A spring of fresh water is a nuisance when it first comes out of ground, producing only mud and mire. It cannot be stopped by cement or earth fill; its flow will continue to seep around the edges. But when the spring is given a protecting and delimiting margin, a channel is provided for its stream and it becomes a source of joy. The same is true of creativity. The spring of creativity exists in all children, but in most the flow has been blocked. The young child creates and destroys almost in the same breath. He may feel guilty over what he has created, for it may not be understood, accepted or valued by others. For various reasons, he may decide to cement in the spring rather than cultivate it. However, the development of mankind depends upon the contributions made by creative persons from time to time. No doubt, machines can do work with much greater efficiency than human beings can, but technological culture demands more of unique ideas and novel ways of solving problems and all this requires creative minds. In Torrance's (1962) view, "It takes little imagination to recognise that the future of our civilisation - our very survival - depends
upon the quality of the creative imagination of our next generation. Also, it has generally been realised today by all nations whether big or small, developed or developing, that their mere survival in the international tug of war may eventually depend upon how effectively they can conserve and utilize their most precious human resources, their gifted children.

Very forceful plea to foster creativity for natural growth, development and progress was made by Toynbee (1964) who, in his famous paper entitled 'Is America neglecting her creative minority?' observed, "To give fair chance to potential creativity is a matter of life and death for any society. This is all important because outstanding creative ability of a fairly small percentage of population is 'mankind's ultimate capital asset and the only one with which man has been endowed... If society fails to make most of this one human asset, or if worse still, it perversely sets itself to stifle it, man is throwing away his birth right by being the lord of creation and is undermining himself to be, instead the least effective species on the face of this planet". The same point has been emphasized by Rogers (1954), a prominent self theorist in his words "Unless individuals, groups and nations can
imagine, construct and creatively devise new way of relating to these complex changes, lights will go out.... Not only individual maladjustment and group tension but international annihilation, will be the price we pay for lack of creativity". According to Weisberg (1993), understanding creativity is a challenging task, not only because creative thinking occurs in diverse domains but also because a complex set of psychological and social forces contribute to it. A major difficulty is that, from a distance, the creative processes leading to the accomplishments of inventors, scientists, and artists seem very mysterious. In fact, these processes often seem incomprehensible to the creators themselves.

Creativity is not an extra-ordinary gift but a basic ability of all human beings. Helveltings (1958) was perhaps the first to recognise it as a quality and not a divine gift. Contrary to the long held idea that it is a divine gift, it is now accepted that creativity exists in every sphere of human activity. Weisberg (1993) concludes from his work that definition of creativity is at once too broad and too narrow. It is too broad because it includes as creative any novel product, so long as it is of value, without considering how that product came about: not all valuable noble products are creative. It is too narrow because it
excludes works that are novel but of little value or even, if such are possible, works with no value whatever, a novel work without value can be creative.

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), working with a number of different tests involving both convergent and divergent types of thinking, found that performance on the IQ tests had relatively little relation to performance on creativity tasks. Thurstone (1952) wrote, "To be extremely intelligent is not the same thing as to be gifted in creative work".

positive correlation between intelligence and creativity. However, the high degree of relationship as investigated by many has been attributed by Madaus (1967a,b) and Dacey, Madaus and Allen (1969) to the interaction between factors related to both the measures rather than to a true high correlation between the two variables. Mehdi (1977) concluded that the exact amount of relationship between intelligence and creativity depends upon the type of tests used and the nature of sample studied. Also, there are researchers who have found low positive correlation (Guilford, 1950; Getzels and Jackson, 1962; Altenhaus, 1964; Clark, Veldmen and Thorpe, 1965; Allen, Dacey and Madaus, 1969; Goyal, 1973), or no correlation (Khire, 1971; Lalithama, 1973; Rawat and Agarwal, 1977; Seetharam and Vedanayagam, 1979; Sansanwal and Jarial, 1979; Schmitz, 1981) or even negative correlation (Flescher, 1963; Mehdi, 1977) between the two variables.

There is a classic study by Getzels and Jackson (1962) which claimed to show that up to an IQ of 120, creativity and IQ went together, but after that they diverged. Lait (1971) also supported the results obtained from Getzels and Jackson's study. Hudson (1966) found correlations between his convergent and divergent tests similar to Getzel and Jackson's and he also found two
contrasting groups in a parallel way but basing his distinctions on bias of scores (i.e. relatively high divergent than convergent scores and vice-versa) rather than on absolute levels. Carlier (1970), Khire (1971), Halpin, Halpin and Tillman (1973), Crawford (1974), Brandt (1975), and Jarial (1979) also reported the emergence of the variables of creativity as independent from intelligence.

In Edward de Bono's (1993) view, "The skills of creative thinking are part of the skills of thinking but have to be learned directly in their own right. An intelligent person who has not learned the skills of creative thinking might well be less creative than a less intelligent person because some of the thinking skills imparted by education may run counter to creative behaviour. If the intelligent person learned the skills of creative thinking, then I would expect that person to be a good creative thinker. So very much depends upon habits, training and expectations. I do not think that being highly intelligent need prevent a person from being creative— if he or she has made an effort to learn the method of creativity. Above a certain basic level of intelligence, I do not believe that a person has to be exceptionally intelligent in order to be creative".

In view of the rationale presented in the preceding
paragraphs, it seems worthwhile to compare intellectually
gifted children (with IQ above 120, the point where
intelligence and creativity are generally said to diverge)
with intellectually average children in the field of
creativity with respect to selected socio-psychological
variables and it is towards this end that the present study
was undertaken.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem may be stated precisely as 'A COMPARATIVE
STUDY OF CREATIVE TALENT AMONG INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED AND
AVERAGE CHILDREN IN RELATION TO SELECTED SOCIO PSYCHOLOGICAL
VARIABLES'.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted with the following objectives
in view:

1. To compare creative talent among the
   intellectually gifted and average children.

2(a) To find out sex difference on creative talent
   among the intellectually gifted and average
   children.

   (b) To find out whether intellectually gifted
       boys differ significantly in their creative
       talent from intellectually average boys.

   (c) To find out whether intellectually gifted
       girls differ significantly in their creative
       talent from intellectually average girls.
3. To compare creative talent among the intellectually gifted and average children belonging to first, second and third birth order.

4. To study and compare the relationship between creativity and socio-economic status among the intellectually gifted and average children for the total sample and also for different socio economic status groups.

5. To study and compare the relationship between creativity and various measures of adjustment among the intellectually gifted and average children.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Creative talent among the intellectually gifted and average children was compared in relation to selected socio psychological variables only.

2. The study was restricted to ninth and tenth class students of government and privately managed recognised secondary schools of certain district headquarters and the students of rural and semi-urban schools were not included in the study.