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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"In recent years American psychologists and educators have given a considerable amount of attention to creativity and the creative process. Psychological literature has emphasized the importance of research concerning creativity. Barron (1) explains the need for more investigation into creative processes.

Beyond these local interests, whether individual or national, is the increasing recognition by man in all parts of the globe that our capacity for creative thought and action may literally make all the difference in the world. The power of scientific discovery has suddenly increased the stakes, both for ethics and for politics; in its crassest form, science serves merely national striving for power, but in its purest it serves that aspect of power involving the spread of our form of life and intelligences throughout the universe. 'Human creativity may prove to be the key to success or failure in mankind's quest for knowledge, in his journey beyond the bounds of the sure and the seen in his exploration of the unknown (1, p. 8).

In agreement with Barron, Rogers (15) says that a generally culture bound and passive people would never be able to cope with multiplying problems and issues that arise from rapid scientific invention and discovery. Unless nations, groups, and individuals can imagine and creatively construct new ways of relating complex changes, culture will perish. Man must be able to make original and new adaptations to his environment.
Moreno (11) states that the universe is infinite creativity. Conserved creativity, at best, truly represents power. As long as the universe was ruled by eternal, rigid laws, no place was available for explosive changes or uniqueness. "We can say with greater certainty than ever that the supreme power ruling the world is Spontaneity-Creativity" (11, p. 373).

Torrance (17) also emphasized the importance of studying creativity. He said that schools have cause to be concerned about the creative growth and the creative talent of children. This concern stems from traditional concerns about fully-functioning personalities, mental hygiene, vocational success, educational achievement, and social welfare.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to investigate the relationship between creativity and self-concept in grade school children, and (2) to discover if creative children see themselves as having traits that past studies have indicated are characteristic of creative individuals.

Theoretical Background

The major theoretical systems upon which this study was based was taken from ideas present by Rugg, Wilt, and Torrance. Rugg (16) had the idea that "the creative act takes its cue primarily from the inside-identification point of view; that
is, organically from the center outward, not mechanistically
from the outside looking in" (6, pp. 291-292). The organism
is active and self-directed. It is not just a reactive
automaton that is controlled by outside stimuli (16).

According to Wilt (21), fostering creativity in children
enables them to gain added insight into their own behavior.
The child's peers reveal themselves to him, and in return,
he reveals himself to them. Wilt states that "one cannot
express from deep inside without enriching one's understand-
ing of self and others" (21, p. 3).

Torrance (18) reported that highly creative children
have been found to rate significantly higher on: ease of
eyear recall, strength of image, availability of Oedipal
anxiety, humor, and uneven ego development. He suggests
that "an examination of the basis of these judgments reflects
what I would term a creative acceptance of oneself and a
greater self awareness" (18, p. 77).

Thus, according to these writers, creative individuals
appeared to have some distinctive characteristics. Among
these traits were added insight and self-awareness. There-
fore, if the creative understand themselves better than the
non-creative, it seems they would recognize certain distinctive
characteristics in themselves. It is upon these ideas that
this study is based.
Related Studies

Frank Barron (2) at the University of California found that individuals who did not yield to pressures from their peers described themselves more often as artistic and original than did those who yielded to group pressure. The individuals who classified themselves as original were found to some degree to prefer complexity and imbalance in phenomena, were more complex psychodynamically, were more independent, were more dominant and self assertive, and tended to reject suppression as a means for the control of their impulse.

Rees and Goldman (13) found that the highly creative were more domineering, aggressive, impulsive, ascendant, and less restraining. There was no indication that maladjustment was related to creativity. Also personality differences were found in the various fields of creative endeavor.

Reid, King, and Wickwire (14) discovered that creative children were more cyclothymic than schizothymic, and did not seem to be more desurgent than the non-creative children. A comparable criterion of creativity among adults and children was strongly indicated.

Harvey (6) found in his study that the person who was able to produce the more original and aesthetic poem, design, or idea was the person who approached a new situation in the following ways:
1. The ability to differentiate various aspects of the situation and to integrate these aspects into a meaningful whole.

2. An openness of self-system so that there is the ability to take new ideas into the system of system-object relationships and to change old relationships when change is called for.

3. Self-strength, so that having adequately differentiated various aspects of a new situation, these aspects may be realistically perceived and reacted to as differentially involving to self (6, p. 4434).

The study concluded that there are stable, definable, and independent variables that characterize a manner of organizing, seeing, and reacting to stimuli that has been defined by this study as the creative process (6).

Myden (12) took a group of creative and non-creative adult subjects and related these categories to personality characteristics. The results indicated that the creative population was characterized by a personality constellation whereby primary thought processes were not repressed but integrated with intellectualized or secondary thought processes. This was combined with a marked degree of introversion and inner-directedness. But these subjects also demonstrated a lot of affect toward external stimuli. These personality characteristics, if combined with a well-organized ego and superior intellectual endowment, seemed to be the sources of the necessary control and creative drives to turn inner fantasies into creative production.

The non-creative individuals as a group seemed to be more outer-directed and more conforming. A primary defense
appeared to be repression. Although they appeared to be superior intellectually, they seemed to function at a level below their potential. Their affect to external stimuli rated lower despite evidence of conformity and outward-directedness (12).

Jersild (7) divided high school students into creative and non-creative groups on the basis of teacher nominations. The study showed no difference in self-attitudes of the two groups. Creative students were found, however, to have higher social attractiveness and social confidence. Results indicated that creative students might have cultural advantages at home. The conclusion was that the stereotyped concept of the creative person being self-rejecting and withdrawn was not justified by this study.

Billings (3) found practically no relationship between degree of anxiety manifested and creativity. Results showed a tendency for creative persons to be slightly less self-accepting than non-creative persons.

Dysinger (4) discovered that creative persons seem to be superior in their flexibility, verbal fluency, and originality. They are more withdrawn, more sophisticated, more self-sufficient, and more radical in their social views.

According to Guilford (5), the highly creative especially appreciate humor and possess some facility in producing humor. As far as is known now, this might be true of the semantic
types only. A child who lacks humor may still be potentially creative in art or mathematics.

The creative child is not bound so much by reality. He is ready to change it or reinterpret it to suit his purposes. He demonstrates a playful attitude toward experience and takes liberties with what he knows and observes. At times he may be called a rebel (5).

Torrence (19) found that students in the primary grades, except for perhaps the first grade, can be taught within a short time a set of principles that will make them able to produce better and more numerous ideas than would have been produced without training. Torrence (20) also presents the following seven characteristics as indicative of creative children:

1. They have sanctions against divergency.
2. Creative children are not necessarily well-rounded.
3. Creative children like to learn on their own.
5. Creative children are always searching for a purpose.
6. Creative children tend to search for their uniqueness.
7. Three things characterize the psychological estrangement of creative children. First, they tend to gain a reputation for having silly or wild ideas. Second, ideas that are "off the beaten tract" tend to characterize their work. Third, they demonstrate playfulness and humor.
Levy (8) reports that creative individuals are able to use their special sensitivities and gifts in various ways so as to find new order from old order. These individuals often seek and live with conflict and tension and are more in contact with the unconscious than other people. They have insight and also the ability to carry through and persist with the refinement and verification required following the awareness of new relationships. Levy quotes Horney as saying that "the less self-conscious, the less intimidated, the less a person tries to comply with the expectation of others, the less his need to be right or perfect, the better he can express whatever gifts he has" (8, p. 77).

Many writers identify lack of creativity with conformity. Mann (9) found that individuals who conformed most to group opinions felt that they were well-adjusted. Extroversion was positively related to conformity, and dominance was negatively related to conformity to group pressures. Also conservative individuals seemed more apt to conform to the opinions of others. These findings are based on personality measures other than self-ratings, for according to Mann, self-description inventories seem to contradict results found by other personality techniques.

According to Marlowe (10) conformists tended to be more trustful than nonconformists. These results were derived from the Social Trust-Distrust Scale. Conformists tended to show
stronger dependency needs and were significantly more co-operative than nonconformists.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are drawn from the preceding theoretical background and related studies. They are as follows:

1. Those subjects who are rated high in creativity will be found to have a significantly different self-concept than those subjects rated low in creativity.

2. Those subjects who are rated high in creativity will be found to rate themselves significantly higher than those who are rated low in creativity on the following characteristics: independence, curiosity, activity, artistic ability, self-acceptance, organization, humor, dominance, aggressiveness, originality, sensitiveness, and radicalism.

3. Those who are rated low in creativity will be found to rate themselves significantly higher than those who are rated high in creativity on the following characteristics: submissiveness, trustfulness, cooperativeness, well-adjustment, friendliness, kindness, helpfulness, optimism, conservatism, extroversion, agreeableness, sociability, emotionality, impulsiveness, and hostility.
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CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 238 children from an elementary school in Denton, Texas. The sample was divided into seventy-one fourth graders, eighty-five fifth graders, and eighty-two sixth graders. There were three sections of each grade.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were two creativity tasks taken from Torrence's Minnesota Tests of Creative Thinking (2), and the Self-rating Scale devised especially for this study. The two creativity tasks were the circles task and the product improvement task (2).

The circles task is a non-verbal test. It is an attempt to stimulate four types of divergent thinking. The task is scored on these four types of thinking.

First, the test is scored according to fluency, which refers to the number of pictures or objects the child can make from the circles. Another type of divergent thinking on which the test is scored is flexibility, which pertains to how many different pictures or objects the individual makes. Third, elaboration refers to how many extra details
or interesting ideas can be put into each response. Fourth, originality is concerned with the number of pictures or objects the child makes that are rare responses (2).

The product improvement task is one of the most dependable verbal-type tests. It is also scored according to the four types of divergent thinking, is a complex task for children, and has a high degree of face validity. It nearly always makes good sense to parents, teachers, and businessmen, for they recognize what they feel a desirable type of thinking as being involved. The task is attractive to them from the standpoint of scoring and administration. It is interesting to most subjects, for it permits them to play around with thoughts that they would never express in more serious tasks (2).

The following are the instructions to the teachers concerning the administration of the creativity test:

1. You will notice that each test has a different number. It is very important that you keep a record of the number of the test that you give each child.

2. Hand out the test booklets and see that each pupil puts his name and grade status at the top of the page. Then read the instructions on the front of the test booklet to the class.

3. Instruct the students to turn to the second page of the booklet to Task 1. Hold up a toy dog for the class
to see as you read the directions aloud to the class. Instruct the class to start and time the pupils for eight minutes, after which they are to stop promptly.

4. Read to the class the directions for Task II, and let them start. The time limit for this task is five minutes.

A self-rating scale was devised to aid in carrying out the second purpose of this study. The original idea came from a study by Lipsitt (1) in which he took a number of adjectives and had children rate themselves along a five point scale. But neither Lipsitt's scale nor any other existing scale seemed to meet the needs for this study. The procedure for making the scale used in this study involved going through personality studies on creativity, conformity, and self-concept. From these studies, adjectives were taken which describe highly creative and highly conforming individuals. Only those adjectives that were agreed on in most of the studies were used in making up the scale. Attempts were made to eliminate adjectives on which researchers did not agree. The studies used in making up the scales have been reported in the preceding section under theory and related studies.

The adjectives were converted into simple statement form. Some of them were too difficult for most fourth, fifth, and sixth graders to understand. If the adjective was simple enough, it was used directly in the statement. The more
difficult ones were not used directly. Rather, simpler synonyms or some modification of the words were attempted. However, for a few of the adjectives, no synonym seemed to be available that would not modify the meaning. In this case, the adjective was used directly in the statement, and an explanation was written out for the teachers administering the scale, telling them the meaning that the word was supposed to convey. The teacher was instructed to read the explanations to the children.

Twenty-seven statements were derived from twenty-seven adjectives. Fifteen of them were adjectives used in studies to describe conforming individuals. Twelve were adjectives used in studies to describe creative individuals. The following five choices were offered for each statement: most of the time, some of the time, not very often, never, and always. A rating of zero was given for answering "never," one point for answering "not very often," two points for answering "sometimes," three points for answering "most of the time," and four points for answering "always." Choices were alternated so as to prevent a pattern of response. A number code was used to prevent students from having to put their names on the scale. This was an attempt to encourage honesty in answering.

The original twenty-seven adjectives were the following: independent, curious, active, artistic, self-accepting, organized,
humorous, dominant, aggressive, original, sensitive, radical, submissive, trustful, cooperative, well-adjusted, friendly, kind, helpful, optimistic, conservative, outgoing, agreeable, sociable, emotional, impulsive, hostile. The first twelve are indicative of creative individuals; the last fifteen are indicative of conforming individuals. The statements were arranged so that all the odd numbered items except twenty-five and twenty-seven were creativity items. All even numbered items plus twenty-five and twenty-seven were conformity items. (See Appendix for copy of test.)

Instructions given to the teachers concerning this scale were as follows:

1. This set of papers are numbered with the same numbers as the creativity tests you gave. Make sure that the child who got a certain number creativity test gets the same number self-rating scale.

2. Hand out the scale and read aloud to the class the directions on the front page of the scale.

3. Instruct the students before letting them begin that if they come to a statement that they don't understand to raise their hand, and you will explain it to them. On top of your stack of record booklets is a copy of the scale for you. It has a simple explanation written out for each statement. If a student raises his hand and says he does not understand a statement, read to him and the class the explanation for that statement. For statements 8, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 25, read
the explanations sometime while the children are working on the scale, even if students fail to ask about them. There is no time limit on the scale.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to obtain a measure of reliability on the scale. Since there were three sections for each grade, the reliability sample was compiled from the largest section of each grade. The sample involved seventy-four students. The scale was administered by the teachers of the three chosen sections. It was given to the entire sample the same day but at a time when the teachers found it most convenient and could fit it into their classroom schedule. The scores for each child were calculated and a reliability of .52 was obtained, utilizing the split-half method and the Spearman-Brown Formula for correction for attenuation.

Procedure

The creativity scores were obtained for each of the 238 students by administering the two tests from Torrence's Minnesota Test of Creativity. The self-concept scores were obtained by administering the newly devised scale. These were group administered by the classroom teachers. The creativity test was administered first. The Self-rating Scale was given approximately a week later only to the six sections that had not been in the reliability sample. It was
not necessary to readminister the scale to the other three sections. No certain time during the day was set for giving either of the measures. Teachers were permitted to give them whenever they could conveniently fit them into their classroom schedules. A number code was used to make it possible to match the creativity test and the self-rating scale for each pupil without requiring them to put their names on the papers.

After all the tests were given and scored, two groups were chosen. The scores on the creativity tests ranged from six to 130. The range was divided into three parts. Those students scoring fifty and below were put into the low creativity group. Those making between fifty and under seventy-nine were considered the middle group. This group was eliminated from the study. Those scoring eighty and over were placed in the high creativity group. Thus, the upper and lower third, consisting of ninety-six subjects, remained in the study. There were twenty-seven subjects in the upper third or high creativity group, and sixty-nine subjects in the lower third or low creativity group.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Significance of difference of the three means was tested by Fisher's t. Table I pertains to the total scores on the self-rating Scale. There is a significant difference at better than the .02 level of confidence. Thus, the results showed a significant difference in self-concept between the children rated high in creativity as compared with those rated low in creativity. The first hypothesis, then, was confirmed. This finding is in agreement with most of the present-day literature. Some of the implications of this finding will be taken up in discussing Tables II and III.

As indicated in Table II, there was a difference significant at better than the .01 level of confidence between the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creativity Group</td>
<td>69.3333</td>
<td>8.3798</td>
<td>2.5118</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Creativity Group</td>
<td>64.2899</td>
<td>8.8940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two groups on the creativity section of the Self-rating Scale. Thus, the high creativity group rated themselves significantly higher on traits indicative of creative individuals. The second hypothesis, then, was confirmed. This finding is particularly in agreement with Torrence (3) and Wilt's (4) ideas that creative individuals have insight into and understanding of their own behavior characteristics.

**TABLE II**

**COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW CREATIVITY GROUPS ON CREATIVITY ITEMS OF THE SELF-RATING SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creativity Group</td>
<td>36.2962</td>
<td>6.0785</td>
<td>3.0450</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Creativity Group</td>
<td>32.5942</td>
<td>4.9616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question arises as to whether the results would have been the same had the instructions to the subjects been different. To encourage honesty, the subjects were not required to put their names on the scale. The possibility remains that had they been required to put their names on the scale and told their teacher would look over their responses carefully, even the highly creative group might have made more responses in the direction of conformity. Such a possibility would be worth investigating.
Table III indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups on the conformity items of the scale. The difference does not approach the 5 per cent level of significance. Therefore, according to this study, the non-creative do not rate themselves significantly different on conformity traits than the creative. The rejection of this third hypothesis may have several implications.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW CREATIVITY GROUPS ON CONFORMITY ITEMS OF THE SELF-RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Fisher’s t</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creativity</td>
<td>33.0370</td>
<td>4.8570</td>
<td>1.0683</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Creativity</td>
<td>31.6956</td>
<td>5.6959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible explanation is that non-creative persons have less self-awareness, less self-understanding, and do not see themselves realistically. But here again the question arises as to whether the results would have been the same if the instructions had been changed so that the subjects thought their responses would be known and observed by the teacher. There is doubt, then, as to whether failure to respond in accordance with the hypothesis was due to lack of self-awareness or some other factor.
Another possible explanation is that non-creative individuals have a less positive self-concept. It may be noticed in Table III that the trend, although not significant, was in the opposite direction to that anticipated. Creative persons tended to rate themselves higher on the conformity items than the non-creative. Since the majority of the items would be associated with positive traits, perhaps the non-creative group rated themselves lower or mediocre on most of the items as the result of a less positive self-concept than those in the high creativity group. Such an idea might be implied in Myden's (2) study in which he reported that although the non-creative may appear to be superior intellectually, they seemed to function at a level below their potential. Lecky (1) would agree that such behavior is associated with a negative self-concept, and the behavior of individuals is consistent with their self-concept.

The creative individuals rated themselves higher on both sections of the scale. Here again, Torrence (3) and Wilt's (4) idea that the creative have insight and self-understanding seems to be a plausible explanation. That is, creative persons may not only be aware of the distinctive characteristics in their behavior, but they also recognize traits in themselves that less creative persons have.
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CHAPeR IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between creativity and self-concept in children. The study was specially designed to determine if those highly creative see themselves as having traits that are most characteristic of creative individuals, and if those less creative see themselves as having traits most characteristic of conforming individuals.

The subjects were 238 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders from an elementary school in Denton, Texas. Each student was administered two tasks of Torrence's Minnesota Tests of Creative Thinking and the Self-rating Scale which was devised for this study. Two groups, a high and low creativity group, were chosen on the basis of the creativity scores.

The assumption was that there would be a significant difference between the self-rating scores of the two groups. The degree of significance was obtained through the use of Fisher's $t$. The level of significance was set at .05. Three $t$ scores were run on the data. One was significant at the .02 level of confidence. Another was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The other was not significant.
Conclusions

The first hypothesis postulated that there would be a significant over-all difference between self-concepts of children rated high in creativity as compared with those rated low in creativity. This hypothesis was confirmed at the .02 level of confidence. This is in agreement with the theories of present-day literature.

The second hypothesis postulated that those rated high in creativity would rate themselves significantly higher than the low creativity group on traits that had been found by previous studies to be most characteristic of creative children. This hypothesis was also confirmed with a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. This finding seems to be in agreement with the theories of Wilt (2) and Torrence (1) that the highly creative have a relatively large degree of insight and self-awareness.

The third hypothesis predicted that those rated low in creativity would rate themselves significantly higher than the high creativity group on traits that had not been found to be most characteristic of creative children, primarily those traits indicating conformity. This postulation was not confirmed by this study, as results did not show a difference significant to the .05 level of confidence. However, there was a trend in opposition to that postulated in the hypothesis.
Thus, there was a tendency for the highly creative to rate themselves higher on all the self-rating items than the non-creative.

Recommendations

There are several recommendations for further study that appear to be suggested by the results of this research. One suggestion would be a replication of this study, but utilizing a different set of measures. The measures involved in this study demand much research before predictive validity can be placed on the obtained scores.

Another recommendation is that the study be replicated, but taking care to get intelligence and achievement scores on the subjects and involve the middle group of subjects rather than just a high and low group. Although present literature suggests that intelligence is not necessarily related to creativity, there is a possibility that intellectual and achievement factors could have entered in, since the groups were divided on the basis of extremely high and low scores and, since one of the creativity tasks did involve some verbal ability.
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APPENDIX

SELF-RATING SCALE

Directions: Below are a number of questions. Look at each question carefully, and then check one of the five choices on the right side of the page that tells how that question describes you as a person. Be sure to check the one that describes you and no one else. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. You will not be timed. You do not have to sign your name, so no one but you will know what answers you give.

1. Do you like to make your own decisions about what you do instead of letting your parents or teacher make them for you?  
   ___ never  
   ___ not very often  
   ___ sometimes  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ always

2. Do you give in to people?  
   ___ sometimes  
   ___ never  
   ___ always  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ not very often

3. Are you curious?  
   ___ always  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ sometimes  
   ___ not very often  
   ___ never

4. Do you trust other people?  
   ___ not very often  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ always  
   ___ never  
   ___ sometimes

5. Had you rather take part in something that is going on than to sit back and watch?  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ always  
   ___ not very often  
   ___ never  
   ___ sometimes

6. Do you co-operate with other people?  
   ___ never  
   ___ not very often  
   ___ sometimes  
   ___ most of the time  
   ___ always
7. Are you good at art, such as painting and making things?

8. Are you a well-adjusted person for your age?

9. Do you accept yourself as you are without always wishing you were different?

10. Are you a friendly person?

11. Do you plan or organize the things you do?

12. Are you kind to people?

13. Do you have a good sense of humor?

14. Do you help other people?
15. Do you tell other people what to do?  

16. Do you look for the best in things?  

17. How aggressive are you?  

18. Are you conservative?  

19. Do you try to think up ways of doing things no one else has ever thought of?  

20. Do you have an outgoing personality?  

21. How sensitive are you?  

22. Do you go along with and agree with other people?
23. Are you radical?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How much do you like to stay around other people?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How emotional are you?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Do you do things suddenly without thinking about it first?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. How often do you feel very angry as if to fight with someone?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: Below are a number of questions. Look at each question carefully, and then check one of the five choices on the right side of the page that tells how that question describes you as a person. Be sure to check the one that describes you and no one else. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. You will not be timed. You do not have to sign your name, so no one but you will know what answers you give.

1. Do you like to make your own decisions about what you do instead of letting your parents or teacher make them for you? This means do you like to do things with as little help as possible?
   - never
   - not very often
   - sometimes
   - most of the time
   - always

2. Do you give in to people? Do you do things people want you to do even if you are not sure you should or not?
   - sometimes
   - never
   - always
   - most of the time
   - not very often

3. Are you curious? Do you wonder about things such as how they were made and how they work?
   - always
   - most of the time
   - sometimes
   - not very often
   - never

4. Do you trust other people? Do you think you can depend on other people? Will they help you when you need help, and do they do what they say they are going to do?
   - not very often
   - most of the time
   - always
   - never
   - sometimes

5. Had you rather take part in something that is going on than to sit back and watch? For example, had you rather play in a game than watch others play? How much do you like to be busy at something?
   - most of the time
   - always
   - not very often
   - never
   - sometimes
6. Do you co-operate with other people?
   Are you willing to help out with projects that everyone is working on in the classroom or at home?
   __never
   __not very often
   __sometimes
   __most of the time
   __always

7. Are you good at art, such as painting and making things?
   Self-explanatory
   __never
   __not very often
   __sometimes
   __most of the time
   __always

8. Are you a well-adjusted person for your age?
   Do you think you are as grown up as you are supposed to be for your age?
   __always
   __most of the time
   __sometimes
   __not very often
   __never

9. Do you accept yourself as you are without always wishing you were different?
   Do you like being yourself?
   __most of the time
   __always
   __not very often
   __never

10. Are you a friendly person?
    Do you speak to people on the street or wherever you go?
    __never
    __not very often
    __sometimes
    __most of the time

11. Do you plan or organize the things you do?
    Do you keep the things that belong to you neat and in order? Do you plan how to do something before doing it?
    __never
    __not very often
    __sometimes
    __most of the time
    __always

12. Are you kind to people?
    Are you nice to people?
    __sometimes
    __never
    __always
    __most of the time
    __not very often

13. Do you have a good sense of humor?
    Do a lot of things you see seem funny to you? Do you like to be funny yourself?
    __always
    __most of the time
    __sometimes
    __not very often
    __never
14. Do you help other people?
   Self-explanatory

15. Do you tell other people what to do?
   Do you like to tell your friends what they should do about things?

16. Do you look for the best in things?
   Do you look at the bright side or good side of things instead of the bad side?

17. How aggressive are you?
   Do you try real hard to be the best in your class in your school work? Or, do you try hard to win when playing a game?

18. Are you conservative?
   Are you careful not to waste things or throw away things even if you think you may never need that thing again?

19. Do you try to think up ways of doing things no one else has ever thought of?
   Self-explanatory

20. Do you have an outgoing personality?
   Are you interested in other people? Do you go out and meet new people instead of waiting for them to come meet you first?

21. How sensitive are you?
   Do you get your feelings hurt easily? Do you worry about what other people think and say about you?
22. Do you go along with and agree with other people?  
Do you think the same way about things that most other people do?  

23. Are you radical?   
Do people consider your ideas about some things to be very different from most people's ideas? Are your ideas considered extreme?  

24. How much do you like to stay around other people?  
Self-explanatory  

25. How emotional are you?  
Is it easy for you to become happy or sad real quick? Do you get real excited or real upset about things?  

26. Do you do things suddenly without thinking about it first?  
Do you do whatever you feel like doing whenever you feel like doing it?  

27. How often do you feel very angry as if to fight with someone?  
Self-explanatory
INTRODUCTION: The tasks in this booklet are a test of your ability to use your imagination, to think of new ideas. There are no "right" answers in the usual sense. We want you to think of as many ideas as you can. Try to think of unusual, interesting, and clever ideas—something which no one else in the class will think of.

You will be given five tasks to do and you will be timed on each one, so do not waste time. Work as rapidly as you can with comfort. If you run out of ideas before time is called, wait until instructions are given before going on to the next task.

Do NOT turn to the next page until told to do so.

(For administrative purposes only)

Originality: _______________________
Fluency: _______________________
Flexibility: _______________________
Total: _______________________

CREATIVITY TEST

Name _______________________
Grade _______________________
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TASK 1. PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT. List below the cleverest, most interesting, and most unusual ways you can think of for changing the toy dog you will be shown so that children would have more fun playing with it.

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

6. 

7. 

8. 

9. 

10. 

11. 

12. 

13. 

14. 

15. 

16. 

17. 

18. 

19. 

20. 

21. 

22. 

23. 

24. 

25. 

26. 

27.
TASK 5. CIRCLES. In ten minutes see how many objects you can make from the circles below. A circle should be the main part of whatever you make. With a pencil add lines to the circles to complete your picture. Your lines can be inside the circle, outside the circle, or both inside and outside the circle. Try to think of things that no one else in the class will think of. Make as many things as you can and put as many ideas as you can in each one. Add names or titles if it is hard to tell what the object is.
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