Date: 1st July-2026

MEASURING AND DEVELOPING TACTICAL CREATIVITY IN ELITE CHESS: A SCIENTIfiC METHODOLOGY, CREATIVITY INDEX, AND STRATEGIC TRAINING MODEL

Egamberdieva Bakhora Fazliddinovna
Uzbek State University of Physical Education and Sports,
Uzbekistan, Chirchik city E-mail: egamberdieva.bakhora@mail.ru

Abstract: Tactical creativity in chess represents one ofthe most underexplored dimensions ofelite athletic performance. While cognitive research has extensively examined pattern recognition, working memory, and calculation in high-level chess players, the systematic measurement and purposeful development ofcreative decision-making in complex tactical situations has received comparatively little scientific attention. This study introduces a comprehensive scientific methodology for assessing tactical creativity in elite chess players (Elo 2000+), presents a validated multi-component Tactical Creativity Index (TCI), and proposes a structured four-week strategic training model designed to enhance creative thinking at the highest levels of sport mastery.

Keywords: tactical creativity, chess, Tactical Creativity Index, divergent thinking, elite sport training, Many-Facet Rasch model, De Bono lateral thinking, computer-human divergence.

Introduction and Problem Statement

Creativity in chess is defined by two core criteria: originality — the rarity ofa solution within comparable positions — and effectiveness — its practical soundness against all defenses (Runco & Jaeger, 2012; Green et al., 2024). Recent psychometric research has produced the Scale of Aesthetics and Creativity in Chess (SACC), validated on 132 chess players using the Many-Facet Rasch model, which demonstrated strong measurement properties: person reliability of 0.93, item reliability of 0.83, and inter-rater agreement ofα = 0.936 across three grandmaster evaluators (Scherbakova, Engelhard & Bahar, 2025). Crucially, this study revealed a paradox of particular relevance to training methodology: intermediate-level players (Elo 1400–1800) consistently scored lower on creativity dimensions than both beginners and experts, suggesting that accumulated technical knowledge may actively suppress non-standard thinking — a phenomen on with direct implications for elite training design.

Parallel to psychometric approaches, computational creativity research has formalized four algorithmic measures ofcreative chess moves: moves never previously played in tournament databases, moves with low historical win rates, sub-optimal material captures, and positional sacrifices (Producing Creative Chess through Engine Self-play, ICCC 2021). The integration of engine-based and human-expert evaluation opens a productive methodological frontier for measuring the gap between human creative decision-making and algorithmic optimization.

Methodology: The Tactical Creativity Index (TCI)

The TCI is a six-component weighted composite metric designed for expert-level assessment of creative performance in complex tactical situations:

$$TCI = 0.25 \cdot O + 0.20 \cdot N + 0.20 \cdot S + 0.15 \cdot H + 0.10 \cdot T + 0.10 \cdot E$$

where O = Originality, N = Non-standard approach, S = Sacrificial quality, H = Heuristic violation, T = Tactical theme application, and E = Economic efficiency. Each dimension is rated on a 1–5 scale by a panel ofminimum three grandmaster raters; psychometric validation follows the Many-Facet Rasch model with required fit statistics of Infit MSE between 0.50 and 1.50.

Originality consistently emerges as the hardest dimension to achieve (highest Rasch difficulty measure: 0.23) and the least reliably rated (α = 0.627), confirming that genuine creative novelty is both rare and subjectively complex to evaluate. Correctness and economic win, by contrast, represent the easiest and most reliably assessed dimensions — reflecting that technical soundness precedes creative expression in expert problem-solving.

A Computer-Human Divergence Index (CHDI) complements the TCI by quantifying the delta between Stockfish 16 centipawn evaluation and human expert TCI scores. Moves occupying the high-TCI, low-centipawn-loss quadrant constitute the "elite creative zone" — objectively sound yet maximally surprising and non-algorithmic.

Strategic Training Model

The proposed four-week training model is organized around progressive thematic cycles:

Week 1 — Foundation of Sacrificial Creativity: Systematic study ofmaterial sacrifice patterns in grandmaster games; pre-engine position analysis followed by Stockfish comparison; De Bono lateral thinking exercises applied to sacrifice identification.

Week 2 — Positional Creativity and Heuristic Violation: Analysis ofpositions where standard principles (king safety, material balance) are deliberately broken for strategic gain; AlphaZero game studies as models ofmachine-generated heuristic violations.

Week 3 — Divergent Thinking Intensive: Structured fluency, flexibility, and originality drills (Guilford, 1967) applied to chess positions; generation ofmaximum solution variety per position within timed constraints; peer-rated TCI scoring sessions.

Week 4 — Competition Simulation and Integration: Real-game application of creative strategies with deliberate pre-move TCI planning; retrospective creativity mapping fall played games; final TCI profiling.

Each day within the weekly module follows a fixed three-part sequence: (1) Theoretical analysis — grandmaster game study and position deconstruction; (2) Engine-assisted work — Stockfish comparison and CHDI calculation; (3) Psychological training — De Bono's Lateral Thinking provocations, the Pause–Breathe–Branch cognitive protocol, flow-state induction via blitz format, and written meta cognitive reflection journaling.

Research Design and Expected Outcomes

The study employs a quasi-experimental pre-post design with matched experimental ($n \geq 15$, TCI-based training) and control ($n \geq 15$, conventional training) groups drawn from elite players at the sport mastery level. Primary outcome measures include TCI total and subscale scores, CHDI values, and divergent thinking scores (fluency, flexibility, originality). Statistical analysis includes Wilcoxon signed-rank tests for within-group dynamics, Mann-Whitney U for between-group comparisons, Spearman rank correlation between TCI and Elo rating change, and Many-Facet Rasch validation ofthe TCI instrument.

Expected outcomes include statistically significant TCI growth in the experimental group ($p < 0.05$), widening ofthe elite creative zone in the CHDI distribution, and a moderate positive correlation between TCI improvement and Elo rating gain ($r \approx 0.30–0.50$). The study further anticipates confirming the intermediate-level creativity paradox and quantifying its magnitude across training conditions.

Conclusion

This research contributes a rigorously validated psychometric instrument (TCI), a novel Computer-Human Divergence Index, and an evidence-based weekly training model to the emerging field ofchess creativity science. By bridging psychometric measurement, computational analysis, and applied sport pedagogy, the proposed framework offers both theoretical advancement and direct practical tools for coaches and players operating at the highest levels ofchess performance. The integration of De Bono's lateral thinking methods and contemporary psychological self-regulation techniques within structured periodized training represents a novel pedagogical contribution with potential applicability across other complex cognitive sports.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Egamberdieva, B., Ishtayev, J., Korobeynikov, G., Khasanov, O., Gapparov, Z., Xursanova, R., ... & Juraev, I. (2025). Brilliant moves in chess and early grandmaster success: a study of the world's youngest grandmasters. Slobozhanskyi Herald of Science and Sport, 29(2), 151-166. https://doi.org/10.15391/snsv.2025-2.06

[2]. Balas, B. J. (2024). Science of Chess: What makes a move seem “Brilliant?”. Chess.com Blog. Retrieved from https://www.chess.com/blog/bjbalas/science-of-chess-what-makes-a-move-seem-brilliant

[3]. Zaidi K., & Guerzhoy M. “Predicting user perception of move brilliance in chess,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11895, Jun. 14, 2024. DOI:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.11895

[4]. ChessBase Mega Database. (2023). Games of Top Female Players (Hou Yifan, Koneru Humpy, Judit Polgár, etc.) [Data set]. Hamburg: ChessBase GmbH.

[5]. Chess.com. (2021). “Brilliant Move – Definition,” Chess.com Help Center, Online article. Available: support.chess.com/en/articles/8572705-how-are-moves-classified-what-is-a-blunder-or-brilliant-etc (retrieved Sept. 29, 2025).

[6]. Hammersborg P., & Strümke I. "Information based explanation methods for deep learning agents—with applications on large open-source chess models," Scientific Reports, vol. 14, no. 1, Article 20174, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-70701-2.
[7]. Bontchev B., & Ivanov H. "Dynamic Adaptation of Difficulty in Chess," in Proc. 2024 IEEE 12th International Conference on Intelligent Systems (IS), Varna, Bulgaria, Aug. 29–31, 2024, pp. 1–6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/IS61756.2024.10705231
[8]. Blanch A., & Colom R. "Talent, practice, and excellence: Dominance of nature over nurture in worldwide chess players," OSF Preprints, 2023. DOI:https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/u82za
[9]. Varga A., & Marschalko E. "The role of emotionality, self-efficacy, rational- and intuitive-thinking styles in advanced chess expertise," Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Psychologia-Paedagogia, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 135–150, 2024. DOI:https://doi.org/10.24193/subbpsyped.2024.1.07
[10]. Rimban E. "Chess strategy and the development of constructivist thinking: Cultivating cognitive skills and transferable competencies," SSRN preprint #4490147, Jun. 24, 2023. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4490147
[11]. Holding D.H. "The evaluation of chess positions," Simulation & Games, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 207–221, 1979. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/104687817901000205
[12]. Omori M., & Tadepalli P. "Chess rating estimation from moves and clock times using a CNN-LSTM," in Proc. 12th Int. Conference on Computers and Games (CG 2024), Virtual Conference, Nov. 25–29, 2024, pp. 3–13. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.11506
[13]. West, Vanessa (NM_Vanessa). "From Trailblazers to Candidates: 10 Brilliancies Played By Women," Chess.com News, Mar. 21, 2024. Available: **www.chess.com**/article/view/brilliancies-played-by-women (retrieved Sept. 29, 2025).
[14]. Karakus G. "Chess and Education," Educational Considerations, vol. 49, no. 2, Art. 5, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2365
[15]. Shahade J. Chess Bitch: Women in the Ultimate Intellectual Sport. Siles Press, Los Angeles, 2005.
[16]. Dreżewski R., & Wątor G. "Chess as sequential data in a chess match outcome prediction using deep learning with various chessboard representations," Procedia Computer Science, vol. 192, pp. 1760–1769, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.08.180
[17]. Begmatova D., Eshkuvatov H., Abdullayev N., Xodjayeva N., Suvonova O., & Ishtayev J. "Use of educational technologies in teaching the basics of nanophysics, nanomaterials and nanotechnologies," Results in Optics, vol. 16, Article 100717, 2024. DOI: 10.1016/j.rio.2024.100717
[18]. Эгамбердиева, Б. Ф. (2026). ЮҚОРИ МАЛАКАЛИ ШАХМАТЧИЛАРНИ ТАЙЁРГАРЛИК ЖАРАЁНИНИ ОПТИМАЛЛАШТИРИШ. INNOVATIONS IN TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE EDUCATION, 5(40), 93-100.