IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENT ON CREATIVITY OF STUDENTS

PROF. JAYSHRIBEN I. CHAUDHARI
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR,
PRAKASH COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
THALTEJ, AHMEDABAD.

ABSTRACT
The present study has been made to final out the effect of environment on creativity of student. How do environmental factor affect students? What can we do to provide best facilities for development of students. These are not just theoretical questions of interest to psychologist many people especially policy makers and are also quite involved in addressing these questions creativity has been major field of interest among psychologist and educators school and home environment have a decisive role to play in creativity in the students.

Key-Words
Creativity, school environment Home environment.

Introduction

Creativity is the ability to see something in a new way to see and solve problems on one else may know exists and to engage in mental and physical experiments that are new unique or different for the overall development of students for bringing about desirable changes in the behavior of students and making school as a means of development of community and society good and conductive environment plays an important role school environment means all those conditions resources and their integrated and interrelated activities which directly or indirectly affect the school environment better school environment better will be the functioning of the school the quality of the school surrounding can be classified into four components: social environment, physical environment, physiological environment and academic environment.

Home environment refer to all sorts of moral and ethical values and emotional social intellectual climate set up by the family members to contribute to the wholesome development of an individual family shapes a child's life in his journey towards self fulfillments Tizad and Hughes (1984) found home as a powerful learning environment.

The close relationship between parents and child as an important factor in learning experiences Amabile (1989) observers that there are several ways that parents can kill creativity in their children she stresses the important Of the environment. Created and that coercion and pushing children into activities before they are ready can be detrimental to the child's creative growth.

Significance of the study

A very few studies have been conducted in the field of Effect of environment on creativity of students. The present study explore their relationship and will help the school administrative practices and improve the physical environment.

The study will be helpful to know how much important and emphasis is being given to develop favorable condition for developing creative potential of students the study also help the aspect band attributes of home environment that could aid in creative development.

Objective

1. To find the creativity level of government and private secondary school children.
2. To find the creativity level of boys and girls.
3. To find the difference in the stimulation dimension, cognitive dimension and permissive of school environment.
4. To find the creativity level of children with rich and poor home environment.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There will be significant difference in the creativity of children of government and private school students.
2. There will be significant difference in the creativity of boys and girls.
3. There are significant difference in the creativity of students due to creative stimulation dimension.
4. There are significant difference in the creativity of children due to cognitive dimension of school.
5. There will be significant in the creativity of student due to permissiveness in school environment.
6. There will be significant difference in creativity of student with rich and poor home environment.

Keeping in view the limitation of available time and resources the present investigation took place with the following limitations to define the scope of the problem under investigation

A. The sample is confined to secondary level school students.
B. The study is restricted to school of surat district only.
C. The study is restricted to government and private schools.
D. The study is confined to 200 students.

Sample

The present study was conducted on a random sample of 200 ninth class students of Surat district . The sample comprised of 100 government school students (50 boys and 50 girls) and 100 private school students (50 boys and 50 girls).

Tool used

The following tools have been used in this study

1. Non-Verbal Test of Creative Thinking (Mehdi, 1985)
2. School Environment Inventory (Mishra, 1984)
3. Home Environment Inventory (Mishra 1989)

Description of tools

1. Non Verbal Test of Creative Thinking (Mehdi, 1985) measures the individual's ability to deal with figural content in a creative manner. Three types of activity are used for this purpose, viz., picture construction (10 minutes), picture completion (15 minutes), and triangles and ellipses (10 minutes). The reliability score and also the total creativity score are considerably high, ranging from 0.93 to 0.94.
2. School Environment Inventory (Mishra, 1984) is an instrument designed to measure the psychosocial climate of the schools perceived by the Pupils. It contains 70 items related to six dimensions of school environment. The split–half reliability for various dimensions of school environment i.e. Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Acceptance, Permissiveness, Rejection and Control are 0.91, 0.79, 0.82, 0.67, 0.78 and 0.76 respectively.
3. Home Environment Inventory (Mishra, 1989) is an instrument designed to measure the psychosocial climate of home as perceived by children. It provides a measure of the quality and quantity of the cognitive, emotional and social support that has been available to the child within the home. The inventory has 100 items belonging to ten dimensions of home environment. Split-half reliability was worked out separately for all ten dimensions, which were reported to be between 0.67 and 0.86 respectively

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1

Mean Difference in Creativity of Government and Private School Students.

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	Govt.		Private			Level of significance
Originality(V)	12.70	7.24	9.67	8.06	2.78	Significant at 0.01 level
Originality (NV)	10.47	6.48	2.65	4.48	9.80	Significant at 0.01 level
Elaboration (V)	31.11	14.98	30.92	15.98	0.08	Not significant
Elaboration (NV)	11.16	7.51	4.63	7.46	6.10	Significant at 0.01 level
C-Total	65.44	21.31	46.70	24.24	5.40	Significant at 0.01 level

* V=Verbal, NV= Non Verbal

The t-values with regard to originality (V), Originality (NV), Elaboration (NV) and C-total were significant at 0.01 level of significance, while the t-value with regard to Elaboration (V) was not significant. On the basis of above results, it can be concluded that the government school students of Surat district have higher creativity except in Elaboration (V) as compared to private school students. Thus hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Table 2

Mean Difference in Creativity of Boys and Girls.

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	Boys		Girls			Level of significance
Originality(V)	10.83	8.11	11.56	7.47	0.66	Not significant
Originality (NV)	6.73	7.10	6.43	6.51	0.30	Not significant
Elaboration (V)	30.39	15.50	31.67	15.34	0.48	Not significant
Elaboration (NV)	8.03	8.42	7.86	7.90	0.14	Not significant
C-Total	55.42	27.81	56.73	24.43	3.54	Significant at 0.01 level

* V=Verbal, NV= Non Verbal

The above results show that there exists no significant difference in the Originality (V), Originality (NV), Elaboration (V) and Elaboration (NV), dimensions of boys and girls. The significant t-value shows that there exist significant difference in the C-total dimension of boys and girls. This shows that the girls as compared to boys have a higher level of creativity. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is partially accepted.

Table 3

Mean Difference in Creativity with Regard to Creative Stimulation of School Environment.

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	High Creative Stimulus		Low Creative Stimulus			Level of significance
Originality(V)	14.35	7.83	9.22	7.33	3.51	Significant at 0.01 level
Originality (NV)	8.22	6.60	6.05	7.00	1.65	Not significant
Elaboration (V)	32.09	13.07	28.01	13.08	1.58	Not significant
Elaboration (NV)	10.48	10.16	6.57	6.65	2.36	Significant at 0.05 level
C-Total	65.14	24.69	49.87	21.83	3.41	Significant at 0.01 level

The t-values with regard to Originality (V), Elaboration (NV) and C-total are significant at 0.01 level of significance, while the t-value with regard to Originality (NV), Elaboration (V) are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The t-values show that there exists significant difference in the Originality (V), Elaboration (NV0) and C-total with regard to creative stimulus of school environment.

Table 4

Mean Difference in Creativity with Regard to Cognitive Environment Dimension of School Environment.

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	High Cognitive Dimension		Low Cognitive Dimension			Level of significance
Originality(V)	13.98	8.30	7.88	7.04	4.07	Significant at 0.01 level
Originality (NV)	7.25	6.52	5.85	7.70	1.02	Not significant
Elaboration (V)	34.83	14.06	25.38	13.20	3.59	Significant at 0.01 level
Elaboration (NV)	8.01	6.94	5.38	6.03	2.10	Significant at 0.05 level
C-Total	64.03	25.08	44.51	21.87	4.30	Significant at 0.01 level

The t-values with regard to Originality (V), Elaboration (V), Elaboration (NV) and C-total were significant at 0.05 level while the t-value with regard to originality (NV) was not significant. Thus Creative stimulus provided in the School effects creativity to certain extent. Thus hypothesis 4 is accepted

Table 5
Mean Difference in Creativity with Regard to Permissiveness Dimension

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	High Permissive		Low Permissive			Level of significance
Originality(V)	12.85	8.03	8.74	6.89	2.85	Significant at 0.01 level
Originality (NV)	6.09	5.84	6.16	7.37	0.05	Not significant
Elaboration (V)	34.61	19.08	25.70	11.53	2.93	Significant at 0.01 level
Elaboration (NV)	6.69	6.96	5.70	5.91	1.01	Not significant
C-Total	60.51	27.87	46.31	29.80	2.98	Significant at 0.01 level

The t-values with regard to Originality (V), Elaboration (V), Elaboration (NV) and C-total were significant at 0.01 level and not significant with regard to originality (NV) and elaboration (NV). Thus hypothesis 5 is partially accepted.

Table 6
Mean Difference in Creativity with Rich and Poor Home Environment

Creativity	M_1	SD_1	M2	SD_2	t	
	Rich Env.		Poor Env.			Level of significance
Originality(V)	14.87	7.13	12.02	7.78	2.79	Significant at 0.01 level
Originality (NV)	9.13	5.11	6.11	6.12	3.98	Significant at 0.01 level
Elaboration (V)	36.12	16.30	32.10	16.28	4.67	Significant at 0.01 level
Elaboration (NV)	11.14	6.70	8.12	7.12	4.43	Significant at 0.01 level
C-Total	68.73	20.10	62.21	21.17	9.75	Significant at 0.01 level

The t-values with regard to Originality (V), Elaboration (V), Elaboration (NV) and C-total were significant therefore there were significant differences between children of rich and poor home environment on all the dimensions of creativity. As per mean values, children of rich home environment were higher on their creativity levels as compared to poor home environment on all the dimensions. Thus hypothesis 6 was accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The school environment of government and private schools of Surat district did differ with respect to Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement and Permissiveness dimensions of school environment but did not differ significantly with respect to Rejection, Acceptance, and Controlled dimensions.
2. The government schools of Surat District provide greater creative stimulation to their students as compared to those studying in the private school. Whereas students in the private schools feel greater rejection in there schools as compared to those in government schools.
3. As regards the comparison of creativity of the school students with their school environment, it can be concluded that the government schools of Surat district have higher creativity generating environment as compared to private schools of Surat district.

The results found in this study can provide impetus for other researchers to conduct further studies aimed at bringing about best practices for parents and teachers to change their school and home environments to stimulate interest for creative and artistic activity in the heart of children. A child's home as well as school can be a wondrous place for creative adventure and growth when stimulated and prepared by good parental attitude, family culture and healthy school environment. The home as well as school is the place of primary influence for a child. This is a fertile ground for stimulation and growth and this study sought to equip parents and teachers to plough that fertile ground.

REFERENCES

Asha, C.B. (1980). Creativity and Academic Achievement Among Secondary School Children. Asian Journal of Psychology and Education Vol.6, No. 1.

Bajwa, H.S. (1998). A study of academic achievement in Physics in relation to intelligence, creativity and altitude for physics at the senior secondary stage. Ph.d (Edu.) Thesis, Panjab University Chandigarh.

Desfroges. C., & Abouchaar, A. (2003). The impact of Parental involvement, Parental support and family Education on pupil achievement and adjustment. A research report, Queen's Printer.

Goel, S.P. (2004). Effect of gender, home and environment on educational aspirations. Journal of Community Guidance and Research, 21(1), 77-81.

Jarial, G.S. (1981). Creativity, Intelligence and Academic Achievement: their Relationship and Difference in Relation to sex and Academic subject. Journal of Education and Psychology Vol.39, No. 2.

Morrison, M. (1966). The relationship of internal and external children to pattern of learning behaviour. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, USA

Tizard, & Hughes (1984). Young children learning. Harvard University Press Cambridge, Mass

Patel, R.S (2010) . Fundamental concepts of research, Ahmedabad: Jay publication

Patel, R.S (2015) . Research in Education, Ahmedabad: Jay publication

Shah, Dibuka D. (2004) ShexanikSanshodhan-Uni. GranthNirmanBoard Ahmedabad.