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**Abstract**

The study was conducted with the general objective to work on the captioned title, “A comparative study of collegian’s on the non-verbal dimension’s of creativity- In Kashmir”. The main objective is to compare collegian male and female subjects on the various dimensions of non-verbal creativity i.e., Elaboration, and Originality. The N-120 subjects were drawn randomly and Baqer Mehdi’s non-verbal tool of creativity was administered. These groups were compared on its various dimensions by using recognized statistical treatment viz, Mean, S.D and t-value respectively to draw out the results of the said study.

The results of the said study depicted that the male and female collegian’s show no significant difference on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity. But on originality dimension of non-verbal creativity shows significant difference accordingly.
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**1. Introduction**

In a country like ours which is developing one and which is on its path of all round development and Expansion, it is necessary that the present trends demand much of materialistic progress. Ever since man has created all progress, in travel, communication or production all this is essentially due to creative activity of the people.

Teacher occupies a vital position in Education system in there hands lies the task of shaping the students. To be effective, the Teacher should to be creative and democratic. Creativity is the key to Education, and the solution of mankind problems. It is an important factor in leadership in any field of business, Engineering, Technology, Politics, Education and Agriculture. Creative acts effect not only scientific progress but society in general.

Considering the Educational scenario of a country and especially of our own state, it is obvious that what is essentially needed is the creative abilities of both the teacher and the taught to overcome the thrusts of the present scientific and industrial age and to find out a safe passage for development in various fields towards the prosperity. It is evident that among various personality factors of the adolescents. The creativity factor has its prominent role to play, especially in the educational setup. The fluency, flexibility and the originality components have to play a vital role for the adolescents to be venturesome, creative and conducive, whether in the institution or in the classroom’s for the learner to learn better and thus to have better personality development.

Theories and ideas about creativity stem from far back in history, unsurprising as Ryhammer & Brolin (1999) point out, given that the development of new ideas and original products is a particularly human characteristic. The notion of ‘inspiration’ or ‘getting an idea’ is found in the Greek, Christian and Muslim traditions and is founded on the belief that a higher power produces it. During the Romantic era in Europe, the source of inspiration and its artistic expression was seen as being the human being. During this era, originality, insight, the creative genius and the subjectivity of feeling were highly valued. From the end of the nineteenth century, people began to investigate the question of what fostered creativity. The first systematic study of creativity was undertaken by Galton (1869). His focus was ‘genius’ and there followed a hundred or so studies on this theme, defined as achievement acknowledged in the wider public arena. This line of investigation remained prevalent into the 1920s, when the focus in psychology shifted to the investigation of intelligence. Although Binet’s work included some investigation of the creative side of intelligence, the major study of creativity in psychology occurred in the 1950s.

More recent directions in creativity research, as indicated, a particularly rich and influential period of research in creativity occurred during the 1950s. Here the focus was on the psychological determinants of individual genius and giftedness. Empirical work formed the methodological basis for much of the investigative work, usually involving large-scale, positivist studies. Many would argue that this era of research was launched by Guilford’s (1950) examination of the limitations of intelligence tests and his investigation of ‘divergent thinking’. There followed a large amount of research which attempted to test and measure creativity, to pin down its characteristics and to foster it through specific teaching approaches.

Creativity is the answer to varied problems of man in today’s society. Innovations and discoveries of novel ideas and things ultimately lead to the civilization of life. The value and worth of human intellect is unlimited. Creativity is the greatest treasure of mankind. It is the cognitive creative talent that is pivotal in shaping our future. Creativity is a unique gift of nature, a highly valued human quality which has been known for a long time to have its influence on scientific, technological and artistic sphere of human activity. The rapidly changing demands and challenges existing in the world today have almost necessarily been accompanied with the creative thought. **Sing (1979); G. S. Sharma (1988); Buno (1989); Jain Smeeta (1992) & Mandal (1992),** reported the Indian Educational system is failing to envelop children’s talent and intelligence and proved failure to them for a rational and creative living that makes education to explicit the creative talent at all levels for the futuristic success and prosperity.

**2. Objectives**

1. To compare male and female college students on the Elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity.
2. To compare male and female college students on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity.

**3. Hypothesis**

* 1. There will be no significant difference between male and female college students on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity.
  2. There will be no significant difference between male and female college students on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity.

**4. Sample**

For this study, the sample was chalked out from the various colleges of the valley, but with special reference to the colleges of district Srinagar and Ganderbal respectively. Population for the said study was the collegian’s of district Srinagar and Ganderbal. The random sampling technique was used to draw N=120 subjects for this study, in which male and female subjects were selected tentamountly i.e., 60 male and 60 female collegian’s were taken equally.

**5. Tools Used**

1. Baqer Mehdi’s non-verbal tool of creativity (1973) was used for the measurement of non-verbal creativity.

**6. Statistical Treatment**

Mean, S.D and t-test were used for the analysis of the data, t-test results depicts the difference between Male and female subjects on the various dimensions of non-verbal creativity.

**Statistical Analysis**

**Table: A**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | Mean | S.D | SEM | N | t-value | Level of significance |
| Male  (Elaboration) | 1.052 | 0.821 | 0.105 | 60 | 0.8502 | NS\* |
| Female  (Elaboration) | 0.910 | 1.017 | 0.131 | 60 |

Table -A shows the significance of mean difference between male and female collegian’s on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity.

**Fig – A.1**

Fig – A.1 shows the mean scores of male and female subjects on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity.

**Table – B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | Mean | S.D | SEM | N | t-value | Level of significance |
| Male  (Originality) | 2.810 | 2.001 | 0.258 | 60 | 5.5697 | NS\*\* |
| Female  (Originality) | 0.933 | 1.707 | 0.220 | 60 |

Table – B shows the significance of mean difference between male and female collegian’s on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity.

**Fig – B.1**

Fig – B.1 shows the mean scores of male and female subjects on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity.

Key:

NS\* = Not Significant

NS\*\* = Significant at 0.01 level

NS\*\*\* = Significant at 0.05 level

**7. Discussions and interpretation of the results**

Table – A: The t-value of the given table (t-0.8502) shows that the table value is not significant at any of the levels, which infer that male and female collegian’s do not differ significantly on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity, i.e. the male and female mean scores didn’t show any difference and the results are equivalent.

Table – B: The t-value of the given table (t-5.5697) shows that the table value is significant at 0.01 level of significance, which infer that male and female collegian’s differ significantly on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity i.e., the male and female mean scores shows significance and the results are differential.

**8. Conclusion**

The results of the present study are as under:-

1. No significant difference was found between male and female college students on the elaboration dimension of non-verbal creativity. Which proves the hypothesis number one of this study.
2. Significant difference was found between male and female college students on the originality dimension of non-verbal creativity, which negates the hypothesis number two of this study after proper analysis.
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