

## A Comparative Study of Creativity and Home Environment of Learning Disabled and Normal Children

\*<sup>1</sup>Dr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma

\*<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department Of B.Ed., R.H. Government P.G. College Kashipur, Uttarakhand, India.

### Abstract

The object of present study to make a comparative study of creativity and home environment of the students of the secondary schools. Affiliated by Uttarakhand board related to the learning disabled students and normal students. The study is restricted to only those learning disabled and normal students who are studying in the normal schools of by city and can communicate.

For this purpose sample for the present study obtained from three School of the Kashipur (Udham Singh Nagar) district of studying in VI, VII and VIII standards. In order to achieve the objectives and verify the hypothesis of the study. The schools were selected randomly following Uttarakhand board syllabus and located in urban areas of Kashipur. All the children's of selected schools were screened for the purpose of the study and 60 were selected on the basis of specific criteria adapted. Among the 60 selected 30 were boys and 30 were girls Chrome normal School.

A comparison of dimensions of creativity (fluency, flexibility and originality) and home environment inventory has been done among the total students between the learning disabled and normal students studying in Govt. and non Govt. schools. The conclusions were draw from the statistical experiment on the data. No significant differences were found. The results indicate that type of schools have no effect on nurturing creativity.

**Keywords:** Learning disabled, normal students, creativity, home environment

### Introduction

The concept of learning disability has generated more controversy, confusion among contemporary professionals than any other exceptionality. Definition of learning disabilities reflect great variation. This may be because of the field's unique evolution, highly accelerated growth pattern and strong interdisciplinary nature. Definition proposed by the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children in 1968, and modified by the Federal Government for the PL, 94-142 regulation is as follows: "Specific learning disability means a disorder in on or more of the basic psychological process involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in a imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write spell, or to do mathematical calculation. The term includes such condition as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia and development aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, or mental retardation, or emotional disturbance of environmental, culture or economic disadvantages."

"Learning disabilities is generic term that refers to heterogeneous group of disorder manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning or mathematical abilities, or of social skills, these disorders are intrinsic to the individual and presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction. Even though a learning disability may occur only with other handicapping conditions (such as sensory impairment, mental retardation, social and emotional disturbance) or socio

environmental influence (such as cultural differences, insufficient or inappropriate instruction, psychogenic factors), and especially with attention deficit disorder, all of which may cause learning problems, a learning disability is not the direct result of those condition for influences."

Learning disability can be classified into following categories: reading disability, writing disability, thematic disability, language disability, psychomotor disability, cognitive disability.

**Learning Disability:** learning disabled children are those who possess one or more of the following characteristics:

1. Scholastic under achievement.
2. Difficulty in either reading, writing and arithmetic.
3. Comprehension: Difficulty in understanding of spoken or written language.

### Creativity

Creativity is understood as a divergent process which is the generation of new information minimally dependent on known information, and the acceptable response to a given problem may be variety of emergent solutions characterized by fluency, flexibility originality.

### Home Environment

Home environment is the psycho-social climate of home as perceived by children. It is concerned with quality and quantity of the cognitive, emotional and social support that has been available to the child within the home. It consists of the following dimensions: control, protectiveness,

punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nature, rejection permissiveness.

### Normal Children

Normal children are those who have no physical, social and mental defects. They possess normal, social interaction and good classroom adjustment and has no history of failure.

### Learning Disability and Creativity

In our society, learning disabled children are normally perceived as uncreative. They cannot think in an organized and clear manner. However, this belief should not be accepted in face value. There are important exceptions and examples to illustrate this fact. For example, Albert Einstein had arithmetic disabled but he became a major proponent of nuclear physics. This fact itself explains that creativity and learning disability may not be casually related.

### Learning Disability and Home Environment

Learning disabled children are found to be engaged in more disruptive behaviour than the normal children. This is more so because of their incompetence in academic life. As a result of disruptive behaviour the parents normally create a disciplinarian home environment and this home environment may influence their creativity. If a child is suffering from disabilities he may be sunned by other. Even the parents make a comparison of their children. Comments by parents, siblings and strangers affect the behaviour of learning disabled which may influence their creativity.

### Need of the Study

In our country research related to education of the learning disabled students is significant, till date the learning disabled students have been segregated and their number in regular school is a question of inquiry. Researchers desire to study the creativity and home environment of learning disabled and normal students. Is the important factors of personality how they behave in the classroom and society? Do they feel happy and satisfied with their position in the society school and family? To answer all these questions the researcher has chosen this topic as an area of research.

The present study was undertaken to study the creativity and home environment of learning disabled and normal students.

### Some Related Researches

**Weber (2003)** [3]: found that community referred children performed more poorly than community non referred children on cognitive ability, academic achievement, attention problems and information processing.

**Martnez and Clikeman (2004)** [5]: The results confirmed that adolescents with another multiple LD (reading and math) reported proper functioning on school Maladjustment, clinical maladjustment, emotional symptoms index, attitude to school.

**Claxton et al. (2005)**: Additionally, the little information we have about creativity pretense two children; show the present study would update this body of literature. Second, we assessed deaf and hearing students in both verbal and figure all domains of divergent thinking in one study. Third, this is the first study to examine these issues in the current generation of the students, whose background experiences are most likely different from the experience of students in the 1970s and 1980s. Additionally, the instructional method defined

in that some students were given instructions for the assessments in a face-to-face condition (i.e., spoken English or sign language) versus a standard condition (i.e. written only).

Our research questions were:

1. Does the performance of the students differ from date of hearing students on verbal and figure measures of divergent thinking?
2. Do deaf students receiving standard instructions are translated into sign language perform differently than those receiving non translated instruction of measures of divergent thinking?

**Ebrahim (2006)**: Found 8 to 11 year old children scoring lower than hearing children in the facts of fluency, originality, and abstractness of titles, with not differences in elevation and resistance to premature closure. Some of the different results across studies may be due to the children having different experience fostering their creativity.

**Thomas and Singh (2006)** [7]: Found that the person with multiple disabilities are better in the area of self-help designs, communication, occupations and socialization in comparison to self-direction. The social maturity to person having mental retardation with hearing impairment is higher.

**Kongawad N.B (2007)**: In his study intended to find out the differences in attitude of parents sending their children with speech and hearing impairment to special schools. Attitude scales to 50 parents of hearing impaired children were administered. Timer 10 suggested that parents sending their children to integrated School were more satisfied with social development of their children. The study aimed at assessing attitude of parents of hearing impaired special schools and to compare the attitude of the parent sending their children to special schools and sending their children integrated schools 50 parents of the hearing impaired constituted 1 the sample. The investigator adopted purposive sampling for the study. To attitude scales to assess the attitude of parents of the hearing impaired children sending their children to special school and parents sending their children to integrated schools were developed. The study indicated that 73% of the parents unhappy over the known availability of the trained teachers and specialized teaching techniques in the integrated schools about 60% of the parents were found to be satisfied with the academic progress of their children reading in integrated schools.

**Rajni Dhingra, Sarika Manhas and Neetu Sethi (2007)**: result reveal that most of the parents was found to provide supportive environment to the hearing children and exhibited adaptability in adjusting to the special needs of their impaired children. The parents also reported incidents of negative social response.

**Marschark and Wauyre (2011)**: research findings based on the TTCT sacral assessment are also conflicting. The majority of studies suggest that the children nevi more nonverbally creative than hearing children.

### Objectives

1. To know whether learning disabled children are more creative than normal children.
2. To know whether home environment of learning disabled is more restrictive than normal children.

### Hypothesis

1. There will be no significant difference between the creativity of learning disabled and normal children in following dimension:  
1.1-Fluency, 1.2-Flexibility, 1.3-Originality
2. There is will be no significant difference between the home environment of learning disabled and normal children in the following dimensions:  
2.1-Control, 2.2-Rejection, 2.3-Nuturance 2.4-Protectiveness, 2.5-Punishment, 2.6-Conformity, 2.7-Social isolation, 2.8-Reward, 2.9-Permissiveness, 2.10-Deprivation of privileges.

### Delimitation

1. Only recognized institution affiliated of Uttarakhand board are considered for the present study.
2. No study to contain to include located in urban areas of Kashipur, (Udham Singh Nagar) of Uttarakhand.

3. The study is restricted to only those learning disabled and normal students who are studying in the normal School of by city and can communicate.

### Methodology

Descriptive method was used.

### Sample

Sample for the present studying obtained from different School of Kashipur (Udham Singh Nagar) city of Uttarakhand studying in VI, VII and VIII standards. In order to achieve the objectives and verify the hypothesis of the study. The schools were selected randomly following Uttarakhand board syllabus and located in urban areas of Kashipur (Udham Singh Nagar) City. All the children of selected schools were screened for the purpose of the study and 60 were selected on the basis of specific criteria adapted. Among the 60 selected 30 were boys and 30 were girls from normal Schools.

**Table 1:** Name of the School Learning Disabled Normal Children Total

Schools Name	Learning Disabled		Normal Students		Total
	M	F	M	F	
Vivekanand Inter College Kashipur	8	-	7	-	15
G.B. Pant Inter College Kashipur	-	15	-	15	30
K.P.C. Inter College Kashipur	7	-	8	-	15
Total	15	15	15	15	60

### Tools Used

1. Verbal test of creative thinking by Dr. Baquer Mehdi (1973).
2. Home environment inventory by Dr. K.S. Mishra (1989).
3. Diagnostic Test of LD by Dr. Smriti Swaroop and Dr D. H. Mehta.

### Data Collection

In the beginning the identified learning visible with the help of a scanning device in normal schools. After identification administrative home environment inventory and creativity Test tools. Letter on the scores were compared to see the significant difference between the learning disabled studying in normal schools.

### Statistical Techniques

Mean, S. D., 't' ratio

The analyses revealed the following conclusion:-

### Home Environment

#### Analysis and Interpretation

Analysis of home environment and creativity of learning disabled (boys and girls) and normal (boys and girls) studying in schools.

**Creativity:** Table 2 represent the mean standard deviation and t ratio with their corresponding level of significance in the various domains of creativity.

**Table 2:** Creativity

Dimensions	Learning Disabled N=30		Normal Students		t-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Fluency	18.43	9.4	30.3	9.3	4.9*
Flexibility	20.53	9.8	31.8	7.8	5.1*
Originality	9.8	7.0	15	7.3	2.8*

\*Significant at 0.05 level

For fluency, the obtained means for normal student and learning disabled were 30.3 and 18.43 standard deviation were 9.3 and 9.4 respectively, t-ratio was 4.9 which is statistically significant P 0.05 level(d.f.57, t 4.9 and P.05). This is placed in table 2. This indicates the rejection of null hypothesis at probability level of .05. It means that there is significant difference between the fluency of normal and learning disabled children.

For flexibility, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled 31.8 and 20.53, standard deviation were 7.8 and 9.8 respectively, the t ratio was 5.1 which is statistically significant at P .05 level. This is placed in table. This indicated the rejection of null hypothesis at the probability level of .05. It mean that there is significant difference between the flexibility scores of normal and learning disabled children.

For originality, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 15.00 and 9.8, standard deviation were 7.3 and 7.0. The t ratio was 2.8 which it's statistically significant at .05 level. This placed in table 2. This indicates the rejection of null hypothesis at the probability level of .05. It meant that there is significant difference between the Originality scores of normal and learning disabled children. Table-3

**Table 3:** Table shows t-value of combined Mean & S.D.

Groups	N	Combined Mean	Combined S.D.	t-value
Flexibility	30	48.76	19.47	8.04*
Originality	30	77.1	18.89	

\*Significant at 0.05 level

For total creativity, the obtained combined mean (fluency, flexibility originality) for normal and learning disabled were 77.1 and 48.76, combined standard deviation were 18.89 and

19.47. The t ratio was 8.04 which is statistically significant at .05 level. So here, null hypothesis was rejected at the probability level of .05. It meant that there is significant difference between the creativity of normal and learning disabled children.

### Home Environment

**Table 4:** Table shows t-value of learning disabled & normal students

Dimensions	Learning Disabled N=30		Normal Students		t-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Control	26.56	4.32	23.4	4.10	2.90*
Rejection	15.25	6.25	11.6	4.05	2.71*
Nutriance	17.36	4.67	21.00	4.46	3.3*

\*Significant at 0.05 level

For controlled dimension, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled 23.4 and 26.5 4. Standard deviation were 4.10 and 4.32 respectively. The t ratio was 2.90 which was statistically significant at .05 level. For rejection, The obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 11.6 and 15.26, standard deviations were 4.05 and 6.25. t-ratio was 2.71 which was statistically significant at .05 level. For nutrients, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 21.00 and 17.36, standard deviation were 4 46 and 4.76, t ratio was 3.3, which was statistically significant at .05 level.

These are placed in table 4. this indicates the control, rejection and nurturance of null hypothesis at the probability level of .05. It meant that there are significant difference between the normal and learning disabled in the control, rejection and nurturance dimension.

**Table 5:** Table shows t-value of learning disabled & normal students

Dimensions	Learning Disabled N=30		Normal Students		t-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Protectiveness	17.46	2.90	17.3	4.56	.162*
Punishment	27.73	4.75	28.93	4.23	1.03*
Confirmative	29.2	3.18	29.06	3.51	.162*
Social isolation	16.53	6.68	14.23	5.20	1.48*
Rewards	26.9	4.60	27.56	5.35	.515*
Permissiveness	13.66	5.02	13.56	5.64	.072*
Deprivation of Privileges	14.56	4.19	14.13	4.09	.401*

\*Not significant at 0.05 level

For protectiveness, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 17.3 and 17.40, standard deviation were 4.56 and 2.90, t-ratio was 162 which is statistically not significant at 1.05 level. For punishment the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 28.39 and 27.73 standard deviation work 4.23 and 4.75 respectively t-ratio was 1.03, which bar statistically not significant at .05 level. For Conformity, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 29.06 and 29.2 Standard deviation were 3.51 and 3.18 respectively, t-ratio was .162 which was statistically not significant at .05 level. For social isolation, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 14.23 and 16.25, standard deviations were 5.20 and 6.68 respectively, t ratio was 1.48, which was statistically not significant at .05 level.

For reward, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 27.56 and 26.9, SD were 5.20 and 6.68 respectively, t ratio was .515, which was statistically not significant at .05 level. For permissiveness, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 13.56 and 13.66 SD were 5.64 and 5.02 respectively, t ratio was .072, which was statistically not significant at .05 level. For deprivation of privileges, the obtained means for normal and learning disabled were 14.13 and 14.56, SD were 4.09 and 4.19 respectively, t ratio was .401, which was statistically not significant at .05 level. These are placed in table 5. Here, null hypothesis are accepted at the probability level of .05. It means that there are no significant differences between the normal and learning disabled children in the area of Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward, Permissiveness and deprivation of privileges.

**Table 6:** Table shows t-value of combined Mean & S.D.

Groups	N	Combined Mean	Combined S.D.	t-value
L.D.	30	20.68	8.28	.039*
Normal Students	30	20.5	4.36	

\*Not significant at 0.05 level

For all the dimension of home environment, the obtained combine means for normal and learning disabled were 20.68 and 20.5, combine standard deviation were 8.28 and 4.36 respectively, t ratio was .039, which was statistically not significant at .05 level. This is placed in table-6. Here null hypothesis is accepted at the probability level of .05. It meant that there is no significant difference between the normal and learning disabled with regard to their home-environment.

### Results

1. As regard to hypothesis 1 significant difference was found in the creativity of learning disabled and normal children. Learning disabled children were less creative than normal counterparts.
2. In respect of hypothesis 1.1 significant difference was found between the both groups in the area of fluency, in this area learning disabled children were found to be less creative than the normal children.
3. As regard to hypothesis 1.2 significant difference was found between the both groups in the area of flexibility, Normal Children were found more creative in this area than the learning disabled children.
4. In respect of hypothesis 1.3, It was found that learning disabled and normal children have significant difference in the area of Originality. In this area learning disabled children were found to be less creative than the normal children.
5. Regarding the home environment of both the groups in hypothesis 2 no significant difference was found between the learning disabled and normal children.
6. As regards to hypothesis 2.1 significant difference was seen between the both groups in the control dimension. Home environment of learning disabled was more autocratic than normal children. many restrictions were imposed on learning disabled by their parents in comparison to normal children.
7. As regard to hypothesis 2.2 significant difference was found between the both groups in dimension of projection.
8. As regard to hypothesis 2.3 significant difference was found again between the learning disabled and normal children in the dimension of Nuturance. Emotional and

physical attachment of parents with the normal children was more than the learning disabled children.

9. In respect of hypothesis 2.4 no significant difference was seen in both the groups in the dimension of protectiveness. Home environment of learning disabled was similar to the normal children.
10. As regards to hypothesis 2.5 no significant difference was found between the learning disabled and normal children in the dimension of punishment.
11. In respect of hypothesis 2.6 no significant difference was found in both the groups in the dimension of conformity, Home environment of learning disabled was found similar in comparison to normal regarding this area.
12. In respect of hypothesis 2.7 no significant difference was seen between the learning disabled and normal children in the dimension of social isolation.
13. As regard to hypothesis 2.8 no significant difference was found between the both groups in the reward dimension. Therefore it may be said that both the groups were provided rewards in their hands to strengthen or increase the probability of desired behaviour.
14. In respect of hypothesis 2.9 no significant difference was found between the both groups in the dimension of Permissiveness. It can therefore, be said that similar opportunities were provided to learning disabled to express their views freely as to normal children. Learning disabled have some opportunity to act according to their desire with no interference from parents.
15. Similarly regarding two hypothesis 2.10 no significant difference was seen between the learning disabled and normal children in the definition of deprivation of privileges.

### Conclusion

In this research researcher had kept a null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between the learning disabled and normal children with respect to creativity. Since creativity was examined on three dimension like fluency, flexibility and originality from this research it was revealed that significant difference exists between the above groups with respect to all this dimension. This significant difference points towards the fact that normal children are more creative than learning disabled children. This could be attributed to various factors including psychological dysfunctions, social reinforcement, school and home environment and cultural stimulation as a whole. There are number of factors which contribute to these differences.

In this research researcher had taken only home environment into consideration. Interestingly, it is observed that out of 10 dimension revealing home-environment only 3 were significant. For example, there is significantly more control on the learning disabled children than normal children and similarly, the learning disabled were also exposed to more rejected environment as compared to their normal counterparts whereas, the normal children has more nurturant environment hence it may be deduced that perhaps greater control and rejection contributed to lower creativity than nurturance. Due to autocratic atmosphere in the homes of learning disabled in which many restriction were imposed on children by their parents. It may be concluded that it influences the Originality, fluency and flexibility of learning disabled children that it is why they were found to be less creative in comparison to normal children.

Rejected environment of learning disabled i.e. attitude of parents of learning disabled children towards the child that he

had no rights as a person, no right to become as autonomous individual. It may be said that this kinds of environment influences the creativity of learning disabled children.

### Education Implication

#### For Parents

1. The creativity and home environment of learning disabled should be more favourable so that they feel comfortable and can grow with their potentialities.
2. The parents should praise them at every right step.
3. It is duty of the all family members that they support morally learning disabled.

#### For School

1. School system should be inclusive of all students and look for effective means of delivering educational service to learning disabled.
2. School system should develop more effective mechanism to identify student learning disabled and provide early intervention services which are multi-disciplinary in nature.
3. School system should develop mechanism to break down cultural barriers with students and parents through training practice and staff compensation.
4. School system should develop proactive, positive instructional discipline-policies, including classroom management.

#### For Teacher

1. The attitude of teachers forward learning disabled should we more trends and cooperative.
2. The teaching methods and approaches should be according to the mental level of the learning disabled students.
3. The teacher should use psychological principles to provide content material into classroom.
4. The teacher should motivate them and give individual attention in the classroom.

### References

1. Singh, Kavindra. A comparative study of creativity and home environment of learning disabled and non disabled children, a dissertation of master of education MJP Rohilkhand University Bareilly, 2001-2002.
2. Evans J, Lunt I. Inclusive Education; Are there limits? *European Journal Special Needs Education*. 2002; 17(1):1-14.
3. Weber. Neurobehavioral factors associated with referral for learning problems in a community sample evidence for an additional model for learning disorders, *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 2003; 35(2):185.
4. Biswas PC, Panda A. A study on attitude barriers to inclusive education, *Journal of Educational Research and Extensive*. 2004; 41(1):30-39.
5. Martinez RS, Clikeman MS. Emotional adjustment and functioning of young adolescents with multiple versus single learning disabilities, *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 2004; 37(5):411.
6. Bunch T. Students attitudes towards peers with disability in inclusive and special education school, *Disability and Society*, 2004, 19(1).
7. Thomas TM, Singh N. Social maturity profile of persons with multiple disabilities: A comparative analysis, *Disabilities and Impairments*. 2006; 21(1):21-27.
8. Shigra R. Study of family environment and social

- adjustment of hearing impaired children disabilities and impairments. 2007; 21(1):19-25.
9. Sharma B, Venkateshwarlu D. Influence of self-esteem of learning disabled and non-disable on academic achievement in inclusive settings, *Disabilities and Impairments*. 2009; 23(2):135-139.
  10. Sharma RK. A Comparative Study of Self-concept, Adaptive Behaviour and Home Environment of Disabled in Special in Inclusive Schools. Ph.D. on special education., 2011, 29
  11. Christophet M, Stanzione Susan M, Perez Amy R, Lederberg. Assisment aspects of creativity in deaf and hearing. High school students, 2012.
  12. Sharma RK. A comparative study of creativity of hearing impairment a dessertation of M.Phil degree, Alagappa University Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, 2005.
  13. Sharma R. A comparative study of home environment of disabled in special and inclusive schools. A research paper of *international journal of social and scientific research India*, 2015, 01(II).