

Małgorzata Franc, Olga Banit

ORCID: 0000-0002-0923-4538, 0000-0001-9002-6439

CULTIVATING WILLPOWER TO PRESERVE THE POTENTIAL OF GIFTED

KSZTAŁCENIE WOLI
BY NIE UTRACIĆ POTENCJAŁU ZDOLNYCH

РОЗВИТОК ВОЛІ ДЛЯ ЗБЕРЕЖЕННЯ
ПОТЕНЦІАЛУ ОБДАРОВАНИХ

1. Introduction

The will is a special philosophical category that, over the centuries, has acquired various dimensions and differing interpretations. When European thought and culture entered the modern era, a fundamental shift occurred: the center of gravity shifted toward the subjective sphere. Cartesian dualism divided reality into two substantial dimensions, between which the connection was severed. The main thread of thought became the philosophizing subject, rather than the objective structure. In his concept, Karl Martin Dietz attempts to reconnect both threads while preserving the autonomy of the subject within the framework of commonly accepted external norms. The act of will of the subject, constituted by freedom and responsibility, enables autonomous thinking and action within the established social order – an order of which the subject is both a part and which it discovers within itself.

The concept of ability-based pedagogy draws on these philosophical premises, advocating for the harmonious development of the learner to shape their

individual talents while also recognizing their responsibilities to the collective. Will is also a psychological category. Typically defined as a capacity or trait of human personality, it enables the formation of various habits, competencies, and skills. From this perspective, will appears to be a key internal mechanism by which individuals consciously and purposefully cultivate their own abilities. By focusing on gifted individuals, ability-based pedagogy supports the qualitative development of dispositions, competencies, and talents.

An open question remains: does ability-based pedagogy sufficiently strive to cultivate the will of the gifted? Does the focus on developing the gifted individual's special dispositions overshadow the need to shape their will? The frequently uttered phrase 'gifted but lazy' seems to confirm the necessity of strengthening volitional acts. Engaging in intellectual effort, bearing emotional costs, and persistently pursuing goals – in other words, cultivating the will – is supported by creative activity. The proposal to develop the will of gifted individuals through creative tasks is the central theme of this statement.

2. The Act of Will

Modern philosophy has repeatedly addressed the issue of individual autonomy and the legitimacy of recognizing objective norms binding for the collective. Questions such as: to what extent does the individual remain free? To what degree does the subjective define the horizon of their thinking and action, and to what extent are they determined by generally accepted universal norms? – These form the foundation of philosophical and ethical discourse, particularly complex and often controversial. The consequences of philosophical currents that advocate for individual autonomy and ethical individualism – assuming the primacy of the individual over the collective – have included relativism, amoralism, and nihilism. Extreme subjectivism has led to the breakdown of interpersonal communication in the name of the individual's supreme interest. "Postmodernist deconstruction deprives social existence of meaning, reducing it to a semantic game. Ultimately, the world becomes a conventional play, in which it is futile to seek meaning not only in the intersubjective, social dimension, but also in the individual one. The subject, closed within itself and its own rules of the game, also loses significance, becoming merely a whim or a fiction. The result of such an attitude is the decay of thought and action, the atrophy of will, narcissism leading to boredom, and ultimately the desire for annihilation." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 114).

However, a human being is also a social creature, existing within a social environment that must be taken into consideration. This environment shapes the

individual in a specific way, making the person a derivative of that context. How, then, should the human will be understood in this context? The fundamental issue concerning the will in human thought and action comes down to the question of its freedom and, at the same time, the subject's ability to consciously grasp its acts.

Karl Martin Dietz (2001) presents a comparison of two attitudes regarding the individual's relationship to the surrounding structure, based on their ability to act in an undetermined manner. According to the author, both models of attitude are processual in nature. The first (developed by the German author Kai H. Matthiessen, who specializes in management and organization in production processes) clearly represents a process of adapting to the surrounding structure, which attempts to fulfill the individual's self-realization needs. The second – an alternative model proposed by Dietz himself – maintains the foundations of ethical individualism and combines them with the aspiration to transcend one's own limitations in order to serve others.

The four-stage first model begins with the human ability to systematically adapt to given conditions. "The individual feels part of a defined whole within which they are able to realize themselves. These conditions allow the individual to consciously identify with the structure. Through this, they gain the ability to act actively within it." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 116).

The second stage in this model is identified by the author as the individual's ability to learn within the existing structure through an attitude of adaptation. "By adopting this kind of attitude, the individual gains the ability to participate in the process of consciously obtaining benefits resulting from being part of the structure. It is not an obstacle to this process; on the contrary, it opens the possibility of using the adaptive attitude as a gateway to new opportunities, to acquiring qualitatively new abilities to act within the given structure." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 116).

The third stage of integrating the individual into the surrounding structure involves gaining the ability to learn and establish one's position by adapting to changing social relations. "Thanks to the adaptation process, the individual becomes proficient in navigating complex social systems. This is achieved through learning and establishing their position, which creates a qualitatively new situation in which the individual can freely use the acquired skills. They thus become simply a part of the structure." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 116).

The fourth stage is a natural consequence of previously undertaken adaptive actions. The individual identifies with a given structure, gaining a sense of identity. Dietz has no doubt that the process of adapting to a structure fundamentally infringes upon the individual's freedom. The four-stage adaptation process is

a process of increasing loss of freedom – nothing less than internal enslavement. In this case, there is no possibility of free choice based on autonomous thinking and action. It is replaced by a voluntary process of gradual dependence on the structure – and it remains undeniable that the individual's consent to submit to the environment occurs voluntarily, as there is no external pressure. "There is therefore no room for autonomous action of the subject. It is the result of internal consent to accept the rules of the game, which arise directly from the principle of the structure's functioning. Ultimately, the structure proves to be dominant. The free act of will is, in this case, replaced by adaptation." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 117).

To this model, Dietz opposes an alternative one, which implicitly assumes individual autonomy. According to the author, the first step toward achieving this goal is the process by which the individual confronts the objective sphere. "The world is for me an object that appears to me as a subject in the process of opposing the subjective and the objective. This principle, rooted in an old philosophical tradition, leads me as an individual (...) to the possibility of resolving this contradiction – but in a way that allows me, as a subject, to remain autonomous, and not by submitting to the objective structure (...). (...) Overcoming the subjective and the objective must take place under conditions of freedom, not under the belief in the necessity of adaptation." (Gołembski, 2002, p. 117).

The next step in Dietz's concept is the pursuit of learning. It is based on the free act of the individual, who, in confrontation with the world (the object), faces the task of defining their own position. "The division into objective and subjective spheres precisely enables this kind of self-reflection, which becomes the beginning of the learning process. (...) It is my independence that enables me to confront the problem of what is transcendent, and this state provides me with the opportunity to seek within myself the foundations for self-development. The impulse to learn I find not in the world, but within myself. In this case, it is treated as a volitional act that originates in me." (ibid., p. 117) As Dietz emphasizes, this is "the second act of freedom – an activity that depends entirely on me." (Dietz, 2001, p. 28).

The third stage of achieving autonomy, in Dietz's view, is the highest level of self-awareness of one's own freedom. Such an experience enables a transformation in the individual's relationship with others – others appear to the individual as free beings. This experience directly leads to a new perception of communal elements – the community appears to the individual as a structure based on freedom.

On this foundation, a sense of responsibility is born, the ultimate source of which is the individual themselves. As Dietz states: "When I clarify my relationship to other people, then it is no longer indifferent to me what happens to others and what occurs in the world." (Dietz, 2001, p. 29) This sense of responsibility

“demands” the individual to take a stance toward the situation at hand, and subsequently inspires action. “Ultimately, it depends on me what happens in the world.” Dietz, 2001, p. 29) In the experience of responsibility toward the whole (social being), initiative begins to develop.

Against this backdrop, the element of will appears as one of the dimensions of human activity. It cannot be understood without considering the functions of thought and emotion. It is precisely thanks to these two spheres that the act of will becomes increasingly distinct, acquires a conscious character, and ceases to be merely a manifestation of blind impulse – an irrational force driving a person toward actions that may be incomprehensible, threatening, or even destructive, leading to self-annihilation. Elevating acts of will to the level of consciousness removes the stigma of irrationality, replacing it with intentionality. Of course, it must be acknowledged that the field of human consciousness remains incomplete – there is a constant possibility of expanding this field by gradually illuminating those areas of the human being that remain hidden. This task also includes illuminating the sphere of will. Through such clarification, the act of will gains an intentional dimension, thus becoming a domain of conscious and purposeful action. (Gołembski, 2002, p. 119).

On this foundation, a specific pedagogical postulate emerges – the ability to consciously direct one’s own destiny, taking into account the human condition in its autonomous dimension. Ability-based pedagogy focuses its attention on the gifted. “By emphasizing the need for harmonious realization of the creative potential of the human person, we express concern for shaping the individual in such a way that it becomes a premise for a happy and dignified life, seamlessly integrated into the existence of others and into the continuity of a world generous in truth, beauty, and other goods.” (Góral ski, 1996a, p. 7).

The tasks of ability-based pedagogy include: forming cognitive, action-oriented, constructive, preservative, aspirational, and creative motives; shaping a diversity of competencies appropriate for realizing those motives and solving tasks belonging to both the sphere of vitality and the sphere of spirituality; caring for the “engineering of emotions,” understood by Góral ski not as the transmission of knowledge and skills, but as the formation of a “whole person – and along this path, striving to recognize the experience of moral obligation as the principal factor crystallizing the entirety of the subject’s activity.” (Góral ski, 1996b, p. 134). These aims create conditions for using will as a tool for achieving a higher level of development – one that enables the gradual mitigation of the effects of self-isolation, separation from others, and existence within the sphere of egoism and xenophobia.

Ability-based pedagogy recognizes the gifted individual as a person and acts “to strengthen their subjectivity” (Góralski, 1996b, p. 137). It takes on the challenge of fostering the belief “in the need to seek and define the appropriate degree of autonomy and self-direction of the educational subject” (Góralski, 1996b, p. 137). In this process, the will plays a crucial role, serving the self-realization of the gifted individual and the construction of their personal life story. Ability-based pedagogy affirms the gifted individual “in their experience and sense of moral obligation” (Góralski, 1996b, p. 137). Thus, it makes the will a means of overcoming an instrumental approach to others, who cease to be merely a source or backdrop for satisfying selfish needs, and instead become part of shaping a world of values. Ability-based pedagogy strengthens the gifted individual “in the need to build resilience to obstacles and lack of support,” and develops “the ability to overcome difficulties and achieve set goals” (Góralski, 1996b, p. 137). In this way, the conscious act of will gives rhythm and direction to the persistent effort of creating oneself and the world.

3. The Capacity of Will

According to the PWN Philosophy Lexicon (2000), will is defined as a human-specific capacity for consciously and purposefully directing one’s behavior, and for making decisions regarding the execution or avoidance of specific actions or behaviors. The key terms in this definition of will are: capacity, conscious (direction of one’s behavior), and purposeful. Most psychologists understand capacity as “an individual trait of a person’s personality, which cannot be reduced to acquired habits, but through which various types of habits, skills, and abilities can be developed” (Hornowski, 1978, p. 48). Capacities are also described as “individual differences that cause people, given the same motivation and prior preparation, to achieve different results in learning and action under comparable external conditions” (Pietrasiniński, 1976, p. 736). Capacities may also be understood as “a potential existing in a specific person, allowing for constructive interactions among various aspects of experiencing the world” – D. H. Feldman (Limont, 1994, p. 9). The issue of capacity can be considered from several perspectives. “One relates to distinguishing types of capacities (e.g., general abilities, specific aptitudes, creative abilities). Two main research approaches can be noted here: treating capacity as a potential through which a person acquires new skills and competencies via learning, and as a skill in itself.” (Limont, 1994, pp. 10–11).

Another classification distinguishes between elementary, natural capacities, which develop “on the basis of innate predispositions through the process

of education, skill acquisition, and habit formation,” and complex capacities – “specifically human, actual capacities that form during ontogenesis as a result of socio-historical influences.” (Limont, 1994, p. 11).

Significant to the issue under consideration are studies conducted in the 1970s on distinguishing between potential abilities (identified through psychological assessments) and actualized abilities (manifested in concrete actions). These studies concluded that individual abilities develop through the integration of three elements of the psyche: cognition, emotion, and motivation. On this basis, intellectual and special abilities (including creative ones) are formed. Similar conclusions were reached by researchers of mathematical abilities (Klix, Van der Meer, 1986, as cited in Popek, 2000) – abilities are, on the one hand, a subfunction of cognitive activity, and on the other, a subfunction of motivational activity.

Further research led to the development of interactional theories of abilities, such as the triad of intellectual abilities, creative talents, and motivation integrated through personality and the individual’s life environment (Renzulli, 1977; Mönks, 1987, in Popek, 2000), or the triad of intellectual, special, and creative abilities integrated first by motivation and subsequently by the ecological environment. The cognitive significance of these studies proved substantial – they led to theoretical “innovations” in the form of interactional theories of abilities, which consider the co-occurrence and interplay of several spheres of human personality in shaping abilities, without privileging any one of them. These theories moved away from hierarchical models in which intelligence was the dominant factor.

Data on ability allow us to define it as a specific trait – a certain human potential – through which it becomes possible to shape various types of habits, skills, competencies, and relationships between the individual and the world across different dimensions and levels. In light of this, will appears as an individual ability that activates a person toward constructive achievements. Will, understood as stemming from the concept of ability as potential, is the quality that reveals itself through learning and motivates a person to acquire new skills and competencies. Will, identified with ability as a skill, is simply a skill that mobilizes the individual to gain experiences and engage with the world. Will, derived from the distinction between natural and complex abilities, is a human disposition that, in the first case, emerges in the process of education and the acquisition of various skills and habits, and in the second, develops during ontogenesis. In each of these cases, it is the disposition that ensures “constructive interactions between various aspects of experiencing the world.” Will, as an individual ability, develops through the integration of three elements of the psyche: cognition, emotion, and motivation.

Defining will as the ability to direct one's own behavior highlights two essential features of this capacity: consciousness and purposefulness. Consciousness is a state of awareness – the sum of experiences present in that state. Plotinus viewed consciousness as an inherent aspect of the soul's nature, distinct from knowledge. Epictetus spoke of an inner faculty of the mind through which a person comes to know themselves and all other things. John Locke defined consciousness as the perception of what is happening in one's own mind (sensations, thoughts, emotions, images). Later, consciousness came to be understood not only as direct knowledge of these phenomena but also as the phenomena themselves. Consciousness became synonymous with the psyche. A significant impulse for reflection on consciousness came with the emergence of psychoanalysis (...), which emphasized the presence of unconscious motives and desires – stemming from drives (Freud) – in conscious experiences and actions, as well as forms of collective unconscious, or archetypes (Jung). (Philosophy, 2000, p. 323) For Edmund Husserl, consciousness was a way in which various types of objects present themselves. Marxism, on the other hand, viewed the essence of consciousness as the ability to symbolically reflect experience – a capacity that emerged with the development of speech, resulting from the evolution of social forms of human activity.

Consciousness is thus the ability to understand objective facts and reality, as well as the skill of generalizing what is perceived and experienced. Consciousness represents the highest level of psychological development, a trait unique to humans among living beings. It is always shaped by life conditions and evolves over the course of historical development. To be conscious means to be aware of something. To consciously direct one's behavior means to demonstrate the ability to perceive, experience, define, and understand all the real factors of a given situation.

Consciousness is linked to purposefulness, which is defined through the lens of consciousness. Purposefulness is a fundamental feature of human actions, characterized by a conscious striving toward a goal. A goal may be understood as the cause by which or for which a being has a defined essence, acts, and moves (metaphysics), or as the endpoint of human striving and behavior directed either toward oneself or another person (ethics). The concepts of purposefulness and teleology were examined by Immanuel Kant in *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Teleological explanation, which starts from the whole, contrasts with mechanistic explanation, which begins with the constituent parts. Aristotle based one of his principles, defining being as the principle of purposefulness, on this conviction.

Goal and purposefulness are not exclusive to humans. From the perspective of teleology, all or at least some phenomena possess purposefulness. These

phenomena, modeled on human behavior, are determined by goals – that is, by future states of affairs. Teleonomy sees purposefulness even in the functioning of every organ and tissue of a living organism. A goal is identified with an action that serves the individual, either supporting their existence or reproduction. Purposefulness is also a historiosophical category, expressing the belief that history has a goal, that the development of society moves toward a higher, more perfect state (historical teleology).

Thus, purposefulness can be understood as a feature of the course of phenomena and events in reality, whereby they develop toward a defined goal. The goal is conditioned by a future state of affairs. Human behavior can be described as purposeful because it is directed toward achieving a predetermined outcome. For a defined goal, the appropriateness of the means chosen is essential (praxeology). In the context of the definition of will, “being purposeful” means adopting a certain course of action in a deliberate and conscious way; “purposeful direction of one’s behavior” means demonstrating the ability to intentionally define future states of affairs and undertake appropriate means to realize one’s intentions.

4. Educating the Will

Human activity – action – consists either in making changes to the environment (or to oneself), or in refraining from interfering with the course of events and allowing them to unfold without our involvement. “Consciously refraining from a certain action is also a form of action.” (Grzegorzczuk, 1995, p. 116) Such action, understood in this way, always contributes to producing a specific effect. The effect may be imagined and intended – in which case it is defined as the goal of the action – or not; it does not necessarily have to have a clearly defined outcome. “The agent may sometimes be aware only of a particular mode of behavior without a distinct image of the result.” (Grzegorzczuk, 1995, p. 116) In other words, the goal is not concretized.

Brickman (1987), a pioneer in research on this type of activity, provides a typical example from the artistic environment: “One thing especially intrigued me. Although almost none of the artists studied had a reputation or made a living from painting, they were completely devoted to their work; they engaged with it day and night, and it seemed that nothing else mattered as much in their lives. Yet, as soon as they finished a painting or sculpture, they lost all interest in their creations. They weren’t particularly concerned with their colleagues’ paintings or masterpieces in the field either. (...) What truly fascinated them were conversations about minor technical details, specialized innovations – the actions, thoughts, and

emotions entangled in artistic activity. Gradually, it became clear that something inherent in the act of painting itself drove them to exert effort. The process of designing the artwork became so enjoyable that they were willing to sacrifice much just to continue it.” Similar patterns can be seen in the behavior of a watch collector or an economic reformer – individuals who devote themselves entirely to their work. (Kozielecki, 1997, pp. 32–33). One might assume that such action is less effective than action with a clearly imagined outcome. Yet the history of art, science, and culture contradicts this. A prime example is the Impressionists, who, in undertaking innovative painting experiments, initially had no clear vision of their artistic direction.

Conscious human activity is therefore oriented either toward maintaining a certain state of affairs or toward bringing about something new. A special case of bringing something into existence is the realization of valuable states of affairs. (Grzegorzcyk, 1995, p. 116) This is possible because the world, as a bearer of various values, possesses an axiological dimension. (Strózewski, 1983, p. 184) Human beings act and strive – that is, behave in a directed manner – to realize states of affairs that are valuable to them.

Human action unfolds within a framework of cognition, decision-making preceded by evaluation, and execution (Grzegorzcyk, 1995, pp. 119–121), and is motivated by the direct experience of values (Grzegorzcyk, 1995, p. 127). Each phase of action is entangled with the experience of values, though the values that motivate action may vary. However, when cognition, decision, evaluation, and execution are all guided by the same value experiences, the action becomes formulaic (*ibid.*, p. 130). Such behavior is a repetition of what has already occurred – based on simple imitation, analogy, or the automatic application of a general rule to a specific case.

Creative action is distinctly non-formulaic. More precisely, it is best described not as a continuous process but as a moment. Thus, one should speak of moments of creativity rather than creative action. This is because the creative moment is equivalent to a person making a decision to act beyond the established framework – a moment that is difficult to capture. “One might even consider it impossible, and only approximately determine that such a moment occurred. The moment of creativity is, in fact, a moment of freedom. It is the moment in which the metaphysical freedom of the human individual is realized.” (Grzegorzcyk, 1995, p. 131). In Grzegorzcyk’s thought, creativity is a conscious action aimed at bringing about change. It is an action that unfolds within the realm of values and in the presence of a full, direct experience of value. It is a fleeting moment of breaking away from the pattern in favor of freedom.

Józef Koźielecki (1997) similarly sees creativity as a departure from the pattern. Creativity is transgression – the crossing of existing material, social, and symbolic boundaries by the individual. Transgression involves expanding the sphere of one's activity, breaking taboos, and going beyond what a person is and what they possess. For Koźielecki, the human being is an active agent whose most distinctive trait – the anthropic constant – is the capacity to think and act transgressively. Living in a multidimensional environment where culture plays the central role, the human being, through transgressive activity, enriches this multidimensionality: they develop culture and civilization. Human behavior, as Grzegorzczuk also emphasized, is purposeful, intentional, and telic. “A goal is an anticipated state of affairs that carries potential values and meanings.” (Koźielecki, 1997, p. 27).

Humans think and act intentionally, thereby creating new values that satisfy their desires. However, not all human actions are goal-oriented – that is, directed toward achieving a specific state of affairs, as Grzegorzczuk would say. “Beyond these, people engage in activities known as committed, open, or paratelic actions (from the Greek words ‘telos’ – end, goal, and ‘para’ – beside).” (Koźielecki, 1997, p. 31) This type of activity is, in a sense, self-directed or autotelic – it is a source of satisfaction and pleasure, as well as deep engagement. “In committed tasks, the actions themselves – the processes of doing – such as searching (e.g., for truth), constructing (e.g., tools), composing (e.g., a symphony), caring (e.g., for AIDS patients), reforming (e.g., education) – become sources of satisfaction and pleasure.” Both everyday observations and the still-limited scientific research show that people often become deeply involved in specific types of activity, such as artistic creativity, environmental protection, leadership and governance, caregiving, faith and religion, adventurous living, or economic reform.

This engagement can be both constructive and destructive to the legacy of previous generations. In our time, examples abound: fundamentalism, terrorism, drug abuse, or the pursuit of a “bright future” by communist regimes have often led – and continue to lead – to unspeakable suffering for entire societies. (Koźielecki, 1997, p. 31). During such activity, a person may formulate goals – or rather, paragoals. “It is worth emphasizing that activity is the source of goals, not goals the source of activity. These goals do not hold a privileged status. Moreover, intentions in committed actions are often unstable, unformed, vague, and diffuse.” (Koźielecki, 1997, p. 32) In these tasks, the activity itself dominates – the agent is immersed in it. “This activity is more spontaneous, less controlled by external conditions; the individual more frequently changes its direction and quite freely selects goals – paragoals. Obstacles in action are not sources of frustration but

rather challenges to the agent's ambition. Committed actions become a kind of adventure, in which sacrifice, renunciation, commitment, and strength of spirit play a major role – a journey in which the person often strives to transcend their own limitations and flaws.”

What results do committed, or paratelic, actions yield? Do their outcomes differ from those of goal-directed behaviors? These important questions can only be answered hypothetically. According to Lewicka (1993), a person pursues goals to obtain values that play a key role in maintaining the status quo, thereby preserving homeostasis. A deficit of basic goods, such as food, clothing, shelter, or safety, triggers a motivation to replenish them. Thus, goal-directed actions increase the individual's chances of survival and adaptation to the ecological and cultural world. Meanwhile, committed actions play a fundamental role in transforming reality and giving rise to new forms and states of affairs. It is through such actions that humans make scientific discoveries, create original scholarly works, or reform outdated economic structures (Kozielecki, 1997, p. 34). In summary, Kozielecki's understanding of creativity can be described as conscious, goal-directed or paratelic transgressive action – an act of crossing material, symbolic, and social boundaries, which expands the sphere of human possibilities. Through these actions, humans transform reality, make discoveries, and build unique public institutions. The transgressive act is an act of creation – of inventing new worlds.

The concepts of creativity presented above allow for a more nuanced examination of creativity itself and reveal shared themes in the understanding of both creativity and will. Grzegorzczuk and Kozielecki demonstrate that creativity is a uniquely human activity. The same applies to will, defined as a capacity exclusive to humans. The authors of these theories argue that creativity is a directed activity (toward boundary-crossing), meaning it is goal-oriented (or paragoal-oriented); similarly, will is defined as the purposeful direction of one's behavior. Moreover, Grzegorzczuk emphasizes that creativity, realized through action aimed at change, is a conscious activity. Kozielecki, in describing committed actions as more spontaneous than goal-directed ones and less controlled by external conditions, does not exclude consciousness from the creative process. Will, meanwhile, is explicitly described as a capacity entangled with consciousness – the ability to consciously direct one's behavior.

The only, though significant, difference in the conceptualization of creativity and will lies in how they are categorized: creativity is referred to as activity, while will is considered a capacity. However, this distinction is not an obstacle, since capacity can be shaped and developed through action – and through creative

action, the capacity of will can be cultivated and strengthened. Based on the data presented, one can infer that it is possible to extract the “potentiality” of will from the set of individual human traits and develop it through the cultivation of “conscious actions directed toward change” – through creativity. The educational approach that most fully supports this aim appears to be ability-based pedagogy. Its primary focus is the gifted individual. The fundamental responsibility of this pedagogical approach is to foster the harmonious and holistic development of the individual, to effectively shape individuals who are complete and rich in qualities. Creativity becomes the core strategy for implementing the goals of ability-based pedagogy.

5. Conclusion

Creativity, by its very nature, aims to achieve new and valuable outcomes (Góral-ski, 2003, p. 48). Creative tasks – such as deliberately selected sets of exercises or creativity training programs (Góral-ski, 2003, pp. 127–132) – actualize creativity and demonstrate that these values are attainable. The conscious and purposeful engagement in solving creative tasks shapes the will of gifted individuals. Creativity is a fundamental means of lasting self-expression and effective self-realization (Góral-ski, 2003, p. 48). In this process, it will occupy a special place. One’s own “self,” as the source of volitional acts – which are intentional and closely tied to the awareness of one’s existence – is directed toward the need for self-realization. Will, carried by the freedom of action and the responsibility of choice, unleashes the individual’s potential to shape themselves.

Creativity is “a fundamental means of overcoming error – both individual and collective” (ibid., p.49). In conditions where the intention of a volitional act is consciously formed, the individual ceases to be dependent solely on blind impulse. They gain the power to direct their behavior, the strength to perceive, experience, define, and understand all real factors of a situation. A conscious act of will enables one to grasp both freedom and necessity (Strózewski, 1983), embracing the randomness and possibilities of challenges, while taking responsibility for the freedom (and rigor) and spontaneity (and control) inherent in their choices. Creativity “is always an attempt to shape the future” (Góral-ski, 2003, p. 49). The act of will is oriented toward the future. “Wanting” expresses what is yet to come, what does not yet exist – what lies on the horizon of consciousness. Will, shaped by creativity, “crystallizes the trace of the future” (ibid., p. 49).

Ability-based pedagogy, focused on forming “a full and richly endowed individuality” (Góral-ski, 1996a, p. 7), through the cultivation of creative potential

and the use of creative strategies (such as solving creative tasks), provides the foundation for shaping will:

- will as a dimension of self-realization – free, autonomous, yet connected to service to others and fully human existence in and for the world;
- will as the capacity for conscious and purposeful direction of one's responsible behavior.

According to Andrzej Góral ski, we cannot afford to lose the potential of the gifted. He writes: “We are losing (...) the opportunity to compete with other nations in the fields of creativity, invention, and innovation – areas that are increasingly becoming decisive factors in the life and development of societies.” (Góral ski, 1996b, p. 133) Ability-based pedagogy, by creating programs tailored to individual talents, should intensify the cultivation of will in the gifted.

SUMMARY: This article presents a philosophical and pedagogical reflection on the dynamic relationship between creativity and will, emphasizing their shared traits of intentionality, consciousness, and transformative power. Drawing on the works of A. Grzegorzcyk, J. Koziellecki, and A. Góral ski, it argues that both creativity and will are uniquely human capacities that enable individuals to shape themselves and the world around them. Will is defined as the ability to consciously and purposefully direct one's behavior, rooted in the integration of cognition, emotion, and motivation. It is not merely a reaction to impulse but a reflective and intentional force that supports self-realization and autonomy. Creativity, similarly, is portrayed as transgressive action – a process of crossing boundaries and forming new realities. It is both goal-oriented, often driven by intrinsic engagement rather than external outcomes.

The article highlights that creative tasks, especially those designed within ability-based pedagogy, serve as a powerful medium for cultivating will. Through creative engagement, individuals develop the capacity for responsible decision-making, self-expression, and the pursuit of meaningful values. Creativity becomes a tool for overcoming error, fostering resilience, and shaping the future. Ultimately, the article advocates for ability-based pedagogy as a framework that nurtures gifted individuals by unlocking their creative potential and strengthening their will. It warns against the societal loss incurred by neglecting the development of the gifted, especially in fields crucial to innovation and progress.

KEYWORDS: philosophy, pedagogy, will, creativity, abilities, gifted personality

STRESZCZENIE: Niniejszy artykuł przedstawia filozoficzną i pedagogiczną refleksję nad dynamiczną relacją między kreatywnością a wolą, podkreślając ich wspólne cechy, takie jak intencjonalność, świadomość i moc transformacji. Opierając się na pracach Grzegorza Grzegorzcyka, Kozielleckiego i Góral skiego, autor dowodzi, że zarówno kreatywność, jak i wola są unikalnie ludzkimi

zdolnościami, które pozwalają jednostkom kształtować siebie i otaczający je świat. Wola jest definiowana jako zdolność do świadomego i celowego kierowania swoim zachowaniem, zakorzeniona w integracji poznania, emocji i motywacji. Nie jest jedynie reakcją na impuls, ale refleksyjną i intencjonalną siłą, która wspiera samorealizację i autonomię. Podobnie, kreatywność jest przedstawiana jako działanie transgresyjne – proces przekraczania granic i kształtowania nowej rzeczywistości. Jest ona zarówno zorientowana na cel, jak i parateliczna, często napędzana wewnętrznym zaangażowaniem, a nie zewnętrznymi rezultatami.

Artykuł podkreśla, że zadania kreatywne, zwłaszcza te zaprojektowane w ramach pedagogiki opartej na zdolnościach, stanowią potężne medium do rozwijania woli. Poprzez kreatywne zaangażowanie jednostki rozwijają zdolność do odpowiedzialnego podejmowania decyzji, samoekspresji i dążenia do wartości. Kreatywność staje się narzędziem pokonywania błędów, wzmacniania odporności i kształtowania przyszłości. Artykuł opowiada się za pedagogiką opartą na zdolnościach jako ramą wspierającą jednostki uzdolnione poprzez uwalnianie ich potencjału twórczego i wzmacnianie woli. Ostrzega przed stratami społecznymi wynikającymi z zaniedbywania rozwoju osób uzdolnionych, zwłaszcza w dziedzinach kluczowych dla innowacji i postępu.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: filozofia, pedagogika, wola, twórczość, zdolności, utalentowana osobowość

АНОТАЦІЯ: У статті представлено філософсько-педагогічне осмислення динамічного зв'язку між креативністю та волею, підкреслюючи їхні спільні риси інтенціональності, свідомості та трансформаційної сили. Спираючись на праці А. Гжегорчика, Я. Козелецького та А. Гуральського, вона стверджує, що як креативність, так і воля є унікальними людськими здібностями, які дозволяють людям формувати себе та навколишній світ. Воля визначається як здатність свідомо та цілеспрямовано спрямовувати свою поведінку, що корениться в інтеграції пізнання, емоцій та мотивації. Це не просто реакція на імпульс, а рефлексивна та навмисна сила, яка підтримує самorealізацію та автономію. Креативність, подібно, зображується як трансгресивна дія — процес подолання кордонів та формування нових реальностей. Вона є цілеспрямованою, часто керованою внутрішньою залученістю, а не зовнішніми результатами.

У статті підкреслюється, що творчі завдання, особливо ті, що розроблені в рамках педагогіки, заснованої на здібностях, служать потужним засобом для розвитку волі. Завдяки творчій залученості люди розвивають здатність до відповідального прийняття рішень, самовираження та прагнення до значущих цінностей. Креативність стає інструментом для подолання помилок, розвитку стійкості та формування майбутнього. Стаття пропагує педагогіку, засновану на здібностях, як основу, яка розвиває обдарованих особистостей, розкриваючи їхній творчий потенціал та зміцнюючи їхню волю. Вона застерігає від суспільних втрат, яких зазнає нехтування розвитком обдарованих, особливо в галузях, що мають вирішальне значення для інновацій та прогресу.

КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА: філософія, педагогіка, воля, креативність, здібності, талановита особистість

Referenses

- Dietz K.M. (2001), *Freiheit oder Anpassung? Zur Aktualitat des ethischen Individualismus*. Heidelberg, Menon.
- Gołembski F. (2002), *Element woli w procesie samorozwoju*. (w:) Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej: Filozofia woli. Nr 6 (26)/2002.
- Góralski A. (1996a), *O pedagogice zdolności*. (w:) Szkice do pedagogiki zdolności. (red.) A. Góralski. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Góralski A. (1996b), *Pedagogika zdolności – miejsca szczególnej troski*. (w:) Szkice do pedagogiki zdolności. (red.) A. Góralski. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Góralski A. (2003), *Teoria twórczości*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo APS.
- Grzegorzczak A. (1995), *Życie jako wyzwanie*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Hornowski B. (1978), *Rozwój inteligencji i zdolności specjalnych*. Warszawa, WSiP.
- Kozielecki J. (1997), *Transgresja i kultura*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie ŻAK.
- Limont W. (1994), *Synektyka a zdolności twórcze*. Toruń, Wydawnictwo UMK
- Pietrasiniński Z. (1976), *Zdolności*. (w:) Psychologia. (red.) T. Tomaszewski. Warszawa, s.735-762.
- Popek S. (2000), *Kwestionariusz Twórczego Zachowania KAHN*. Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Stróżewski Wł. (1983), *Dialektyka twórczości*. Kraków, Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.
- Filozofia*, Leksykon (2000), Warszawa, PWN.