

A retrospective look at the creative individual and his characteristics as revealed in the present study, a brief survey of the work reported in the previous chapters of this thesis and useful suggestions for further research work have been presented in the paragraphs.

## CONCLUSIONS

## Discovery of the Creative and His characteristics

Apart from fulfilling the objective of taking stock of the findings, it is intended that the description of the characteristics would provide additional meaning to the Norms. The description is based on the inspection of the responses given by those Ss who stood above the 80th percentile point ( $P_{80} = 437.80$ ). Nature of responses has been discussed by mentioning the traditional names of the factors.

<u>Fluency</u>: Creative individuals are relatively more fluent and give a wide variety of responses. Most of the responses given by a group can be found among the responses given by the only creative section of that group. Among the creatives, the responses which are common to all are very few. The key of original responses appended to this thesis is invariably touched by the creative group. This clearly indicates the crave among the creatives to give responses which are statistically uncommon and hence not stereotyped. This supports the findings of the studies quoted earlier about the tolerance for ambiguity in a stimulus situation and tendency to make uncommon responses.

<u>Originality:</u> In general quality of the responses has been very high among the creatives. The creative individuals preferred indirect literary expressions to direct ordinary expressions. There is less reference in their responses to structural and figural elements of the stimulus figures. Probably this increased the number of whole responses to figures. Part-responses were very few, rarely there was any irrelevant one. In fact part responses, irrelevant ones and those directly giving geometrical description of the figures were more among non-creatives occupying lower end of the distribution.

Perception of movements unusual to commonly expressed ones, of depth or height of the transparency and light seems to characterise responses from the creatives. Expression to feelings as evoked by the stimulus has been another important characteristic. Possibly creative individuals seem to place less restriction over their expressions manifested due to the stimulus situation. However this should be regarded as a liberal conclusion. There is a tendency among the creatives to go away from the figural set provided by the stimulus, thus making the responses uncommon. Probably correlation between fluency and originality scores of the creatives is higher than it would be for the group as a whole. This is a point for discussion and further study.

Obviously, there is a great deal of difference in responses to CIM I and CRM II stimulus figures. Responses in the latter case have been more figurally bound. Factoranalysis provided no support for the content-wise differentiation of the two sets of figures viz., CRM I and CRM II. Except that there has been unidentified factor fully defined by high loadings on scores from CRM II. Responses, however, indicated naughtiness in either humanising the expression or making peculiar expressions involving movements, and persons and animals. This may be seen by comparing the keys.

This might be the reason for originality scores derived from the two subtests, CEM I and CEM II, standing for a common concept 'Originality', as hypothesised. However when compared to CEM I, the responses of the type referred above are less.

<u>Elaboration:</u> Non creatives seem to limit themselves strictly to responses with less or no elaboration. This may be due to the tendency among the non-creatives to go with the figural set. Creative individuals, who, as stated earlier, have a tendency to break such a set must find additional ideas to express what they feel. This might be the reason for better elaboration of responses by the creatives.

<u>Symbolic Abilities:</u> When coming to any conclusion on the not-well identified factors is risky, it can be said that the creative children, in general, show above average performance on the two symbolic abilities represented by CRM III and IV. On the otherhand, the creative children who stand very high in these abilities show above average performance on the semantic creative abilities discussed above, viz., fluency, originality and elaboration.

Taking into consideration the basic approach to scoring adopted in this study of deriving multiple scores and arriving at a composite creativity index, attempt to compare

performance in different factors has not been made. A few children might well stand high on all abilities represented in the composite creativity index. Further research may be made on these points taking individual factor tests.

## SUMMA RY

An attempt has been made here to summarise the work enumerated in this thesis. However, the summary should only be regarded for getting a hurried picture, and reference, when needed in detail, should be made to the preceding chapters.

The test "Creativity Response Matrix" was evolved after a study of available tests and literature. The test contains four parts: CRN I, CRM II, CRM III and IV. CRM I and CRM II contain visual figural stimuli of varying ambiguity. CR4 III and IV contain symbolic stimuli. At the pilot study stage CRM II, III and IV contained 25, 24, 6 and 5 items respectively. Items were first retained on the basis of mean fluency scores and on the efficasy of the items in eliciting the whole responses. Only the items retained in this manner were subjected to item analysis (N = 370). In all, the final test consisted of twelve items + "practice item" apart from two items to be worked out by the examiner.

277

A composite creativity index (CCI) was evolved on the basis of eight scores derived either from different scoring hypothesis and or from different subtests. Split-half reliability based on separately timed parts of the test corrected to full length by Spearman - Brown Prophecy Formula was found to be .86. Kuder-Richardson Reliability was found to be .71. Validity coefficients were found to be between .18 and .44 on different criteria. A composite criteria consisting of Teacher Ratings, circles test and Activities Checklist had on  $r_b$  of .44 with the CCI. All the above statistics were based on the data obtained from a sample of 230 children studying in X Std..

Factor - analysis of a 16 - variable correlation matrix (N = 230) resulted in eight factors. Rotation of these factors to simple structure, positive manifold and psychological meaningfulness resulted in the identification of such factors as fluency, originality and elaboration and two symbolic factors. Factor loadings varied between .52 and .87. Construct validity was based on the well established constructs. The data were collected during December - March, 1969-70 from the schools of Dharwar and Udipi Taluks of Mysore States. Percentile and Standard score Norms for the CCI were based on 450 Ss.

## Suggestions for Further Research

The investigator's experience and the insights gained during the study has been useful in making the following suggestions for further research work:

1. Research on multiple scoring taking different  $S_1$  - facets viz., content, operation and product orientation of responses.

2. Developing a ready - guide giving nature of creative responses for the use of teachers.

3. Developing Norms using a national normative sample and norms in different languages.

4. Extending the test for different age groups above and below the school-leaving age.

The suggestions made above are strictly related to the test evolved and discussed in this report.

Theoretical and other weighty suggestions in the area of creativity have been made, wherever necessary, in the body of this report. In short, there is much to understand, explore and create about the creative, the creation, the created and the creative environment in general! Car there be dearth of problems for those who are creative?

',

1