

Comparative Study of Extreme Groups of Delinquency Proneness, on the Verbal Dimensions of Creativity – In Kashmir Region

Prof. Neelofar Khan, N. A. Gash

Director, Directorate of Distance Education, University of Kashmir.
Research Scholar, Department of Education, University of Kashmir.
showkat80ahmad@gmail.com

Abstract: The study was executed with the objective to work on the title, “A Comparative Study of Extreme Groups of Delinquency Proneness, on the Verbal Dimensions of Creativity – in Kashmir Region”. Firstly the objective of the study is to identify high and low delinquency prone adolescents, to compare these delinquency prone adolescent groups on the various dimensions of verbal creativity i.e, Fluency, Flexibility and originality accordingly. The 100 adolescent subjects were drawn randomly, Lidhoo’s delinquency proneness scale and Baqer Mehdi’s verbal tool of creativity were administered. The extreme group technique was used, to categorize high and low delinquency prone groups. These groups were compared on the various dimensions of verbal creativity by using recognized statistical technique viz, Mean, S.D, and ‘t’ value respectively, to pool out the required results of the study. The results of the said study revealed that the high and low delinquency prone adolescents show no significant difference on the originality dimension of verbal creativity. But on fluency and flexibility dimensions of verbal creativity shows significant difference tentamountly.

[Neelofar Khan, N. A. Gash. **Comparative Study of Extreme Groups of Delinquency Proneness, on the Verbal Dimensions of Creativity – In Kashmir Region.** *Researcher* 2012;4(6):1-4]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 1

Key words: Delinquency Prone Adolescents, Extreme Groups, Verbal Creativity, Fluency, Flexibility, Originality.

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.

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.

When we over view the literature the diverse opinions of different psychologists, sociologists and researcher's are as:-

(i) Beccaria (1764) relates delinquency with physique and crime, the delinquent offender's depicts on the intensive survey and research report grounds that the delinquency is directly related to physical makeup and the crime rate in the social set up. The robust physical makeup of an individual is appealed towards the acts of delinquency and an approximate high crime rate also reveals that high delinquency rate positively. The review of literature is supported by Gluck and Gluck (1950), Kavaraceus (1966) and Gluck (1960) depicts that the delinquency is not always associated with under the roof environment, but in some instances it is more related to personality makeup i-e, physique.

(ii) W. Healy (1915) relates delinquency with social conditions, The socio-environmental conditions are also governing the rate of delinquency. Several sociologists (Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Clinard, 1942; Merton, 1957; Reckless, 1955; Sutherland, 1937; Lindesmith, 1941; to name a few) have conceptualized crime and delinquency as social phenomena, developed through reasons embedded in the functioning of the social process. For instance it may be due to the association with antisocial groups and consequent absorption of criminal values. This group of scientists put the entire emphasis on the characteristics of different social conditions and social processes.

(iii) Slawson (1926) relates delinquency with intelligence, Delinquency and intelligence have positive correlation up to certain intensity level than after words does not shows any interactions i-e, some works show that delinquency is negatively related with intelligence, but certain survey reports shows as the intelligence rate exceeds so the delinquency.

(iv) Gitten's (1952) relate it with broken homes and Trenamen (1952) relates delinquency with size of the family, Broken homes and the size of family are the demographic criterions of delinquency. Using a psychodynamic procedure, different degrees of maladjustment among the delinquents were spotted by Schachtel (1951), Stott (1959), Shally and Toch (1962), Johnson and Szuerk (1952), Maitra (1965) and Shanmugam (1975) and many others. The overview of the literature and the works of above researcher's reveals that home environment directly influence the individuals behaviour either on normal or deviant behaviour.

(v) Glacer and Rice (1959) relates delinquency with poverty, Even in the current

scenario of this decade the Scio-economic variable is directly related with the delinquency. Those societies which are traditional in nature have agrarian economy, have interactions with delinquency ascendance as the poverty is severe.

2. Objectives

1. To identify high and low delinquency prone adolescents.
2. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the fluency dimension of verbal creativity.
3. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the flexibility dimension of verbal creativity.
4. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the originality dimension of verbal creativity.

3. Hypothesis

- i. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the fluency dimension of verbal creativity.
- ii. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the flexibility dimension of verbal creativity.
- iii. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the originality dimension of verbal creativity.

4. Sample

For this study, the adequate sample was drawn from the various higher secondary schools of district Srinagar. The population for the said study were 11th and 12th class adolescents of district Srinagar. The criterion of random sampling technique was employed to draw N=100 subjects for this study. Provided further the class wise criterion was taken into consideration to draw class wise tentamount sample accordingly.

5. Tools Used

- a. Lidhoo's delinquency proneness scale (1984) was used for the measurement of delinquency proneness.
- b. Baqer Mehdi's verbal tool of creativity (1973) was used for the measurement of 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 high and low delinquency prone subjects on the various dimensions of verbal creativity.

Statistical Analysis

Table: 1

Groups	Mean	S.D	SEM	N	t-value	Level of Significance
H.D (Fluency)	0.293	2.310	0.444	27	2.957	NS **
L.D (Fluency)	2.035	2.022	0.389	27		

Table -I shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the fluency dimension of verbal creativity.

Table: II

Groups	Mean	S.D	SEM	N	t-value	Level of Significance
H.D (Flexibility)	1.007	0.936	0.180	27	6.830	NS **
L.D (Flexibility)	2.824	1.029	0.198	27		

Table -II shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the flexibility dimension of verbal creativity.

Table: III

Groups	Mean	S.D	SEM	N	t-value	Level of Significance
H.D (Originality)	0.981	0.945	0.181	27	0.147	NS *
L.D (Originality)	1.021	1.063	0.204	27		

Table -III shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the Originality dimension of verbal creativity.

Key

- (i) 'H.D' = high delinquency prone group
- (ii) 'L.D' = Low delinquency prone group
- (iii) NS* = Not Significant
- (iv) NS** = Significant at 0.01 level
- (v) NS*** = Significant at 0.05 level

7. Discussions and interpretation of the results

Table -1: The t-value of the given table ($t = 2.957$) shows that the table value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Which infer that (HD) 'high delinquent' and (LD) 'Low delinquent' prone subjects differ significantly on the 'fluency dimension of verbal creativity', in district Srinagar.

Table -2: The t-value of the given table ($t = 6.830$) shows that the table value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Which infer that (HD) 'high delinquent' and (LD) 'Low delinquent' prone subjects differ significantly on the 'flexibility dimension of verbal creativity', in district Srinagar.

Table -3: The t-value of the given table ($t = 0.147$) shows that the table value is not significant at any of the levels, which infer that (HD) 'high delinquent' and (LD) 'Low delinquent' prone subjects do not differ significantly on the 'originality dimension of verbal creativity', in district Srinagar.

8. Conclusion

The various outcomes of the said study are presented on the basis of discussion and interpretation of the data under study as:

- I. Significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the fluency dimension of verbal creativity. Which negates the hypothesis number one.
- II. Significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the flexibility dimension of verbal creativity. Which negates the hypothesis number two.
- III. No significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on the originality dimension of verbal creativity. Which proves the hypothesis number three as true.

References

1. Baqer Mehdi, (1973). "Manual of Verbal and Non-verbal Tool of Creativity". Psychological Corporation of India, Kachari Ghat, New Delhi.
2. Carson, S.H., Peterson, J.B., Higgins, D.M. (2005). "Reliability, Validity, and Factor Structure of the Creative Achievement

- Questionnaire". *Creativity Research Journal* 17 (1): 37–50.
3. Chauhan, S. S. (2006). *Advanced Educational Psychology* (IV reprint ed.), Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
 4. Cox S. G. (2005). *The Cox Review of Creativity in Business*. London: HM Treasury.
 5. Craft, A. (2005). *Creativity in Schools: tensions and dilemmas*. Routledge. Dorst, K.
 6. Davila T, Epstein M.J., and Shelton R.D. (2007). *The creative enterprise: Managing innovative organizations and people*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.
 7. Domingues, J.M., (2000). *Social creativity, collective subjectivity and contemporary modernity*. New York: St. Martin's.
 8. Dr Mahender Reddy and Sarsani (2005). "Creativity in education" sarup and sons new Delhi- 110002.
 9. Dushkin, (2000). *Juvenile Delinquency*, McGraw Hill.
 10. Eisner, E.W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
 11. Gahan P, Minahan S and Glow H. (2007). A creative twist: Management theory, creativity and the Arts. *Journal of Management and Organization* 13 (1) : 41.
 12. Gash, N.A., (2011). "Demographic Profile of Delinquent Adolescents – A study". Lambert Academic Publishing (U.S.A).
 13. Gash, N.A., (2012). "Creativity and Achievement Motivation". Lambert Academic Publishing (U.S.A).
 14. Greg Dyke. (2009). Greg Dyke to head Conservative party's creative industries review.
 15. Hartley J. (2005). *Creative industries*. Malden MA: Blackwell.
 16. Healy G. (2008). *Unlock creativity in hard sciences*. The Australian.
 17. John Randolph Fuller (2008). *Juvenile Delinquency: Mainstream and Crosscurrents* (Hardcover).
 18. Jullien, F., Paula M. Varsano (Translator) (2004). *In Praise of Blandness: Proceeding from Chinese Thought and Aesthetics*. Zone Books, U. S.
 19. Jung, D.I., (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13, 185-195.
 20. Khan, N., (2007-08). "Creativity and Aspiration". (I-Edition) Rajat Publications, 4675/21 Ansari Road Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.
 21. Lidhoo, M. L. (1984). "Manual of Delinquency Proneness Scale". Psychological Corporation of India, Kachari Ghat, New Delhi.
 22. Mc Clelland David C., (1968) *Achieving Society*. Princeton, N.J. Van Nostrand.
 23. Mukherji, K., and Basu M. (1989). "Assessment of Delinquency". Wiley Eastern Limited, New Delhi, Bangalore, Bombay, Calcutta.
 24. Nermin Dydemir and Johnson (2009). *Schools and Delinquency Renewed*. (Book Review of London Publications).
 25. Regooli, Robert, M. Boston (2000). "Delinquency in Society", McGraw-Hill.
 26. Schmallegger, Frank and Boston, (2008). "Juvenile Delinquency". Pearson Publications in Education.
 27. Sugata Menon, (2000). *Young Criminals Crime and Punishment in Juvenile Delinquency* (2nd Edition).
 28. Susan, J. Terrio, (2009). *Judging Mohammad, Juvenile Delinquency, Immigration and exclusion at the Paris Palace of Justice*.

4/22/2012