

## CREATIVITY AS RELATED TO PERSONALITY THROUGH ITS MOST ESTABLISHED DIMENSIONS

UZMA MAJEED WANI<sup>1</sup>, PROF. NAHEED VAIDA<sup>2</sup> & DR. YASMEEN ASHAI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D, Research Scholar, Institute of Home Science, University of Kashmir, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Institute of Home Science, University of Kashmir, India

<sup>3</sup>Professor, Principal, Amar Singh College, Srinagar, India.

### ABSTRACT

*The present study was an attempt to find out the relationship of personality characteristics and creativity among secondary level students. The sample consisted of 160 secondary level students- 80 boys and 80 girls from various schools of Srinagar city. Eysenck's personality questionnaire-R and verbal test of creative thinking by Dr. Baqer Mehdi were administered. The results reveal that there is no significant difference between creative and non-creative students on psychoticism, extraversion and lie-scale. Also non-creative students are found to be more neurotic i.e., emotionally over responsive, anxious. In comparison creative students are emotionally stable*

*Keywords: creativity, personality characteristics, and secondary level students.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

No nation whether big or small can afford to overlook the importance of creativity in this age of competition. Creativity is nature which is exceptional. Creativity is regarded the valuable asset of mankind. The future of mankind depends on this valuable asset. Rogers (1954) defines creativity as, "the emergence in action of a novel relational product, growing out of the uniqueness of the individual on the one hand and the materials, events, people or circumstances of his life on the other." Torrance (1962) defines creativity as, "the process of seeing problems, or gaps in information, forming ideas or hypothesis, testing and modifying these hypotheses and communicating the results." Every child is born creative and that it is unique in each individual. Demographic factors like age, gender, birth order, socio-economic status, locality etc., play a vital role in creativity (Torrance, 1975). As we know some people are more creative than others. What makes them more creative is an important question? To understand how creativity occurs, and what processes are involved in creative thinking still remains

a challenge and “might transform our view of ourselves and our societies” (Zeki, 2001). The relationship between personality and creativity has long been of interest to psychologists to describe what creative people are like. When psychologists define personality, they tend to refer to qualities within a person, characteristics of a person’s behaviour, or both. Gordon Allport (1937) mentioned both inner qualities and behaviour, but he emphasized the inner qualities: “Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment”. Cattell, (1956) equates personality with the individual aspects of behaviour. He defines personality as “that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation”. Feist(1998) in a Meta analysis of personality revealed that openness to new experiences, unconventionality, conscientiousness, self-confidence, self-acceptance, impulsiveness, ambitious, dominant and hostility are related to creativity. Martindale (2007) found psychoticism and extraversion to be related to creativity. Openness to experience is the strongest and most consistent predictor of creativity (Silvia et al. 2009, Batey et al. 2010). Extraversion and openness to experience are significantly correlated to creativity (Furnham and Bachtiar, 2008; Sanchez- Ruiz et al,2011; Silvia et al, 2011; Kaufman et al, 2013). According to Esfahani et al (2012) extraversion, conscientiousness and emotional stability have effect on creativity. The present investigation was one of the attempts to find out the relationship of personality characteristics and creativity among secondary level students.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

A total sample of 160 secondary level students including both boys and girls in equal distribution were selected from different schools of Srinagar district. The study was conducted on 17 schools and a maximum number of 10 students were randomly selected from each school. The age range of the subjects was 13-18 years. Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire-R and Verbal Test of Creative Thinking by Dr. Baqer Mehdi were administered. The data collected from the study was analysed and interpreted by applying statistical techniques viz., Mean, SD and t-test. Finally, the data was represented through tables.

## 3. RESULTS

**Table 3.1: Demography of sample**

Creative		Non-creative		Total (%age)
Boys (%age)	Girls (%age)	Boys (%age)	Girls (%age)	
17 (10.62)	22 (13.75)	63 (39.38)	58 (36.25)	160 (100)

The data presented in the table 3.1 reveals that 10.62% boys and 13.75% girls are creative and 39.38% boys and 36.25% girls are non-creative.

**Table 3.2: Mean comparison of various creativity dimensions of creative and non creative secondary students**

Dimension of creativity	Type	N	Mean	S.D	t value	p value
Fluency	Creative	39	65.169	6.97	12.169	<0.01
	Non creative	121	49.281	7.24		
Flexibility	Creative	39	64.54	5.288	11.227	<0.01
	Non creative	121	50.102	7.440		
Originality	Creative	39	66.579	11.191	13.494	<0.01
	Non creative	121	48.527	5.463		

<0.01 = highly significant

<0.05 = significant

>0.05 = insignificant

From Table 3.2, it is evident that the t-value on the first dimension of creativity, i.e., fluency of creative and non-creative secondary students is 12.169 which is highly significant at 0.01 level. It reveals that the two groups significantly differ on fluency. Further, the mean score reveal that creative secondary students (65.361) are found to be higher on fluency as compared to non creative students (49.281). For the second dimension of creativity i.e., flexibility, the t-value is 11.227 which is highly significant at 0.01 level, indicating that the two groups significantly differ on flexibility too. From the mean scores it is evident that creative students (64.54) are found to be higher on flexibility when compared to the non-creative students (50.102). The t-value on the last dimension of creativity i.e., originality is 13.494 which is highly significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the creative and non-creative students differ significantly on originality. Further, the mean score reveal that the creative students (66.579) are found to be higher on originality as compared to non-creative students (48.527).

**Table 3.3: Mean comparison of various creativity dimensions of creative boys and girls.**

Dimension of creativity	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	U	t value	p value
Fluency	Creative Boys	17	6.15	6.874	87	2.825	<0.05
	Creative Girls	22	13.846	6.094			
Flexibility	Creative Boys	17	7.077	5.048	123	1.81	>0.05

	<b>Creative Girls</b>	22	12.923	5.196			
<b>Originality</b>	<b>Creative Boys</b>	17	8.218	11.014	167.5	0.538	>0.05
	<b>Creative Girls</b>	22	11.782	11.508			

<0.01 = highly significant  
 <0.05 = significant  
 >0.05 = insignificant

The table 3.3 shows the mean comparison of creativity dimensions between creative boys and creative girls. The table reflects that the t-value on fluency of creative boys and creative girls is 2.825 which is significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that creative boys and creative girls differ significantly on fluency. Further the mean value indicates that creative girls (13.846) are found to be higher on fluency as compared to creative boys (6.154). On the dimension of flexibility t-value of creative boys and creative girls is 1.81 which is insignificant at 0.05 level, revealing no significant difference between the two. For the dimension of originality the t-value is 0.538 which is insignificant at 0.05 level. It reveals that there is no significant difference between creative boys and creative girls on originality.

**Table 3.4: Mean comparison of various personality dimensions of creative and non creative secondary students**

<b>Dimension of personality</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>	<b>t value</b>	<b>p value</b>
<b>Psychoticism</b>	<b>Creative</b>	39	7.667	1.840	1.743	>0.05
	<b>Non creative</b>	121	8.165	1.451		
<b>Extraversion</b>	<b>Creative</b>	39	5.949	1.806	1.001	>0.05
	<b>Non creative</b>	121	6.231	1.436		
<b>Neuroticism</b>	<b>Creative</b>	39	6.077	1.797	2.086	<0.05
	<b>Non creative</b>	121	6.727	1.658		
<b>Lie scale</b>	<b>Creative</b>	39	7.641	1.495	1.286	>0.05
	<b>Non creative</b>	121	8.074	1.924		

<0.01 = highly significant  
 <0.05 = significant  
 >0.05 = insignificant

From Table 3.4, it is evident that the t- value on the first dimension of personality, i.e., psychoticism of creative and non-creative secondary students is 1.743 which is insignificant at 0.05 level. No significant difference exists between the two groups on psychoticism. For the second dimension of personality i.e., extraversion, the t-value is

1.001 which is insignificant at 0.05 level, indicating no significant difference on extraversion between the two groups. The t-value on the third dimension of personality i.e., neuroticism is 2.086 which is significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that the creative and non-creative students differ significantly on neuroticism. Further, the mean score reveals that non-creative secondary students (6.727) are found to be higher on neuroticism as compared to creative students (6.077). The t-value for the last dimension of personality i.e., lie scale is 1.286 which is insignificant at 0.01 level. It reflects that creative and non-creative students do not differ on lie scale.

#### 4. MAIN FINDINGS

Following findings have been drawn from the present investigation:

- Creative students are found to be higher on all dimensions of creativity i.e., fluency, flexibility and originality than non-creative students.
- Creative girls are higher on fluency than creative boys.
- No difference exists on flexibility and originality between creative boys and girls.
- There is no significant difference between creative and non-creative on psychoticism, extraversion and lie scale.
- Non-creative students are found to be more neurotic when compared to creative students.

#### 5. REFERENCES

1. Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt And Company.
2. Batey, M., Furnham, A., & Safiullina, X. (2010). Intelligence, general knowledge and personality as predictors of creativity. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20, 532-535.
3. Cattell, R.B. (1956). *Personality: A Systematic Theoretical and Factual Study*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.
4. Esfahani, A.N., Ghafari, M., Emami, A.R., & Baboli, A.T. (2012). Studying impacts of personality traits on creativity ( case study: university of isfahan's students). *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(4), 3457-3460.
5. Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychological Review*, 2(4), 290–309.
6. Furnham, A., & Bachtair, V. (2008). Personality and intelligence as predictor of creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45(7), 613-617.
7. Kaufman, J.C., Pumacahua, T.T., & Holt, R.E. (2013). Personality and creativity in realistic, investigative, artistic, social and enterprising college majors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 913-917.

8. Martindal, C. (2007). Creativity, primordial cognition and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 1777-1785.
9. Rogers, C. R. (1954). Towards a theory of creativity: In Andersons, H.H. (Ed.) *Creativity and Its Cultivation*. N.Y, Harper and Brothers.
10. Sanchez-Ruiz, M.J., Hernandez-Torrano, D., Perez-Gonzalez, J.C., Batey, M., & Petrides, K.V. (2011). The relationship between trait emotional intelligence and creativity across subject domains. *Motiv Emot*, 35, 461-473.
11. Silvia, P.J., Nusbaum, E.C., Berg, C., Martin, C., & O'Connor, A. (2009). Openness to experience, plasticity, and creativity: exploring lower-order, high-order, and interactive effects. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 1087-1090.
12. Silvia, P. J., Kaufman, J. C., Palmon, R. R., & Wigert, B. (2011). Cantankerous creativity: Honesty–Humility, Agreeableness, and the HEXACO structure of creative achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 687–689.
13. Torrance, E.P. (1962). *Guiding creativity talent*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall.
14. Torrance, E.P. (1975). *Preliminary Manual: Ideal Child Checklist*, Athens: University of Georgia.
15. Zeki, S. (2001). Artistic creativity and the brain. *Science*, 293, 51–52.