CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

After discussing the results in Chapter-V, now we are in a position to present the summary of the investigations and conclusions derived from the major findings.

6.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of research specifically reads as:

"A study of relationship between certain child rearing variables which have been broadly classified as antecedent conditions to parental behaviour and behaviour proper and creativity in children."

6.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aims to determine how are the various child rearing factors related to the highly complex phenomenon of creativity. Considering the creativity groups and parental sex the following four groups of population were involved into the study.
1. Fathers of high creative children.
2. Fathers of low creative children.
3. Mothers of high creative children.
4. Mothers of low creative children.

Keeping this division in mind the following five objectives of the study may be mentioned more specifically in the form of research questions:

1. Do the parents of high creatives and low creatives perceive their children differently in respect of their various characteristics and developmental pattern?

2. Whether parents of the two creativity groups differ in respect of their degree of agreement regarding perception of child's ability, characteristics and behaviour?

3. Do the parents of two creativity groups differ in their own characteristics?

4. Is there any difference between high creative children and low creative children in respect of their certain characteristics?
5. Do the parents of high creative children differ from the parents of low creative children in respect of their treatment towards children?

6.3 SAMPLE AND TOOLS

A two-tier sampling procedure was adopted for the investigation. Firstly, the sample consisted of 100 high creative and 100 low creative male children of age 10+ to 11+ years reading in Class V selected from 500 children from 13 schools of Burdwan and Suri, the two district towns of West Bengal. 200 fathers and 200 mothers, 100 each from the low and high creativity groups comprised of the final sample for studies into the child rearing variables.

For the purpose of sampling two types of instruments were used. An adopted and modified version of Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking was used to measure creativity of the subjects and intelligence was measured by Chakraborti Group test of Verbal Intelligence (1976). On the other hand a newly developed interview schedule was used for the parents of 200 selected children seeking structured and categorized information about child rearing.
The variables included in the schedule were as follows:

1. **PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS**

   (a) Parental age  
   (b) Parental sex  
   (c) Parental education  
   (d) Parental occupation  
   (e) Period of Marital life  
   (f) Parental pattern of interest

2. **CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY STRUCTURE**

   (a) Ordinal position  
   (b) Number of children  
   (c) Interest pattern of children  
   (d) Intelligence  
   (e) Early physical and motor development

3. **PARENTS' PERCEPTION**

   (a) Parental perception of language development of children  
   (b) Parental perception of intellectual development of children  
   (c) Parental perception of emotional development of children which included frequency and intensity of anger, fear, excitement in joy and anxiety  
   (d) Parental perception of child's choice of dress and food
(e) Parental perception of sibling relationship

(f) Parental perception of child's discipline in daily activities

(g) Parental perception of child's behaviour under common stress

(h) Parental perception of child's sense of responsibility

(i) Parental perception of child's reactions to punishment

(j) Parents' perception of home environment, social environment, economic environment and educational environment.

4. PARENTS' BEHAVIOUR WITH THE CHILD

(a) Interference with the child's activities

(b) Type of punishments given by the parents to the child

(c) Severity of punishment given by the parents

(d) Purpose of punishment

(e) Parental reward

(f) Occasions of rewarding

5. VARIABLES REGARDING PARENTAL ATTITUDE
   AND CONCEPT

(a) Parents' attitude towards parental role and responsibility

(b) Parents' concept of their role and responsibility

(c) Parents' concept of goal of child rearing.
6.4 **SCORING**

The responses from parents obtained through the interview schedule were dichotomised into categories and in some cases were given scores.

6.5 **ANALYSIS**

Analysis of variance was the primary mode of analysis for the present study. Two-way ANOVA for the rating categories was used and as a consequence all the analysis were conducted in a 2 x 2 paradigm. In some cases, however, the differences between the parental sex and creativity groups was studied by chi-square test as the scores obtained were in the frequency form. Also, in some other instances, the differences were studied by t test.

6.6 **CONCLUSIONS**

1. It was found that the difference of age between fathers of two creativity groups was not significant, while the difference in mother's age of the two creativity groups was significant at .05 level indicating that mothers of the high creativity group are older than those of the less creativity group. Also the age difference between
father and mother was significantly higher in the low creative group than that in the high creative group.

2. There was a difference between high and low creativity groups in relation to the period of marriage of the parents and this signified that within the low creativity group the number of later born children were relatively higher than those in the high creativity group.

3. Children of high creativity group did not belong to a specific ordinal position which was different from the ordinal position occupied by the low creative children. But a tendency that the first born children were relatively higher in the high creativity group than the low creativity group was observed.

4. There was no difference between two creativity groups in relation to mother's occupation, while father's occupation differed significantly at .01 level indicating that children from business family contributed to the low creativity group to a relatively greater proportion than the high creativity group.

5. The parents and children of the high creativity group had better standard of education than the low creativity group. Both the parents of low creativity group had relatively lower level of education, but fathers had
relatively higher level than the mothers. On the other hand, both the parents of high creativity group had relatively higher level of education and mothers' education played a very important role in the development of creativity of their children.

6. There was no difference between two creativity groups in relation to the number of male and female children separately. But in connection with the total number of children, it was found that parents of low creativity group had the tendency of having greater number of children in comparison to high creativity group.

7. It was found that more families in the high creativity group had equal number of male and female children, while most of the families in the low creativity group had either higher proportion of male children than female children or higher proportion of female children than male children.

8. Most of the parents of both the groups spent their leisure time in stereotyped activities, though the number of parents who spent their leisure time in potentially creative activities were relatively greater in high creative group. Again, it was found clearly that most of the children of the high creativity group had
creative hobbies, whereas children of the low creativity group had stereotyped hobbies.

9. The difference between the two creativity groups in respect of the early physical and motor development was not found to be significant.

10. Results showed that children of high creativity group were advanced in the development of language, while the children of low creativity group were relatively less advanced. Again it was obtained from the results that mothers of the low creativity group tended to underevaluate the language development of their children.

11. In spite of the fact that none of the children belonged to the below average level of intelligence, parents of low creativity group evaluated their children as slow or retarded in intellectual development. Particularly, mothers of low creative children evaluated their children as retarded in intellectual development. The difference between fathers and mothers in evaluating the intellectual development irrespective of creativity group was also found.

12. There was no difference between two creativity groups in respect of parental perception of the frequency of anger. But in relation to the intensity of a
mothers evaluated their children as more aggressive than fathers did.

13. It was found that parents of the low creativity group perceived their children to be more frequent and severe in expressing fear, while parents of high creativity group perceived their children normal in expressing fear. Again, mothers irrespective of creativity group perceived their children to be more fearful in terms of intensity.

14. The parents of low creativity group perceived their children as more frequent in expressing joyous excitement. But so far perception of intensity is concerned, parents of two creativity groups did not differ within themselves or between themselves.

15. The parents of the two creativity groups did not differ within themselves or between themselves in respect of their perception of the frequency of child's anxiety. But in case of intensity of anxiety mothers perceived their children to be more anxious than fathers did.

16. Further analysis on parents' perception of the children's choice of food and dress revealed that there was no difference between high and low creativity groups.
in this regard. But it was found that particularly mothers of the high creativity group perceived their children as most fastidious in the choice of food and dress.

17. Analysis on parents' perception of sibling relationship revealed that parents of high creativity group perceived their children as more accommodative in sibling relations.

18. Results indicated that parents of high creativity group perceived their children to be more disciplined in their activities and habits.

19. None of the F values due to creativity group, parental sex and parental sex creativity interaction was significant in respect of parental perception of child's behaviour under common stress.

20. Parents of high creativity group perceived their children to be more responsible than the parents of low creative group.

21. Degree of interference by the fathers was greater than the mothers. Particularly fathers of the low creativity group were most interfering.
22. The results regarding the use of physical punishment by parents indicated that there was a difference between two creativity groups and between fathers and mothers irrespective of the creativity groups. It was found that parents of low creativity group used more physical punishment and mothers, irrespective of any group, used more physical punishment than fathers.

23. There was a difference between high creativity group and low creativity group in the use of verbal punishment. Parents of high creative group used more verbal punishment than low creative group. Again, fathers, irrespective of creativity group used less verbal punishment than mothers and it signified that fathers were least punishing.

24. It was found that parents of low creativity group were more severe in punishment. Fathers of high creativity group were found to be more lenient as punishers.

25. Parents in the low creative group perceived their children to be hostile in reactions against punishment. Particularly mothers of the low creative group perceived their children to be most hostile to punishment.
26. There was a difference between two creativity groups and between fathers and mothers in respect of purpose of giving punishment. Fathers punished their children relatively to a greater extent for behavioural control, while mothers punished their children for both behavioural control and cognitive control. It was also found by comparing two creativity groups that fathers of low creativity group punished their children for both the purposes, while fathers in the high creativity group for behavioural control only.

27. The number of rewarding parents in the high creative group were very high, while the number of same in the low creative group were very small.

28. It was found that the number of parents who gave rewards on educational achievement were greater in the high creative group than those of low creative group.

29. It was evident from the results obtained that mothers possessed more positive attitude in their role and responsibility than fathers.

30. It was appeared from the results that in the low creativity group fathers thought of their own dominance in parental responsibility, while mothers believed in
mutual understanding. On the other hand both fathers and mothers in the high creativity group thought of mutual understanding.

31. It was found that fathers in general conceived the goal of child rearing more in the idealistic direction while the mothers in the pragmatic direction.

32. It was evident from the results obtained that parents in the low creative group perceived home environment as most unfavourable whereas parents in the high creative group perceived the home environment as more favourable.

33. Parents in the high creative group perceived their social environment mostly favourable, while parents in the low creative group perceived the same as unfavourable. Fathers of low creative group perceived the social environment as most unfavourable. It was also found that fathers perceived the social environment as unfavourable than those of mothers irrespective of creativity group.

34. There was a difference between two creativity groups in respect of parental perception of economic environment in general. Parents in the high creative group perceived the environment as favourable while the economic environment was perceived by the parents of low creative group as unfavourable. Particularly fathers of low crea-
tive group perceived the economic environment as most unfavourable.

35. Educational environment was perceived by the parents of low creatives as unfavourable. On the other hand, the same environment was perceived by the parents of high creatives as favourable. Again, mothers irrespective of creativity group, perceived the educational environment most favourably than fathers.

6.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Possibly there can be no such study which is completely perfect or free from any defect. In spite of our best effort, there might have remained some limitations of the study due to various reasons. Particularly for an individual researcher, it is not possible to overcome all the limitations. The possible limitations of the study as the present researcher is aware of, have been identified and explained below one by one.

1. In some cases (though very few) retrospective reports about children have been taken from parents. These reports were chiefly collected because, the major stem of the study being parental perception and attitudes etc. in many cases it was necessary to ask questions about the past of the children so that there might be any attempt
to give very casual responses on the part of the parents. But it is found that retrospective reports are not reliable. Radeke-Yarrow (Jersild, Telford and Sawrey, 1975) reported an well-conducted study of parents' retrospective accounts over an extensive periods of time. He observed that retrospective accounts given by the parents, on the whole, quite dependable. Ingraham and Videbeck (Jersild, Telford and Sawrey, 1975) also found in an interesting study that parents could not recall 56.5 percent of the incidents they happened in their family. He also observed that 22 percent of the behaviours the parents recalled as having occurred actually had not occurred.

However, the matter is very much dubitable. Because many investigators, on the other hand, had taken retrospective reports from parents for granted in their study. Any way, the present study is not being affected much by the drawbacks of retrospective reports, if any. Because the study is basically stands on parental perception of their child's behaviour and development, parental attitude and concept, parental perception of environment etc. which did not need retrospective reports.

2. Variables used for our investigation may appear to many somewhat scattered or unorganised. Because in our study we dealt with many intervening variables instead of terminal factors. It may be argued that use of terminal
variables could have served our purpose more systematically and also easily. Because, in that case it would have been possible for us to concentrate on different intervening variables within some definite terminal variables. But before going to attach different intervening variables to some particular terminal variable, we have to find out the nature of covariation between intervening variables and terminal variables. But the task of taking different intervening variables under some terminal or background variables systematically is not easy. Because there are innumerable number of parental behaviours which are very difficult to classify scientifically. It is also difficult to prepare the exhaustive list of parental child rearing behaviours. Some researchers like Milton (1958) tried to classifying parental child rearing behaviour under some broad factors. But this cannot be accepted as quite satisfactory due to the arguments mentioned earlier. So we thought to be wise to select intervening variables for our study.

3. Thirdly, intercorrelations among intervening variables were not considered for our study. This may appear to be another limitation of our study, though we have already explained the reasons of not taking correlational design for our study in the section 3.3.3 of Chapter-III. For correlational study scores should be obtained from measures of continuous variabl
out of the same population. Secondly, for correlational study normal distribution of the scores are essential, at least too much deviation in this regard is not desirable. But in our study most of the independent variables have been treated as ordinal variables. Because if we were to demand measurement of these variables at least in an interval scale, the parents would have to respond against each specific behaviour of the child which were many in number. But it is already argued earlier that such specific behaviour events have not yet been classified appropriately so as to claim confidently that certain behaviour \( X \) has a specific reference to certain other trait \( Y \). So under present circumstance; continuous measurement of parental perception regarding their child's development will be unwarranted. Again, for continuous measurement of each specific area of child rearing behaviour plenty of tests are essential. But these test for measuring parental child rearing behaviour are not available. Thirdly, for adopting correlational design it is normally essential to get scores from measures of continuous variable arising out of the same population. But for our present investigation we have got children in one hand, and parents on the other hand. So considering all these things, inter-correlation among intervening variables was not considered for our study.
4. It may be recalled that an interview schedule in the form of a questionnaire was used for collecting structured and categorized parental information and rating in detail. So the questions may be raised about the reliability of interviewing method.

In response, it may be argued first that over the long period interviews with parents and questionnaires filled out by parents have been the most popular modes of collecting information about parent-child interactions. It was found that interviewing method proved itself as efficient and useful approach for collecting information from parents (Lambert, Hamers and Smith, 1979). Campbell (1979) comments that the usefulness of interview and questionnaire procedure is beyond question.

Secondly, the reliability and validity of the schedule had to be duly considered. Because though the questionnaire used for seeking parental information was predominantly an interview schedule but a major part of it has been used like psychological scales as it is commonly found in the rating scales. Part of the questionnaire which was meant for purely objective information e.g. parental age, number of children, parental occupation etc. was naturally eliminated for the reliability and validity studied. The consistency of the questionnaire was judged
by applying it to a small group of parents at an interval of three months and retest reliability was determined separately for the items, group of items and also for the whole questionnaire.

Thirdly, the questionnaire was so prepared that parents could not respond casually. For this purpose, supporting questions were given to refrain parents from giving casual response. Parents were asked when thought necessary to recall any particular event or to give reasons behind certain responses, so it is expected that the responses were reliable and valid.

6.8 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The limitations of the study mentioned in the previous section and the obvious limitation of an individual researcher have paved the ways of new openings for further research. This is quite natural for any research endeavour. The suggestions for further study are given below.

1. Very casual attempts have been taken by some investigators to identify the dimensions of child rearing variables. But for the present study or for some other similar studies concerning the effect of parental child
rearing behaviour on children, it is important to know the consistent dimensions of child rearing behaviour patterns. So an extensive study for identifying the dimensions of parental child rearing variables may be undertaken.

2. Secondly, studies may be undertaken to determine the relationship between any terminal variable like attitudes, concepts etc. and specific parental behaviour.

3. A study to identify the terminal or background variables of parental behaviour may be undertaken to meet the necessity demanded by the similar other studies and also the relationship between such terminal variable and developmental pattern.

4. Studies may be undertaken to develop measuring tools for the different dimensions of child rearing variables.

5. Lastly, a theoretical model has to be evolved for better conceptualisation and integration of all the child rearing variables and allied concepts like the concept of parenthood, attitude etc.
6.9 ORIGINALITY OF THE STUDY

The present study may claim the credit for the originalities given below.

1. A large number of variables have been taken for the present study which was not found in other studies.

2. Sample size was also quite large for such an independent study. Total five hundred children were tested both for their intelligence and creativity. Out of these five hundred children two hundred were selected as high and low creatives. Finally, two hundred mothers and two hundred fathers were interviewed for collecting information regarding their child rearing. Applying an interview schedule to 400 men and women appears to be an enormous task particularly when the interview schedule covered a large number of parental activities, perception and feelings.

3. The present study dealt with intervening variables instead of terminal variables in connection with the creativity and child rearing. Again, the present study investigated the relationship of the parental perception of emotional development, intellectual development, language development and parental concept with creativity which was not studied by other investigators.
4. Parental perception of child's behaviour, instead of parental child rearing behaviour proper, was given much attention in our study and this was almost a new approach in relation to creative development.

5. Concept of parental role and responsibility, concept of the goal of child rearing are the two variables which have shown potentiality of unveiling new dimensions of child-rearing, were never used as a variable by any researcher, at least in so far as the research reports available to me are concerned.