Järvenoja, H., Malmberg, J., Haataja, E., Sobocinski, M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2023). Examining the causal model between socially shared regulation of motivation, engagement, and creative performance. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 48, 101288.
- [18] Kettler, T., Lamb, K. N., Willerson, A., & Mullet, D. R. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of creativity in the classroom. *Creativity Research Journal*, 30(2), 164–171.
- [19] Khodabakhshzadeh, H., Hosseinnia, M., Moghadam, H. A., & Ahmadi, F. (2018). EFL teachers' creativity and their teaching's effectiveness: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 227–238.
- [20] Klieme, E., Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (2009). The Pythagoras Study: Teaching quality and student outcomes in German mathematics classrooms. In E. Klieme, C. Pauli, & K. Reusser (Eds.), *Teaching quality and student outcomes in mathematics and science education* (pp. 35–56). Springer.
- [21] Liao, Y. H., Chen, Y. L., Chen, H. C., & Chang, Y. L. (2018). Infusing creative pedagogy into an English as a foreign language classroom: Learning performance, creativity, and motivation. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 29, 213–223.
- [22] Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Mullet, D. R., Willerson, A., Lamb, K. N., & Kettler, T. (2016). Examining teacher perceptions of creativity: A systematic review of the literature. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 21, 9–30.
- [24] Pishghadam, R., Baghaei, P., & Shayesteh, S. (2012). Construction and validation of an English language teacher creativity scale (ELT-CS). *Journal of American Science*, 8(3), 497–508.
- [25] Plucker, J. A., & Beghetto, R. A. (2004). Why Creativity Is Domain General, Why It Looks Domain Specific, and Why the Distinction Does Not Matter. In R. J. Sternberg, E. L. Grigorenko, & J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity: From potential to realization* (pp. 153–167). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10692-009>
- [26] Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 42(7), 305–310.
- [27] Sharma, K. (1979). *Manual for Divergent Production Ability Test*. National Psychological Corporation.
- [28] Shen, D. (2021). Influential Factors on Language Creativity of College Students in ESL Writing. *Advances in Educational Technology and Psychology*, 5(9), 146–154.
- [29] Soh, K. (2017). Fostering student creativity. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 23, 58–66.
- [30] Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. Free Press.
- [31] Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- [32] Torrance, E. P. (1962). *Guiding creative talent*. Prentice Hall.
- [33] Vasudevan, H. (2010). *The influence of teachers' creativity, attitude and commitment on students' proficiency of the English language* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Malaya.
- [34] Zhang, Z., Chen, C.-H., Guo, Z., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2026). How does learner prior language knowledge play in GenAI-assisted project-based learning for creative thinking? *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-026-09984-5>
- [35] Zielińska, A., Lebuda, I., Czerwonka, M., & Karwowski, M. (2025). Self-regulation prompts improve creative performance. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 59, e674. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.674>

Dan Shen, PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at the School of Language, Civilization and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia. She is an English teacher at the School of Foreign Languages, Guangzhou Institute of Science and Technology, China. Her research interests include EFL writing, language creativity, and foreign language pedagogy.

Rafizah Mohd Rawian, Associate Professor, School of Language, Civilization and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia. Her research interests include language education, ESL reading and writing, discourse studies and applied linguistics.