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ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the Analysis and Interpretation of data of the present study. The present Investigation was intended to assess the level of creativity among High school children with reference to certain selected variables. Hence it would be befitting to start with an examination of the creativity scores obtained by IX standard students selected for the present study.

The obtained results are analysed and interpreted under Four Sections. The First Section deals with significance of difference between the creativity scores in relation to different groups selected for the study. The Second Section deals with the extent of relationship between creativity and some selected variables. In Section Three the characteristics of High and Low creative children, with reference to some selected variables are discussed. In Section Four the attitude of teachers towards creative children is discussed.

SECTION ONE – ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT GROUPS

6.1 CREATIVITY AND GENDER

Creativity has been studied in relation to Gender on various categories of subjects like architects, mathematicians (Helson 1968), Children (Batchstold 1973), Women (Hussain 1974), Pandit (1976), Thorat (1977) and Adolescents, Rawat and Saroj (1977).
Hence Gender is selected as a variable affecting creativity in the present study.

\textbf{H}_1: There is no significant difference between the creative abilities of Boys and Girls of IX standard High School Children in South Kanara District.

The sample group consisted of 1000 children of whom there were 489 Boys and 511 girls. The significance of difference between the creativity scores of Boys and Girls has been analysed by 't' test in table 6.1.

\textbf{Table 6.1}
The Mean and SD's of creativity scores of Boys and Girls and the result of 't' test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>'t' *</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>348.56</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>338.84</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 't' value should be 1.96 or more for 1000 df to be significant at 0.05 level and it should be 2.58 or more for 1000 df to be significant at 0.01 level.

The 't' value reveals that there is a significant difference between the creativity scores of Boys and Girls. From the table it is observed that obtained 't' value is 4.19 for a df of 998. The 't' value is significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that Boys have significantly Higher Mean creativity scores than the Girls. The Mean score and SD for boys are 348.56 and 37.82 respectively. The Mean and SD for girls group are 338.84 and 35.68 respectively. Slightly more SD in boys
group indicates that boys differ in creativity among themselves than girls. These results are graphically shown in Graph No. 1. The results of the present study show that Gender has some influence on the level of creativity of IX standard children.

These results may be attributed to more freedom of expression permitted to boys in Indian society and relatively more restriction to girls.

Studies on creativity carried on by other researchers bring out four separate findings, which are mentioned here, and a few of them are dealt with later.

1. Males are superior to females.
2. Females are superior to males.
3. Females happen to be superior to males on certain tests of creativity while males are superior to females on certain other tests of creativity and
4. There is no significant sex difference in creativity scores of males and females.

The findings of the present study are supported by the following studies. Jacqueline and Murray (1967) studied American and Indian children (both males and females) on creativity and found females scoring lower than males in both the societies. Comparatively, gender difference on creative measures was found to be less among American children, which differences they attributed to greater freedom and individuality permitted in United States of America.

Saroj and Rawat (1977), Sharma (1979) reported in their studies that males significantly out performed females in creativity. Raina
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(1968) working on teachers found male teachers to be better than female teachers on originality dimension. Passi (1975) reported superiority of boys over girls on Verbal creativity, while girls were found superior to boys on Non-Verbal creativity scores. Raina (1971), Naintara (1981), Dharmangadan (1981), Goutam. S (1992), Singh. R. (1992) also found out the supremacy of male over female students.

Though the results of the present investigation, concerning creativity and gender, have several supporting studies, there appears to be contradictory findings either regarding creativity in general or differential performances on different creativity tests. For instance Hussain (1974) compared males and females on their creativity scores. The study revealed a significantly higher score for girls as compared to boys. Hota A.K.(1991), Andal .M.and Santhana Krishnan (1999) studied the interactive effects of gender, locale and Socio-economic status of the students on creative thinking ability and revealed that there was significant difference between boys and girls.

Further, there are some investigations, which do not reveal the superiority of one sex over the other. Gupta (1975) reported that gender neither accelerates nor hinders creativity of adolescent students at any educational level. Similarly as reported by Thorat (1977), even among college students, no significant difference was found among males and females on any of the component of creativity.

Based on the above findings which derive support from similar findings of other researchers, the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between creativity and gender is rejected and it is
concluded that as far as the present study is concerned Boys are superior to Girls in the level of creativity.

Boys show greater creativity than girls, especially as childhood advances. In large part, this is due to the differential treatment boys and girls receive. Boys are given more opportunities to be independent, they are prodded by peers to take more risks, and they are encouraged by parents and teachers to show more initiative and originality (Arathesh (1968), Bhavani (1972), Cramer. P. and Hogan K.A.(1975)

6.2 CREATIVITY AND LOCALE

When we see the literature of education and psychology we often come across indications that the subjects coming from deprived environments tend to be low in intelligence and other cognitive abilities. Several research findings prove that performance of students with Socio-economic deprivation when properly taken note of and compensated with suitable invigorating environment would become better and show better results.

The area or locale in which an individual is placed makes an important initiative in the achievement of the learner. Children differ in their several behaviour at any stage of their development on account of a great influence, which is exercised on them by the culture and customs in which they are born or live. The same is the difference in tradition that is taken care of by the environment in the urban and rural areas.

With this background in mind the present investigator has considered locale of the subjects also as a variable influencing
creativity. Accordingly it was presumed that urban settings like cities would serve as a rich, invigorating and stimulating environment for flowering of creative potential of the subjects, whereas the rural environment would be to a certain extent a limiting factor acting as a deterrent for invigorating environment for the subjects from these locales.

Thus the subjects coming from urban and rural area were considered as two distinct groups in the present study.

**H₂:** There is no significant difference between the creative abilities of rural and urban IX standard High School Children in South Kanara District.

The study group consisted of 517 Urban students and 483 Rural students. The mean creativity scores were calculated separately for these groups and these results and the results of ‘t’ test is shown in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>357.86</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Significance at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>346.64</td>
<td>49.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 6.2 there is a significant difference between the two groups at 0.01 level as the obtained ‘t’ value being 4.06 for a df of 998. The mean creativity scores of urban
students is significantly higher than that of rural students (357.86 compared to 346.64). It indicates that there exists marked differences in creative potential of urban and rural students and that urban students are more creative than their rural counterparts. Thus it is concluded that the urban students of the present sample have performed better than the rural students.

Though the studies in the field are few, there are some studies, which support the result of the present investigation. Passi (1972), Goyal (1973), Jain (1977), Srivastav (1978) and Singh R (1992) reported that the urban students are more creative than their rural counterparts. On the other hand Sharma (1974) and Gupta (1988) reported that the rural students were more creative than urban students. But Aaran and Malatesha (1969), Sehgal (1978) explored that there exists no significant difference in creativity among urban and rural students. Yadav R.L. and Patel H.L (1999) in their study found out that the rural students did not differ significantly from the similar groups of urban students on the creative ability.

From the above findings the null hypothesis viz., “There is no significant difference between the Creative abilities of Rural and Urban IX standard High school children in South Kanara District” is rejected and it is concluded that the level of creativity is more in urban students than rural IX standard students in the present study.

6.3 CREATIVITY AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

There are schools, which run by the Government and Private agencies. In spite of the adequate facilities in Government schools parents have the notion that the teaching is not up to the mark in
Government institutions. Therefore they first of all try to get admission for their children in private institutions. Those with poor economic status will go to the Government schools. But several studies showed that Government schools also secure high results leaving aside Aided schools.

Hence in the present study the type of schools was also chosen as a variable influencing creativity levels.

**H₃**: There is no significant difference between the creative abilities of IX standard High School children in different type of schools in South Kanara District.

Out of the total sample 1000, there are 514 children from Government High schools and 486 children from Aided High Schools. The significance of difference between the creativity scores of Government High School and Aided High School children has been analysed by ‘t’ test in Table No. 6.3

**Table 6.3**

The Mean creativity scores and SD’s of Government and Aided School children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>361.49</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>Significance at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>356.26</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference between the creativity scores of Government and Aided High School children. The obtained ‘t’ value is
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2.09 for a df of 998. This ‘t’ value is significant at 0.05 level. The Mean creativity scores of Government High School children is significantly higher than Aided High school children (361.49 compared to 356.26). It indicates that students from Government institutions have more creative potential compared to Aided High schools. But the SD’s indicate that Aided school children differ more among themselves than children of Government schools.

These results are rather surprising. Because it is often felt that teachers in Government schools have tendency to show less concern to students and are likely to fail to encourage students to express their creativity.

But in the context of Government schools in South Kanara District it is seen that schools achieving higher results in the school final examinations and in Government schools also the education imparted is not in any way lower in quality than the private institutions as well. Hence the superiority of Government schools in creativity is not surprising as teachers in Government schools in South Kanara District show more concern to students.

Studies are very few in the regard. But Heist (1967) Haddon and Lytton (1963), Gupta (1978) have studied creativity in relation to the type of schools. Findings of these studies show that creativity performance is influenced to some extent by the general school environment, the social and emotional climate and the role of teacher.

Maganlal. S. Molia (1999) did a comparative study of Government and Non-Government school children of secondary level and found out that Non-Government school children were superior to
Government school children in the level of creativity.

Contrary to the general notion that children in Government schools perform poorly compared to Aided schools, results of the present study indicates better performance on creativity tests by the students of Government schools. Several studies in different areas of education have proved that South Kanara District stands highest in literacy level and the standard of education which is also attributed to the social structure of the families, way of bringing up children, importance given to education and teacher’s commitment towards their profession is definitely higher than the other regions of the state. The same set of factors account for higher performance of Government schools, and we do not find much difference in the facilities provided in Government and Aided schools.

From the above findings the hypothesis “There is no significant difference in the level of creativity of High School Students studying in different type of schools” is rejected. It is concluded that the performance of students of Government schools is better than students of Aided schools.

6.4 VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL CREATIVITY

Varieties of tests have been prepared by psychologists to test the creative ability of children. In the present study Baqer Mehdi’s tests were used which contained two types of tests. Viz., Verbal and Non-Verbal.

Different creative abilities are tapped by these two types of tests. Psychological studies have shown that there are individual differences as far as Verbal and Non-Verbal creative abilities are concerned.
Therefore in the present study the investigator decided to find out whether there were any differences between the performance level of students on Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity tests.

\( H_4 \): There is no significant difference between the levels of Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity scores of IX standard High school children in South Kanara District.

The data related to this hypothesis are given in Table no 6.4 and the same data is represented in Graph. No. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>148.86</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df = 998, Significance at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>200.32</td>
<td>27.98</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is found out that ‘t’ value is 43.93 for a df of 998. The ‘t’ value is significant at 0.05 level. This indicates that there is significant difference between the Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity scores of High school children.

Performance of children on Non-Verbal tests has been definitely better than their performance on Verbal tests (Mean of Verbal tests is 148.86, Mean of Non-Verbal tests is 200.32). This result is expected even in the performance on intelligence tests. Subjects are found to perform better on Non-Verbal intelligence tests than Verbal tests. This
Graph No. 2
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is explained in terms of the difficulty involved in understanding Verbal test items and the language difficulties encountered by children. The same argument holds good in explaining the performance superiority on Non-Verbal creativity test than Verbal creativity tests.

On the basis of the above findings the hypothesis “There is no significant difference between the level of Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity scores of IX standard children in South Kanara District ” is rejected. Hence it is concluded that children tend to perform better on Non-Verbal tests than Verbal tests.

SECTION TWO – CORRELATION BETWEEN CREATIVITY AND RELATED VARIABLES

Studies show that creativity is related to several variables like Socio-economic status, Academic achievement and so on. Hence in the present investigation an attempt is made to find out to what extent creativity is related to the Socio-economic status and Academic achievement of IX standard students. For this purpose Chi-square (x²) analysis has been computed between creativity scores and levels of Socio-economic status and correlation coefficient has been computed between creativity and academic achievement.

6.5 CREATIVITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Studies show that Socio-economic status is related to creativity. While examining its relation to creativity it was noticed that very few cases were at the extreme ends of the scale such as Upper and Lower categories. Therefore for the purpose of the study, subjects were grouped into three categories namely High, Middle and Low.
In the present investigation, the number of students in each of these three categories among High, Middle, and Low Socio-economic status groups having High, Average and Low creative groups are given in Table no 6.5

$H_5$: There is no significant relationship between Creative abilities and Socio-economic status of IX standard High school children in South Kanara district.

### Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High creatives</th>
<th>Average creatives</th>
<th>Low creatives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 6.0415$  df = 2, significant at 0.05 level

To find out whether the factors of Socio-economic status and creativity are related to each other. Chi-square test was applied classifying Socio-economic status into three levels and creativity into three levels. The obtained chi-square ($x^2$) of 6.04 for 2 df is more than the Chi-square ($x^2$) value of 5.991 for 2 df to be significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between creativity and Socio-economic status of IX Standard High School children” is rejected and it is concluded that
there is significant relationship between Socio-economic status and creativity and these two variables are dependent on each other.

The above findings of the present study are supported by findings of other researchers. Hussain (1974) investigated the difference between males and females of the same class belonging to different Socio-economic status. The better performance of females was considered to be due to better home and Socio-economic background. Singh (1977) reported that higher the Socio-economic status, better is the performance in flexibility and originality i.e. creativity. Thorat (1979) found out that students with high Socio-economic status were superior to low Socio-economic status on creativity scores. They also established their superiority over middle Socio-economic status group on originality.

Srivastava (1978) concluded that students who scored high on Kuppuswami’s scale of Socio-economic status significantly higher scores on creativity than those with low Socio-economic status. Jarial (1979) found out that students of high Socio-economic status were significantly higher than students of other Socio-economic groups.

6.6 CREATIVITY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Achievement is the level of accomplishment or proficiency of performance in school subjects. Is creativity related to scholastic performance of the children? Whether the commonly held belief that those high in intelligence and creativity are also better performers in school achievement is true? Does creative teaching improve the scholastic performance along with the improvement in creativity?
Getzels – Jackson study implied that creativity can compensate for a relative lack of skills in the areas sampled by more conventional intelligence tests. Most of the studies come to the same conclusion that creativity and achievement are closely related.

Hence, in the present study also Academic Achievement was chosen as one of the variable in relation to creativity.

H$_0$: There is no significant relationship between the level of Creativity and the level of Academic Achievement of IX standard High School Children in South Kanara District.

To answer the questions raised above, Product moment correlation between the scores of creativity and achievement scores was computed in Table no 6.6

**Table 6.6**

Showing the correlation (r) between creativity scores and Academic Achievement scores of High school children (IX standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Creativity and Achievement</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Significance at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table 6.6 it is evident that ‘r’ value 0.336 is significant at 0.01 level for a df 998.

This indicates that there is significant relationship between the scores of creativity and scores of Academic Achievement of High School Children.

The above study is supported by Yamamoto (1964), Hudson (1960) who investigated the relationship between school achievement
and intellectual style. Vijayalakshmi (1980), Asha (1980) and Kamalesh (1992) found out the significant relationship between creativity and Academic Achievement.

Although results of various studies support the thesis that creativity is positively related to scholastic achievement, some contradictory findings are also observed by Roe (1953), Torrance (1962d) and MacKinnon (1962). It seems then that creativity and achievement in school subjects are lowly but positively related.

In the light of the above findings the null hypothesis viz., 'there is no significant relationship between creativity and Academic Achievement of IX standard High School Children in South Kanara District' is rejected.

SECTION THREE – ANALYSIS OF SUB-SAMPLES OF HIGH CREATIVE AND LOW CREATIVE CHILDREN

In this section an attempt is made to study the characteristics and background factors of High and Low achievers in creativity. For this purpose High and Low achievers in creativity were identified. Those whose creativity scores (composite scores combining Verbal and Non-Verbal scores) were above +1 SD in the distribution of scores of the total sample were considered as High Achievers and those whose scores were below −1SD in the total distribution were considered as Low achievers. Out of the total sample of 1000 children 145 were identified as High achievers and 133 as Low achievers. For the purpose of the analysis Boys and Girls were combined as one group both in High Achievers group and Low achievers group. The factors on which these two groups are compared fall into two groups—Psychological
factors like school adjustment, intelligence, Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity, creative activities and background factor of Socio-economic status.

6.7 VERBAL CREATIVITY

H₇: There is no significant difference between the level of Verbal creativity of High and Low creative children.

The data related to this hypothesis is given in Table 6.7

Table 6.7

Mean and SD’s of Verbal creativity scores of High and Low creative children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>182.77</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>129.14</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is significant difference between the level of Verbal creativity of High and Low creative children. The value of ‘t’ is 18.03 for a df of 276. ‘t’ is significant at 0.01 level. The Mean scores of High and Low creatives are 182.77 and 129.14 respectively. This shows that High creative children scored high in Verbal test than Low creative children.

Hence the null hypothesis “there is no significant difference between the level of Verbal creativity of High and Low creative children” is rejected.
creative aspect is something that suffuses the whole experience. The behaviour, the expression, the experience in all-or-none way. Creativity may be understood as a composite of various abilities.

In the school and in the classroom the teacher can identify potential creatives, reach them and test them by their creative activities. Many creatives have unusual experiences and exhibit unusual or typical behaviours and indulge in creative activities. The creative individual may have a large store of ideas but owing to lack of appropriate challenges the creative sees no need to organize or reorganize the ideas in novel patterns that would be creative in nature.

In the present study an attempt is made to find out the creative activities performed by the High and Low creatives by using Torrence's creative activity check list.

H0: There is no significant difference between the frequency of Creative activities of High and Low creative children.

In order to test this hypothesis the Mean scores of Creative activities for the two groups were computed and the statistical significance of the differences between the two Means was calculated. The result is represented in table no. 6.9. A graph is also drawn for the same(Graph.No.3)

**Table 6.9**

Mean Scores and SD's of creative activities of High creative and Low creative children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>'t'</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>55.15</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>6.165</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph No. 3

Showing the average creative activities of high and low creative children.
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The scores reveal that there is significant difference between the creative activities of High creative and Low creative children. From the table it is observed that ‘t’ value is 6.16 for a df of 276. The ‘t’ value is found to be significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that High creatives have exhibited significantly higher creative activities than Low creatives. In the light of these findings the hypothesis “there is no significant difference between the frequency of creative activities of High and Low creative children” is rejected and it is concluded that High creative children exhibit signs of creative talents to a greater extent than Low creative children.

6.10 INTELLIGENCE

Occasionally there are reports of people with Highly creative talents whose intellectual levels are Low, and it is well known that not at all people with High intelligence are creatives.

Whether High intelligence and High creativity go hand in hand depends largely on factors extraneous to both creativity and intelligence. Factors in the environment or within the person often interfere with the development of creativity. Strict authoritarian child training methods may stifle creativity but not affect a High native intelligence. Under such conditions the correlation between intelligence and creativity will be low.

There is however, a low positive correlation between intelligence and creativity. This may at first sound contradictory but creativity which leads to the production of somewhat new, is dependent upon the ability to acquire accepted knowledge. It makes use of knowledge previously acquired, and this depends upon the intellectual abilities of a person.
In the present study intelligence is selected as a variable and the investigator tried to find out the relationship between intelligence and creativity with reference to High and Low creative groups.

H$_{10}$: there is no significant difference between the level of intelligence of High and Low creative children.

The Mean scores of intelligence for the two groups were computed and the significant differences is shown in table no.6.10.

**Table 6.10**

Showing Mean and SD's of Intelligence scores of High creative and Low creative children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155.41</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is significant difference between the level of Intelligence of High and Low creative children. The value of ‘t’ is 5.54 for a df of 276. This ‘t’ value is significant at 0.01 level. The mean scores of High creatives is 155.41 and Low creatives is 149.5

From the above findings it is concluded that High creative children are more intelligent compared to Low creatives. It is found that the mean intelligence scores of both High and Low creative groups (High creatives 155.41 and Low creatives 149.5) are definitely above average (the average of score in the test used is 92). However the level of intelligence of High creatives is more than Low creatives. This can be expected due to the fact that a Non-Verbal intelligence test has been used. The performance on Non-verbal test is usually better than Verbal tests. Research studies on the relationship between creativity and
intelligence show Low or moderate correlation. It implies that High creatives may or may not show High level of intelligence. But in the present study, the results indicate the contrary trend. That is Highly creative children have high degree of intelligence also. Even Low creatives were above average in intelligence. This trend is expected. In spite of these mixed results it is an accepted fact that expression of creative talents requires average level of general intelligence. Low level of intelligence does not favour creative expression.

The above results are partly supported by the studies of Baqer Mehdi (1977), Jarial and Gurupal (1981) and Madhu (1982). These studies have reported Low but positive relationship between creativity and intelligence among boys and girls of urban and rural children.

Hence the null hypothesis “there is no significant difference between intelligence and creativity scores of High creative and Low creative children” is rejected.

In the absence of obstacles that interfere with the development of creativity, it is reasonably safe to say that the more intelligent the child, the more creative the child could be. On the other hand, it is questionable whether a child with very Low intelligence could ever be more than moderately creative even in the most favourable of environments.

6.11 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

H_{11}: There is no significant difference between the level of Academic Achievement of High and Low creative children.
The Mean scores of Academic Achievement were calculated for High creative and Low creative groups. The obtained results are presented in the following table 6.11.

Table 6.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>'t'</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>375.84</td>
<td>108.03</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>288.01</td>
<td>67.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11 shows that there is significant difference between the academic achievement scores of High and Low creative children. The 't' value being 8.21 for a df of 276. The 't' value is significant at 0.01 level. From the above result it can be concluded that High creative children have shown better Academic Achievement than Low creative children. The mean achievement score of High Creative is 375.84. The maximum marks for all the subjects put together (six subjects) is 625 at IX standard level. With reference to this maximum marks the achievement of High creatives work out to be 60.16% (375.84/625). This level is the first class level of achievement. So High creative children have shown High level of achievement in their school subject. The mean achievement score is 288.01. This works out to be just 46.08% (288.01/625) that is third class level. Hence it can be concluded that High creative children have shown definitely more Academic Achievement than Low creative children. This result is expected as High creative children have High degree of Verbal
creativity and also High level of general intelligence, which contribute to Academic Achievement to a great extent.

Therefore the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference between the level of academic achievement of High and Low creative children” is rejected.

6.12 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

H₁₂: There is no significant difference between the Socio-economic background of High and Low creative children.

The following Table 6.12 shows the mean Socio-economic scores of High and Low creative groups and the result is tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above result shows that there is significant difference between High and Low creative children with respect to Socio-economic status, ‘t’ value being 3.59 for a df of 276. ‘t’ is significant at 0.01 level.

The mean SES (Socio-economic status) scores of High and Low creative groups are 18.03 and 15.59 respectively. These scores fall within the score range of Middle SES (9-18) according to norms of the
SES scale used. This shows that both High and Low creative children hail from Middle SES families. However, High creative children hail from Upper Middle class families whereas Low creative children hail from Low Middle class families. Many studies, Sing (1977), Thorat (1977), Srivasthava (1978), Jarial (1979) have shown that High creative children hail from upper Socio-economic families and children hailing from Lower Socio-economic families score Low in creativity. In the present study also Low creative children have come from Lowe middle class families. But High creative children also, contray to expectation, have come from middle class families. This contradictory result may be due to the fact that majority of children in the sample were drawn from Middle class and Lower Socio-economic families were not represented in the sample.

In view of the significant ‘t’ value obtained the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference between the Socio-economic status of High and Low creative children” is rejected. It is concluded that High creative children tend to hail from better Socio-economic families compared to the Socio-economic background of families of Low creative children.

6.13 SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT

H₁₃: There is no significant difference between the level of school Adjustment of High and Low creative children.

The following Table 6.13 shows the mean scores of school adjustment of High and Low creative children.
Table 6.13

Mean and SD’s of School Adjustment scores of High and Low creative children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High creative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>111.13</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>105.59</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Table shows that there is significant difference between the levels of school adjustment of High and Low creative children. The value of ‘t’ is 7.31 for a df of 276. The High creatives have mean value 111.13 and the Low creatives have mean value 105.59. This shows that High creatives are more adjusted than the Low creatives. But the means of both High and Low creative groups are within the score limits of average adjustment level i.e. score limits of 119.89. Hence it is concluded that although there is significant difference between the mean school adjustment score of High and Low creative groups, both the groups are at average school adjustment level.

However the High creative children are better adjusted to school life than Low creative children.

The following studies support the above findings. Pandit (1976) studied creativity in relation to adjustment. The study revealed that creativity was positively and significantly related to the levels of adjustment. This observation has been supported by studies Drevdahl (1954) and Cattell (1964).
Kumari's (1975) and Sharma (1978) studies revealed that adjustment had no relationship to creativity. Kaur (1980) studied different dimensions of creativity and reported that High creatives encountered significantly more problems than Low creatives. Yadav R.S and Patel H.L studied the interactional effect with home, school and locale and concluded that High level school environment with Low environment of rural areas has the Lowest creative abilities. Kumari and Kamalesh (1992) in their study revealed that High Socio-economic status had better emotional social, educational and total adjustment.

6.14 BACKGROUND VARIABLES (Gender, Locale and Type of School):

An attempt has also been made to analyse the background variables of High creative and Low creative children. The purpose has been to find out from what type of social background High creative children tend to come. With reference to this one type of analysis has already been done previously (Refer sub section 6.12) where an attempt was made to determine the significance of difference between the Socio-economic background (taken quantitatively) of High creative and Low creative children. The difference was significant at 0.01 level and it was in favour of High creative children, indicating thereby that High creative children tend to come from Upper-middle and High Socio-economic families. Extending this analysis, in this Sub-section, an attempt has been made to determine the frequency of High creative and Low creative children (Percentage of such children) in the present sample coming from different categories of three background factors of Gender, Locale and Type of School.
Table 6.14

Showing the frequency of High creative and Low creative children falling under different categories of Background variables of Gender, Locale and Type of School. (Numbers within the brackets show the respective percentages for frequencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High creative</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=145)</td>
<td>(51.7%)</td>
<td>(48.3%)</td>
<td>(73.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low creative</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=133)</td>
<td>(45.1%)</td>
<td>(54.9%)</td>
<td>(37.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14 shows the frequency and percentage of High creative and Low creative children falling under different categories of background variables of Gender, Locale and Type of school. The same data are graphically represented in graph nos. 4, 5 and 6.

When the background variables of Gender, Locale and Type of School of High and Low creative children are analysed it is found that Background variables are also related to creativity scores. Regarding Gender of High and Low creatives, out of 145 High creative children there are 75 boys (51.7%) and 70 girls (48.3%). The percentage of Boys is Higher than Girls. In the Low creative Group out of 133 children there are 60 boys (45.1%) and 73 girls (54.9%). More number
of girls scores High marks than Boys. As there is not much difference between the percentages of Boys and Girls in both the High creative and Low creative groups, it is concluded that as far as Present Study is concerned, more or less the same Percentage of Boys and Girls are found in High and Low creativity groups.

With reference to the variable of Locale it can be seen that there are 106 children (73.1%) are in Urban group and 39 children (26.9%) are in the Rural group in High creatives. In Low creatives there are 50 children (37.6%) in the Urban group and 83 children (62.4%) are in the Rural group. Several studies have shown that mostly High creative children come from urban areas. The Present Study also clearly point out in this direction. A significantly Higher percentage of 73.1% of High creative children have come from Urban area, compared to only 26.9% from Rural area. Less percentage of Urban children (37.6%) have scores less and more percentage of children have scored less in Low creative group. These results clearly are in favour of urban children. This trend is expected. Creative children in urban families are brought up from the beginning in a favourable environment which has a positive effect on the cognitive development of children. Urban children get better home environment, Parental encouragement, healthy academic competition and exposure to Communication media like Radio, Television etc. rural children are deprived of these influences. Lack of proper education, lack of parental guidance, lack of encouragement adversely effect the development and expression of creative talents among rural children.

With reference to the variable, type of school, the Table shows that in the High creative group out of 145 children there are 39 children
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Showing the percentage of Boys and Girls among high and Low creative children.
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Graph No. 5

Showing the percentage of High Creative and low creative children coming from Urban and Rural areas.
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Graph No. 6

Showing the Percentage of High Creative and low creative children studying in Government and Aided Schools.
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(26.9%) from Government schools and 106 children (73.1%) are from Aided schools. In the Low creative group out of 133 children there are 77 children (57.9%) from Government schools and 56 children (42.1%) from Aided schools.

The results show that in the High creative group significantly higher percentage (73.1%) have come from Aided schools. But in Low creative group this trend is not seen. In this group there is not much of difference in the Percentage of children studying in Government and Aided schools (the percentage are 57.9 and 42.1 respectively, though slightly more number of children in Government schools have scores less or more on creativity tests). The higher percentage of students scoring High on creativity tests can be explained in terms of qualitative differences between conditions, Aided schools provide qualitatively better and stimulating school environment and school life than Government schools. Students in Aided schools get more stimulating academic atmosphere, involve in greater frequency of varied co-curricular activities exposed to healthy competition. Aided school management and teachers evince more interest in the educational development of students. These statements hold good with respect to Aided schools in South Kanara District also. This is clearly indicated by the results.

SECTION FOUR – ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS ATTITUDE

6.15 TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS CREATIVE CHILDREN

Creativity cannot take place in a vacuum. The more knowledge children can acquire the better the foundations on which to build
creative products. As Pulaski (1974) has said “Children must have content in order to fantasize”

Regardless of how far short of adult standards their achievements fall, children must be encouraged to be creative and free from the ridicule and criticism that far too often are heaped on creative children. Democratic and permissive child training in the home and school foster creativity while authoritarian training stifles it. Both the home and school environments must stimulate creativity by providing guidance and encouragement to see the materials that will encourage creativity.

It is an established fact that attitudes of teachers influence classroom learning and personality development of children. This influence is so subtle that teachers themselves may not be aware of positive or negative influence of their attitudes on children. The attitudes contour teacher’s talk, their behaviour and their interaction with children. Teachers have different attitudes – positive, negative or neutral towards creative children, creative behaviour and creative talents. Those having positive attitude towards these show concern to creative children, accept their behaviour positively, encourage and appreciate creative behaviour and creative products of children. Teacher’s having neutral or negative attitude tend to show little concern to creative children, fail to recognize and appreciate and may even consider creative children and their behaviour as nuisance. Such behaviour on the part of teachers stultify development of creative talents and discourage creative children. With this background the Present Investigator decided to study the attitude of teachers in South Kanara Schools towards creative children. Hence attitude of teachers
towards creative children was selected as a variable.

The Attitude Scale prepared by the Investigators was administered to a group of 30 teachers of Secondary Schools from which the Present sample was selected. The results were analysed and interpreted below in Table no. 6.14.

The following Table 6.15 shows the level of attitude of teachers towards creative children. The range of scores and category wise is represented graphically in Graph no. 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above 157</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Highly +ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-156</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-144</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 108</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Highly –ve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that only 6 out of 30 teachers (20%) have mild positive attitude towards creative children. Only 5 teachers (16.6%) have mild negative attitude towards creative children. Majority of the teachers (19 out of 30 i.e., 63.3%) have neutral attitude towards creative children. It is surprising to find that there is not even a single teacher in the group has shown extreme positive or negative attitude towards creative children. Neutral attitude results due to lack of information or knowledge about the attitudinal object, in these cases of creative children. The results imply that secondary school teachers in South Kanara, included in the present sample lack adequate knowledge or information about the nature of creativity and creative children.
Graph No. 7

Showing the level of attitude of Teachers towards creative children
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Naturally such teachers are in a position to encourage creative children and foster creative talents.

6.16 THE PROFILES OF HIGH CREATIVE CHILD AND LOW CREATIVE CHILD

After the foregoing analysis of the results and their interpretation the researcher has attempted to depict a profile of a High creative child and a Low creative child as far as the Present Study is concerned. These Profiles refer to a typical High creative and Low creative child. However, it is true that if High creative and Low creative children are taken as groups there will be individual differences. But the overall differences will be there between High creative and Low creative children.

Profile of High Creative Child

As far as this study is concerned a High Creative child shows better performance both on Verbal and Non-Verbal Creativity test. Thereby showing Higher level of Creativity. A High creative child exhibits greater frequency of creative activities. Thereby giving expression to its creative talents. A High Creative child shows above average Intellectual capacity. It excels in the Academic Achievement in the school subjects. A High Creative child mostly hails from Upper-Middle class or High Socio-economic families. A High creative child shows satisfactory level of school Adjustment. As far as the probability of High creative child being a boy or girl is concerned it can be said that this probability is equal i.e., a High creative child may be a boy or girl. A High creative child mostly comes from Urban area and mostly from Aided schools.
Profile of Low Creative Child

A Low creative child is most likely to score low both on Verbal and Non-Verbal creativity tests. Thereby showing low performance on creativity tests. A Low creative child exhibits a low frequency and a limited range of Creative Activities. But a Low creative child shows average or more than average level of intelligence. A Low creative child is also likely to be low in Academic Achievement. A Low creative child, however exhibits average level of School Adjustment. As far as the probability of Gender is concerned the probability of a Low creative child being a boy or a girl is almost equal. A Low creative child mostly comes from Rural area and Government Schools.

6.17 INTERACTING FACTORS FAVOURING AND DETERRING THE CREATIVE ABILITIES OF HIGH SCHOOL CHILDREN

The major thrust of the present Investigation into study the interacting factors favouring and deterring the creative abilities of IX standard High school children in South Kanara District. So far the collected data with reference to the objectives formulated have been systemically analysed and interpreted and conclusions have been drawn. On the basis of this, typical profiles of High Creative child and Low creative child have been developed. Now on the basis of the above analysis it is time to identify the factors favouring and deterring the Creative abilities of children.

The analysis indicates the gender of the child does not appear to be either favouring or deterring factor for the development of creativity. However, the Socio-economic background of parents is
definitely an influencing factor for the development of creativity. Upper-middle or Higher Socio-economic status of parents is definitely a favouring factor for fostering creative talents of children. Lower Socio-economic status, as it results in an impoverished environment adversely affecting the development of cognitive abilities in general and creative abilities in particular. Hence Lower Socio-economic level acts as a deterring factor for the development of creativity. Average or above average intelligence acts as a favouring factor for the development of creativity. Studies show Low correlation but positive correlation between Intelligence and Creativity. Thereby implying that a creative child need not be Highly intelligent also. But at least average level of intellectual capacity is required for the proper flowering of creative talents. This helps the child to process cognitive information adequately utilise this information for the expression of creative talents and also understanding the knowledge, techniques, procedures, media etc relating to nurturance and expression of creative talents. Children who are very Low in their intellectual capacity are unable to develop their creative potentialities fully. There are some instances quoted in psychological literature of children with Low intelligence showing evidence of High creative talents. But in such instances the range of expression of these talent remains Highly limited due to lack of adequate general intellectual level. The results indicate creative talents along with general intelligence favour academic achievement.

Adjustment is a crucial factor in the development of creativity. A number of studies have shown that good adjustment favours creativity. Especially if the child is well adjusted to school life it becomes a favourable factor for fostering creativity. If the child is not well adjusted to school life then it becomes a deterring factor for the
nurturance of creative talents. As far as the other background factors are concerned, it can be said that school environment in Aided Institutions can provide congenial environment for the development of creative talents. This point is indicated by this study in which children from Aided Schools have given evidence of Higher frequency of creative activities. Aided schools in general take more interest in the all-round development of children by giving equal emphasis to both curricular and extra curricular activities. Urban environment appears to provide favourable environment for the development of creative talents. Children living in Rural areas lack encouraging and competitive opportunities to express their talents. Unless the talents are properly nurtured in a child living in Rural area, the creative talents of that child are bound to remain dormant. Finally the attitude of teachers towards creativity. Creative activities and creative children is a crucial factor in fostering creativity. If these attitudes are not favourable then they become deterring factors for the nurturance of creativity. Not only negative attitudes but neutral attitudes also deterring factors. Positive attitudes towards creative child acts as a favouring factor because teachers having such positive attitude recognize the creative talents of children very early, encourage such children to go ahead and educate the parents of such children about the value of creative talents in society. Such teachers take positive steps both cognitively and effectively to foster the creative talents of children.

6.17 SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

On the basis of Analysis and Interpretation of the data and the conclusions drawn, the Researcher likes to give the following suggestions for fostering creative talents among High school children.
not, only in the High schools of South Kanara District but in the High Schools of other Districts also.

1) Creative talents are expressed through Creative Activities. Children high in creative talents are motivated to expose these talents through creative activities like Drawing, Singing, Composing rhymes, Dramatising, Mimicry, Collection activities like collection of stamps, Flowers, designs etc. A high creative child can be identified by observing its creative activities so that its creative talents are identified and nurtured properly. Hence it becomes important that High school teachers should keep a watch on the creative activities of children, which are the indicative of their hidden talents. It is possible sometimes that the activities of a creative child may seem to interfere regular school work. In such a situation classroom teachers tend to discourage such a child. This type of teacher behaviour stifles creative talents. High school teachers are advised to watch the creative activities of their children, draw implications from these activities about their hidden talents and take suitable steps to foster these talents. Maintaining anecdotal records of significant behaviours of children is a simple technique of identifying the creative activities of children. Periodically such activities should become the topic of academic discussions of teachers about their students.

2) It has been indicated in the course of the Analysis of the data that Rural children tend to score low on creativity tests. But this does not mean that Rural children do not possess creative potentialities. The recent thinking about creativity does not
favour the view “All are None” principle about the presence or absence of creative talents in children. Instead the modern thinking is that every child has immense creative potentialities hidden within steps have to be taken to bring out these potentialities if proper encouragement is given to children’s creative expressions from the beginning. Gradually the hidden potentialities begin to come to the surface and are expressed. It is true that there are individual differences in the amount of creative talents. But every child can be made creative up to a reasonable level provided proper measures are taken to foster creativity. In the light of this it is essential that teachers should give special attention to Rural children. Any sign of creative talent in a Rural child should not be missed by the teacher and immediate steps to be taken to encourage such talents. Rural children are especially handicapped by lack of linguistic ability, which is essential for Verbal creativity. Hence attention should be given to develop language skills in Rural children. Many Rural children are very skillful in their performance and constructive activities like painting, making models etc. Such skills should be specially nurtured in Rural children. Appreciation of any creative Activity shown by a rural child goes a long way in encouraging the child to improve upon its talents.

3) Expression of creativity requires proper medium through which the talents are expressed. Apart from language a variety of materials like Clay, Paper mache, Plaster of paris, drawing sheets etc are required to express artistic talents. Varieties of musical instruments are required to express musical talents.
Materials are required for construction activities. These materials should be available for children to express their creative talents. Unfortunately in India in majority of the schools there is a dearth of such materials. It is true in only some elitist schools such materials are made available for children. It is also true that in Indian condition considering the non availability of adequate finance for education it may not be possible to provide these materials in all schools in full measure. But a resourceful Head master can manage to mobilise locally available resources to provide at least some of these materials to some extent to children who definitely show the signs of creative potentialities.

4) Another important point to be remembered in fostering creativity is to recognise the creative products of children and appreciating them. This acts as a powerful motivating factor. Hence it is important that the schools should arrange exhibitions from time to time where the creative products like paintings, models etc are to be exhibited. Verbal creative products like dramatisation, poems etc are exhibited through school magazines and photographs. Parents should be invited to such exhibitions and creative children should be introduced to the visitors. Inter school exhibitions, State and National level exhibitions can also be arranged in this direction and the products of creative children are exhibited in such exhibitions. A scheme of awarding the creative products should also be introduced.

5) Studies have shown that the creative talents flourish in an environment of psychological security and freedom. Such an environment can provide school life, which ensures good school
adjustment of children. If the school environment is congenial then children enjoy their school life and are encouraged to express their talents freely. This is possible when the creative activities are not discouraged in any way but encouraged. However the teacher should not forget the academic activities of the school. A healthy balance between the academic activities and creative activities has to be maintained. It is possible for a creative teacher to make academic activities also like creative activities. It is essential to make arrangements for giving counselling for children who have problems in adjusting to school life. During counselling sessions it is possible to identify the hidden talents in children.

6) Psychological literature is full of varieties of special programmes for fostering creative talents of children and adults. Many such special programmes can be organised by schools, which have ample material and personal resources. Brain storming sessions can be arranged to encourage divergent thinking. Quiz programmes on special topics can be arranged. Such programmes can be inter school events also children can be encouraged to take up creative writing in an organised programme with the guidance of a creative writer. Adopting stories for dramatization, develop improvisation for stage craft, teaching aids, adopting curricular content especially from History and languages to write skits, Mono acting, one act play etc can be encouraged in schools. Lectures by creative person and demonstration of their talents provide modelling effect on children.
7) The importance of teachers role in fostering creativity has been well recognised. Teachers can foster creative talents in their children in two ways

a. Teaching for creativity – Teachers can identify the talents and take steps to foster these talents through programmes and activities explained above

b. Creative Teaching – studies have shown that every subject can be taught in a creative manner. For example: Mathematics can be made interesting through problem solving strategy. The celebrated treatise ‘Leelavathi’ by the famous Mathematician Bhaskaracharya is a very good example for teaching Mathematics creatively. A number of Algebraic problems are formulated in terms of interesting situation so that the student is encouraged to follow the problems. Similarly History can be taught in a creative manner through Dramatisation, Role plat etc. Science and Biology provide ample opportunities for several collection and construction activities. Teacher training programmes have to be reoriented to train teachers towards fostering creativity in children. Michelko (1998) after conducting a thorough study of the nature of creative persons and the processes involved in thinking has come to the conclusion that creative person tend to see ‘what no one else is seeing’ It consists of two sub strategies 1) knowing How to see and 2) Making the thought visible. Teachers should be made aware of these processes so that they can follow these strategies in fostering creativity. Michelko has come
to the conclusion that there is need to draw the attention of teacher educators so that suitable work books to develop creativity may be developed and introduced in schools. He insists that application of thinking strategies has to form a part of teachers initial training and subsequent inservice programmes as well.

8) Teachers attitude towards creativity and creative children place an important role in fostering creativity. The present study indicated the teachers have exhibited a neutral attitude towards creative children. This implies the teachers do not have enough information about creativity and creative children. This is an unfortunate trend. Hence there is need to reorient our teachers towards the importance of contributions of creative individuals to society. It is surprising to know that though the teachers study about creativity in their training programmes they have failed to develop a positive attitude towards creative children. Hence inservice training programmes should give attention to these aspects and emphasize the importance of fostering creativity in education.

9) Many parents in Indian condition are not aware of the creative potentialities of their children. They lack favourable attitude towards creativity. They tend to think that creative activities of children interfere in the academic life of children so they may not give adequate attention to foster creative talents in children. Fortunately in recent years, thanks to the effects of mass media like Radio and Television, which encourage creative talents through competitions. Educated parents started realizing the
professional economic value of creative talents in the modern world and they are taking interest in encouraging their children’s creative talents. However, schools should educate parents about the importance of developing creative talents.

It is suggested that creative activities should also find a place in the total scheme of evaluation of children in schools. It is better to set apart some weightage for the creative activities shown by children. This will act as a motivating factor to encourage children to express their creative talents and it also motivates parents to recognize the worth of creativity in the development of creativity.

The Researcher likes to end this analysis by quoting a statement by the Philosopher Sri Sri Ravishankar (2002) about the value of creativity “Creativity brings a new beginning for ‘time’ when you are creative, you break the monotony of time. Everything becomes fresh and alive.

Creativity brings along with it a new round of enthusiasm. Both creative and procreative impulses in nature are associated with enthusiasm. When you are enthusiastic you are closer to the creative principle of existence.

Deep silence is the mother of creativity. No creativity can come out of one who is too busy, worried, over ambitious or lethargic. Balanced activity, rest and Yoga can kindle skills and creativity in you”.
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