CHAPTER VI
The present study is an exploratory attempt to investigate the relationship of curiosity to intelligence, creativity, extraversion and neuroticism in elementary school children of 7 to 10-years of age.

An attempt has been made to find out sex differences in curiosity in children of 7, 8, 9 and 10-years. Further attempt has been made to find out whether there are differences in curiosity between the high and low socio-economic status groups of 10-year old boys and girls only.

Tools

For assessing curiosity, an adaptation of Maw and Maw's (1961) 'The You Test' of Curiosity was used. The 'You Test' was standardized for the present study on a preliminary sample of 400 boys and girls, of standards 3, 4 and 5, and belonging to the ages 7, 8, 9 and 10-years.

To measure intelligence, Goodenough's (1926) 'Draw-a-Man' test as adapted by Phatak (1966) was used.
For assessing creativity, a short scale of the Wallach and Kogan (1965) battery of creativity instruments as adapted by Paramesh (1971) for Indian conditions was employed.

For the measurement of extraversion and neuroticism aspects of personality, The Junior Eysenck Personality Inventory (s.B.G. Eysenck 1965a) as adapted by Sarojini (1971) for Indian conditions was used.

Sample

The sample for the main study consisted of 500 boys and girls drawn at random from four schools in the city of Madras. Of this sample, 400 pupils, 200 of each sex, belonged to the age groups 7 to 10-years and who were studying in standards 3, 4 and 5 in schools generally catering to the high socio-economic status groups. There were 50 boys and 50 girls in each age group of the high socio-economic sample. The rest, i.e. 100 pupils, 50 of each sex, belonged to the age group 10 only and were studying in standard 5 in a school usually serving the low socio-economic stratum.

The data obtained from the tests used was treated statistically.
Statistical Techniques Used

Product moment coefficient of correlation and multiple correlation were the statistical tools employed for determining the relationship of curiosity to intelligence, creativity, extraversion and neuroticism. This was done separately for each age group and within each age group for the sexes separately.

'Critical Ratio' was employed to find out sex and socio-economic status differences in curiosity.

Summary of Results

The following are the summary of results of the study.

(i) In the different age groups, the relationship between curiosity and intelligence is found to be significant, only in one age group namely, 10-year old girls. In all the other age groups, the relationship is found to be significant only in some subtests of curiosity. Hence, it is inferred that overall, there is no significant relationship between curiosity and intelligence.
(ii) The relationship between curiosity and creativity, indicates that it is significant in some age groups and not significant in other age groups. No developmental trend is observed in the relationship.

(iii) Between curiosity and extraversion, the relationship is not significant except in some age groups and in some subtests of curiosity. Overall, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between curiosity and extraversion.

(iv) The relationship between curiosity and neuroticism is not significant.

(v) The multiple correlations between curiosity and intelligence, creativity, extraversion and neuroticism for the different age groups indicate overall significant relationships. It is inferred that curiosity is a combined effect of the variables of intelligence, creativity, extraversion and neuroticism.

(vi) Sex differences are found in curiosity in the different age groups studied, with boys generally scoring higher in curiosity than girls. However, the younger age groups as compared to the older age groups show a higher level of curiosity.
(vii) It is observed that there are significant differences in curiosity between the high and the low socio-economic status boys and girls in only the 10-year age group. However, it must be stated that the differences in curiosity between the high and low socio-economic status groups of girls are more, in terms of subtests of curiosity; whereas the differences in curiosity between the high and low socio-economic status group of boys in terms of subtests of curiosity are relatively less.

Conclusion

The results of the present study have revealed curiosity to be a multifactor phenomenon. Curiosity appears to be a complex construct, involving cognitive, and personality factors. Sex and socio-economic factors are also found to be related to curiosity.
LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Human research, or for that matter, research in any field always abounds with problems of one type or another. This is especially true of research in the area of child development. The concept of curiosity, is one which needs further delineation. Research in this area is only of recent origin and empirical studies are woefully inadequate and more so in the Indian context, where there is a more or less total absence of investigations in the curiosity of children, or adults. Hence, the Investigator was faced with the problem of paucity of empirical studies in the area of curiosity in Indian children. This placed limitations on the tools to be used for the measurement of curiosity. In this respect the Investigator had to modify and adapt the curiosity tests by Maw and Maw, in order to render them suitable for administration under Indian conditions.

It may be pointed out that only three tests of curiosity are used in this investigation and the conclusions therefore are limited to these three tests alone. No generalizations on the relationship between curiosity and intelligence, creativity, extraversion
and neuroticism are contemplated in this study. At best they could be treated as only indicative of such relationships.

A further limitation of the study is that it compared the children from the high and low socio-economic status groups, only at one age level. It would have been more interesting and informative if the comparison had been made at all the four age levels, i.e. 7 to 10-years. Time-constraint was one of the factors which made the Investigator limit this comparison to only one group, viz. 10-years.

The results in terms of age are rather divergent. Though all precautions were taken, there is no tenable explanation for this. However, it may be added that this has been the trend of results in different developmental studies in the Indian context (e.g. Shanmugam 1956; Rajalakshmi 1956; and Sarojini 1971). Hence the study needs to be replicated on different samples.

Goodenough's Draw-a-Man Test though found to be a good and reliable test of intelligence as far as Indian children are concerned, is not equivalent to the Coloured Progressive Matrices or the Primary Mental
Abilities Test as a test of general ability. Therefore, a future study should consider using different intelligence tests.

POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present study has indicated several trends which should be further studied.

1. Maw and Maw's 'You Test' of Curiosity should be factor analyzed and the factors identified with reference to Indian children.

2. It is found that curiosity is a multifactor phenomenon involving cognitive, conative and affective factors. It is necessary to clarify this concept by factor analysis of the data, adding more motivational and personality variables.

3. A study to find out the influence of a rural background on the curiosity behaviour in children could be made.