Chapter-VIII

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The present study entitled, "A Comparative Study of Creative Talent among Intellectually Gifted and Average Children in Relation to Selected Socio Psychological Variables' was designed to compare the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average children, specially with respect to sex and birth order and to study and compare the relationship between creativity measures on one side and socio-economic status (total sample and high, average and low socio-economic groups) and various measures of adjustment (social, emotional and educational) on the other among intellectually gifted and average children.

The development of mankind depends upon the contributions made by creative persons from time to time. In Torrance's (1962) view "It takes little imagination to recognise that the future of our civilization - our very survival - depends upon the quality of the creative imagination of our next generation".

Creativity is not an extra-ordinary gift but a basic ability of all human beings. Helvettings (1958) was perhaps
the first to recognise it as a quality and not a divine gift. It is responsible for human survival and has helped man to control the environment. A great deal of research on creativity has been devoted to settle the controversy which basically would regard creativity measures as either independent or all inclusive of intelligence measures. The early as well as the recent empirical evidences have shown the distinctive independence of creativity from intelligence. Chassell (1916) found that performance on the IQ test, had relatively little relation to performance in creativity tests. Thurstone (1952) wrote, "To be extremely intelligent is not the same thing as to be gifted in creative work". Getzels and Jackson's (1962) study claimed to show that up to an IQ of 120, creativity and IQ went together, but afterwards they diverged. Lait (1971) also supported the results obtained from Getzels and Jackson's study. Studies by Carlier (1970), Khire (1971), Halpin, Halpin and Tillman (1973), Crawford (1974), Brandt (1975), Jarial (1979), Gupta (1980), Thrimurthy (1987) also reported the emergence of variables of creativity as independent from intelligence.

A large number of researchers have tried to explore the impact of socio psychological variables - sex, birth-order, socio-economic status and adjustment - upon the
creative talent of subjects, but their findings are contradictory and inconclusive. Moreover, they considered samples as a whole and did not compare the creative talent of subjects among intellectually gifted and average groups in relation to these socio-psychological variables. So there seemed sufficient scope of undertake the present investigation.

HYPOTHESES

(1) Significant difference does not exist in the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average children.

(2a) There is no significant difference in the creative talent among intellectually gifted boys and girls.

(2b) There is no significant difference in the creative talent among intellectually average boys and girls.

(2c) There is no significant difference in the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average boys.

(2d) There is no significant difference in the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average girls.

(3a) No significant difference exists in the creative talent among first born, second born and third born intellectually gifted children.

(3b) No significant difference exists in the creative talent among first born, second born and third born intellectually average children.

(3c) No significant difference exists in the creative talent among first born intellectually gifted and average children.
No significant difference exists in the creative talent among second born intellectually gifted and average children.

No significant difference exists in the creative talent among third born intellectually gifted and average children.

A significant positive relationship exists between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually gifted children.

A significant positive relationship exists between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually average children.

There is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually gifted and average children.

There is a significant positive relationship between creativity and social adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.

There is a significant positive relationship between creativity and emotional adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.

There is a significant positive relationship between creativity and educational adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.

There is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and social adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.

There is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and emotional adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.

There is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and educational adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children.
PROCEDURE

Intellectually gifted and average children were identified on the basis of IQ and marks in the previous examination.

Significance of differences between the means of creativity scores of total sample of intellectually gifted and average children and also among groups based upon sex and birth-order were found out. Bi-variate correlational approach was employed to study the relationship between creativity measures on one side and socio-economic status (total sample and high, average and low SES groups) and adjustment (social, emotional and educational) on the other among intellectually gifted and average children and, then, significance of difference between the correlations was found out.

SAMPLE

Sample comprising 542 ninth and tenth class students (312 intellectually average and 230 intellectually gifted) was drawn from high/senior secondary schools of six out of fourteen district headquarters of Punjab by employing multi-staged stratified randomization technique of sampling. Students with IQ above 120 and marks in the previous examination above 60 per cent were identified as
intellectually gifted and students with IQ between 90 and 110 and marks in the previous examination between 45 per cent and 55 per cent were identified as intellectually average.

TOOLS USED

The following tools were used to collect data:

(1) Personal data form to obtain information about sex and birth order of the subjects.
(2) Jalota and Singh's Group Test of General Mental Ability (1982).
(3) Torrance's Test of Creative Thinking, Verbal, Form A (1966).
(5) Sinha and Singh's Adjustment Inventory for School Students (1972).

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

The following statistical techniques were used for analyzing the data:

- Conversion of raw scores of all the twenty measures of verbal creativity, obtained from seven activities of the test, into T-scores was done with mean 50 and SD 10 for obtaining total scores on different dimensions of creativity.
(fluency, flexibility and originality) along with total creativity.

- Descriptive statistics i.e. mean, median, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis were used to examine the nature of distribution of scores.

- Pearson's coefficient of correlation technique was used to find out the relationship between creativity and socio-economic status and between creativity and various measures of adjustment of intellectually gifted and average children.

- Critical ratios were obtained to find out the significance of difference between the means and coefficient of correlations.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the analysis of results, as discussed in chapter VI to VIII, the following conclusions were drawn:

I. Comparison of Creative Talent among Intellectually Gifted and Average Children with Respect to Sex and Birth Order

(1) There is no significant difference between the means of various creativity measures (fluency, flexibility, originality and total creativity scores) among intellectually gifted and average children.
This conclusion leads to the acceptance of hypothesis 1 that "significant difference does not exist in the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average children".

(2) Significant difference exists in the means of various creativity measures, with the exception of flexibility, among intellectually gifted boys and girls and in the means of all the creativity measures among intellectually average boys and girls.

Thus, the hypothesis 2(a) that "there is no significant difference in the creative talent among the intellectually gifted boys and girls" stands accepted only with regard to the flexibility aspect, whereas hypothesis 2(b) that "there is no significant difference in the creative talent among the intellectually average boys and girls" cannot be accepted at all.

(3) Significant difference does not exist in the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average boys and also among intellectually gifted and average girls.

The hypotheses 2(c) that "there is no significant difference in the creative talent among the intellectually gifted and average boys" and 2(d) that "there is no significant difference in the creative talent among the
intellectually gifted and average girls" stands accepted (vide conclusion 3).

4. First born intellectually gifted children differ significantly in their creative talent from second born intellectually gifted children, whereas there is no significant difference among first and third born, and also among second and third born intellectually gifted children. As regards the intellectually average group, significant difference was not observed in the creative talent among first born, second born and third born subjects.

The hypothesis 3(a) that "no significant difference exists in the creative talent among first born, second born and third born intellectually gifted children" stands accepted, except the difference among first born and second born children, whereas hypothesis 3(b) that "no significant difference exists in the creative talent among first born, second born and third born intellectually average children" stands accepted.

5. First born, second born and third born intellectually gifted children do not differ significantly in their creative talent from first born, second born and third born intellectually average children respectively.

This conclusion leads to the confirmation of
hypothesis 3(c) that "no significant difference exists in
the creative talent among first born intellectually gifted
and average children", 3d that "no significant difference
exists in the creative talent among second born
intellectually gifted and average children" and 3(e) that
"no significant difference exists in the creative talent
among third born intellectually gifted and average
children".

II. Relationship between Creativity and Socio-Economic Status

1. For the intellectually gifted group, no significant
relationship was found between various creativity measures
and socio-economic status when the total sample and low
socio-economic status group were considered and also between
originality and total creativity on one side and socio-
economic status on the other for high SES group. However,
significant association was observed between all the
creativity measures and socio-economic status when average
SES group was considered and also between fluency and socio-
economic status and between flexibility and socio-economic
status for the high SES group.

2. For the intellectually average group, no significant
relationship was found between various creativity measures
and socio-economic group when the total sample and different
SES groups (high, average and low) were taken into consideration, except the relationships between originality and socio-economic status and between flexibility and socio-economic status for the high and low SES groups respectively, which were found to be significant.

3. No significant difference was found in the relationship between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually gifted and average children for the total sample. For the high and low SES groups, only the differences in relationship between flexibility and socio-economic status were significant and for average SES group, all the differences in relationship between various creativity measures (except originality) and socio-economic status turned out to be significant.

Thus, hypothesis 4(c) that "there is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually gifted and average children" stands accepted for the total sample, whereas it is confirmed for high SES and low SES groups except the difference in relationship between flexibility and socio-economic status and for average SES group only for the difference in relationship between originality and socio-economic status.

The hypothesis 4(a) that "a significant positive
relationship exists between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually gifted children" is not confirmed when the sample is taken as a whole, though a mixed picture emerges when the different socio-economic groups (high, average and low) are taken into consideration (vide conclusion Sr.No.1) and hypothesis 4(b) that "a significant positive relationship exists between creativity and socio-economic status of intellectually average children" is not accepted for the total sample and also for average SES group, though a mixed picture is observed when high and low socio-economic groups are considered.

III. Relationship between Creativity and Adjustment

1. Creativity of intellectually gifted children has no significant relationship with the various measures of adjustment, i.e. social, emotional and educational. Similarly, regarding the intellectually average group, no significant relationship was observed between creativity and social and emotional measures of adjustment, whereas a positive significant relationship was found between creativity and educational aspect of adjustment.

So hypothesis 5(a) that "there is a significant positive relationship between creativity and social adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average
children" and 5(b) that "there is a significant positive relationship between creativity and emotional adjustment of intellectually gifted and average children" do no stand accepted whereas hypothesis 5(c) that "there is a significant positive relationship between creativity and educational adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children" stands accepted only for the group of intellectually average children.

There is no significant difference in the relationship between creativity and adjustment (social, educational and emotional) of the intellectually gifted and average children.

The hypothesis 6(a) that "no significant difference exists in the relationship between creativity and social adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children", 6(b) that "no significant difference exists in the relationship between creativity and emotional adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children" and 6(c) that "no significant difference exists in the relationship between creativity and educational adjustment of the intellectually gifted and average children" stands accepted in view of the conclusion mentioned at S.No.2.
EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Barron (1969) points out that "our capacity for creativity thought and action may literally make all the difference in the world --- Human creativity may prove to be the key to success or failure in mankind's quest for knowledge, in his journey beyond the bounds of the sure and seen, in his exploration of the unknown". Until recently, the stress has been laid mainly on convergent thinking and divergent thinking or creative potential, the most precious human resource, has not been paid due attention. Most of the school teachers prefer high IQ pupil to high creative one, because the latter causes problems to the teacher as well as the administration as he is unpredictable. The creative child is made a victim of ridicule and, consequently, his abilities degenerate and he joins the ordinary group of students. Thus, the environment of our educational institutions is unfavourable to the recognition of creative talent among children.

The results of the present study make it abundantly clear that intellectually gifted and average children have the same creative potential and it should be considered a good news by the educational authorities because, being creative, even the intellectually average children can contribute towards the progress of the nation in the fields
of art, literature, science, technology, etc. So an appropriate environment should be created in the educational institutions for the nurture of creativity among the children.

In our male dominant society, girls are brought up with greater restraint and a stricter code of behaviour than the boys and are provided with fewer opportunities of exploration. But inspite of this fact, the study reveals that girls are superior to boys in their creative potentialities. So if they are given proper encouragement, they can outshine their male counterparts in various fields involving creative talent and, thus, become leading participants in the progress of the country. Of course, this requires a drastic change in the attitude of parents and teachers and they should realise that 'girl child' is more valuable than 'boy child'.

The study has implications for counsellors and guidance workers as no significant difference has been found in the creative talent of high and low socio-economic groups, meaning thereby that children belonging to the low SES group can be as creative as the high SES group children. So there is a dire need of proper inspiration and stimulation to the low SES group students so that they can
also contribute their share in the development in various fields.

Maximum benefit to the individual and society can occur only when potential creativity of all the members of the society is developed and utilized in constructive ways and, to begin with, appropriate environment conducive to creative thinking, must be created in the educational institutions.

The investigator submits that the applicability and generality of conclusions of the study be viewed within its limitations and constraints.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Scholastic achievement, academic subjects and affective variables like values and personality may be taken up to compare the creative talent among intellectually gifted and average children.

2. A similar study may be undertaken on rural population to determine the validity of findings of the present study across urban-rural areas.