Review Article

DOI: 10.48165/jes.2021.37.2.9

ACS Publisher
www.acspublisher.com

Journal of Extension System

Year 2021, Volume-37, Issue-2 (Jul-Dec)

ISSN 0970-2989 (Print)
ISSN 2582-273X (Online)

Association of Personal and Home Environment with the Abilities of Seeing Problems among Rural Young Adolescents

Sumit Sheoran[1*], Bimla Dhanda[2], Krishna Duhan[3] and Bhavesh[4]

[1*]PhD. Research Scholar (Corresponding Author), [2]Dean & Professor and [3,4]Professor
[1, 2,3]Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) I.C. College of Home Science,
[4]Department of Agronomy,College of Agriculture, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana- 125004, India

ARTICLE INFO

Key word: Creativity, Home environment, Personal variables, Seeing problem (SP), Young adolescents

ABSTRACT

Most educators agree that the world requires innovators to solve various global issues including economic, social and environmental. Hence, the creativity and innovation have become worldwide areas of concern and it can't be denied that it is an important aspect of scientific skills and life. The study was planned to explore the mediating role of home environment in students' the abilities of seeing problem. The primary data was collected from 300 academically bright rural young adolescents. Chi-square was applied to discover the influence of independent variables (school environment) on the dependent variables (blocks and consequences creativity). Results elucidated highly significant associations of Seeing Problem (SP) with respondents' birth order, sleep disorder, monthly disease frequency, health risks, family size, number of siblings, maternal occupation, paternal occupation, monthly family income and role played by parents' in adolescents' creativity enhancement. While, type of family, land holding and parenting style adopted by parents were significantly associated with the seeing problem abilities of the respondents.

Introduction

In the starting phase of 21st century, creativity was recognized as centre of attraction globally. Bronson and Merryman indicated, year 2009 was nominated as the European Year of Creativity and Innovation with the slogan "Imagine-Create-Innovate". The mission of this programme was to raise awareness on the importance of creativity for personal social and economic development. In China, creativity is perceived to be of national priority in various government policies (Xi Jinping, 2017). Schools are focusing on a problem-based learning approach in education that allows for more innovative thinking among students (West-Knights, 2017). Educationists (Couros, 2015; Robinson, 2011, Zhao, 2012) concluded that perhaps as a backlash from decades of elevated stakes assessment that determine knowledge acquisition resulting in stress on mimetic instruction in the schools, require transformations in teaching and learning that sets creative and critical thinking at the forefront.

*Corresponding author.
E-mail address: sumitisheoran13@gmail.com (Sumit Sheoran)
Received 12-12-2021; Accepted 17-11-2021

This special issue devoted to the theme of creativity, perceives creativity from different angles that are particularly relevant to education, from the neuroscience on what manipulates creativity and global visions on creativity to specific programs that aim the development of creativity. Efforts toward nurturing creativity in public schools, higher education and teacher education are represented. Schreiber (2015) emphasized on personal and professional experiences gained from over 20 years working in the educational system to illustrate the dearth of creativity in both public schools and teacher preparation programs. He felt the need of re-modeling in current teacher education as a contributing factor in creative ability building.

Zhou (2012) provided rationalized review of the neuroscience research on the association between creativity and intelligence. Zhou also asserted that, despite imperative findings in cognitive neuroscience that can improve classroom practice, there has been very little research on inculcating creativity in education policy. Additionally, Zhou pointed out the requirement for policy makers to come up with assessment programs that assess the effectiveness of creativity based education for culturally diverse student populations. Jules and Sundberg (2019) implemented the research results of their quantitative content analysis of 21st century learning capabilities to discover the connection between proposal and reality. On the basis of their analysis, they suggested that creativity and innovation should be incorporated in every subject in order to ensure employability and longevity in the intelligent economy. Layman (2013) explored the perspectives of families who had the alternative to decide between educational programs from traditional program or a creativity based program. The results revealed that parents' perception on the importance of creativity in life and opportunity for creativity influences their decisions while selecting educational program for their children. Additionally, the nurturing of creativity for parents appeared to be more imperative for high school students than for young students. Miller (2019) indicated that creative coursework is a considerably positive forecaster of confidence in various skills and abilities that would assist students prepare for different work settings. This article tends to support the opinion that there is a crisis in imbibing creativity in education while offering insight into the environments where creativity flourishes. While there are varying views of what creativity is and why it is important, this issue tend to agree that creativity requires being an intentional goal in education. There is also a thread in the article that recommends the development of creativity which engages modeling of the creative process and opportunity for creativity in secure environments where learners are enthusiastic to take risks, learn from mistakes, collaborate, follow and adopt their interests.

Methodology

The study was conducted on 300 rural young adolescent boys and girls of age group 12 to 14 years from Hisar District of Haryana, India. The participants were chosen on criterion-basis and the criterion was kept their academic brightness. The independent variables (home environment) and dependent variable (seeing problem) were examined in order to determine the association of young adolescents' creative abilities with their home environment.

To collect data all the respondents were personally interviewed by the researcher. Raw data regarding all independent variables was collected with self-developed questionnaire-cum-interview schedule. While, the data pertaining to dependent variables was collected by using standardized Passi Test of Creativity developed by B.K. Passi, 2006.The data was analyzed and interpreted by using Statistical Package for the Social- Science (SPSS) to calculate Chi-square test.

Results and Discussion

Highly significant associations of Seeing Problem (SP) were observed with respondents' birth order (χ^2= 14.89, p<0.01), sleep disorder (χ^2= 15.20, p<0.01), monthly disease frequency (χ^2= 13.18, p<0.01), and health risks (χ^2= 19.65, p<0.01). The research results were also supported by Aquil & Ahamad (2015) and Tehlan (2015), who also revealed that family variables influence the creativity of students positively irrespective of their gender. Deolal and Nayal (2021) also found significant difference between the male and female adolescents on the level of aggression. Age of adolescent girls was found associated with awareness level by Awoyemi et al, (2019)

Highly significant association of Seeing Problem (SP) was examined with family size (χ^2= 23.26, p<0.01), number of siblings (χ^2= 16.70, p<0.01), maternal occupation (χ^2= 12.72, p<0.01), paternal occupation (χ^2= 13.85, p<0.01), monthly family income (χ^2= 13.32, p<0.01) and role played by parents' in adolescents' creativity enhancement (χ^2= 20.06, p<0.01). While, type of family (χ^2= 9.23, p<0.05), land holding (χ^2= 8.79, p<0.05), parenting style adopted by parents in the rearing of their children (χ^2= 9.66, p<0.05) were significantly associated with the seeing problem abilities of the respondents. The research results were also supported by Harris & Goodall (2012), Lew and Cho (2013), Aquil & Ahamad (2015) and Tehlan (2015), who revealed that family variables and motivation influence the creativity of students positively. Whereas, contradictory results were recorded by Baral (2018), which stated that there were no differences in the seeing problem abilities of adolescents' across their home environment variables.

Table 1. Association of personal variables with Seeing Problem (SP) abilities

Sr. No.	Variables	Below Average F (%)	Average F (%)	Above Average F (%)	Chi square value
1.	Gender				
	Male	47 (15.7)	57 (19.0)	46 (15.3)	4.05
	Female	51 (17.0)	68 (22.7)	31 (10.3)	
2.	Age				
	12 Year	23 (7.7)	35 (11.7)	24 (8.0)	4.62
	13 Year	23 (7.7)	26 (8.7)	09 (3.0)	
	14 Year	52 (17.3)	64 (21.3)	44 (14.7)	
3.	Birth Order				
	First Born	36 (12.0)	32 (10.7)	35 (11.7)	14.89**
	Second Born	34 (11.4)	35 (11.7)	23 (7.7)	
	Third Born	17 (5.7)	38 (12.7)	12 (4.0)	
	Fourth Born	11 (3.7)	20 (6.7)	07 (2.3)	
4.	Caste				
	General	36 (12.0)	46 (15.3)	20 (6.7)	8.46
	Scheduled Caste (SC)	22 (7.3)	39 (13.0)	32 (10.7)	
	Backward Caste (BC)	40 (13.3)	40 (13.3)	25 (8.3)	
5.	Sleep Disorder				
	Never	42 (14.0)	59 (19.7)	31 (10.3)	15.20**
	Sometimes	47 (15.7)	61 (20.3)	30 (10.0)	
	Always	09 (3.0)	05 (1.7)	16 (5.3)	
6.	Disease Frequency (Monthly)				
	Quite Often	02 (0.7)	17 (5.7)	11 (3.7)	13.18**
	Sometimes	38 (12.7)	47 (15.7)	35 (11.7)	
	Rarely	58 (19.3)	61 (20.3)	31 (10.3)	
7.	Health Risk				
	Chronic	09 (3.0)	13 (4.3)	19 (6.3)	19.65**
	Acute	17 (5.7)	16 (5.3)	20 (6.7)	
	None	72 (24.0)	96 (32.0)	38 (12.7)	
8.	Physical Deformity				
	Yes	11 (3.7)	14 (4.7)	15 (5.0)	3.39
	No	87 (29.0)	111 (37.0)	62 (20.7)	

*Significant at 0.05, **Significant at 0.01 , Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage

Table 2. Association of home environment variables with Seeing Problem (SP) abilities

Sr. No.	Variables	Below Average F (%)	Average F (%)	Above Average F (%)	Chi square value
1.	Type of Family				
	Single Parent	00 (0.0)	02 (0.7)	02 (0.7)	9.23*
	Joint Family	54 (18.0)	62 (20.7)	32 (10.7)	
	Extended	14 (4.7)	26 (8.7)	23 (7.7)	
	Nuclear	30 (10.0)	35 (11.7)	20 (6.7)	

(Table continued)

(Table continued)

Sr. No.	Variables	Below Average F (%)	Average F (%)	Above Average F (%)	Chi square value
2.	Family Size				
	Marginal	44 (14.7)	29 (9.7)	40 (13.3)	23.26**
	Small	34 (11.3)	65 (21.7)	23 (7.7)	
	Medium	10 (3.3)	17 (5.7)	11 (3.7)	
	Large	10 (3.3)	14 (4.7)	03 (1.0)	
3.	Number of Siblings				
	Single Child	06 (2.0)	01 (0.3)	02 (0.7)	16.70**
	One Sibling	08 (2.7)	11 (3.7)	11 (3.7)	
	Two Sibling	38 (12.7)	35 (11.7)	34 (11.3)	
	Three and more	46 (15.3)	78 (26.0)	30 (10.0)	
4.	Maternal Education				
	Illiterate	37 (12.3)	58 (19.3)	32 (10.7)	1.73
	Up to Matric	45 (15.0)	50 (16.7)	33 (11.0)	
	Graduate & Post Graduate	16 (5.3)	17 (5.7)	12 (4.0)	
5.	Paternal Education				
	Illiterate	18 (6.0)	23 (7.7)	15 (5.0)	2.69
	Up to Matric	44 (14.7)	68 (22.7)	37 (12.3)	
	Graduate & Post Graduate	36 (12.0)	34 (11.3)	25 (8.3)	
6.	Maternal Occupation				
	Home maker	80 (26.7)	86 (28.7)	51 (17.0)	12.72**
	Agriculture	06 (2.0)	12 (4.0)	13 (4.3)	
	Private Sector Job	09 (3.0)	12 (4.0)	05 (1.7)	
	Govt. Employee	03 (1.0)	15 (5.0)	08 (2.7)	
7.	Paternal Occupation				
	Agriculture	56 (18.7)	60 (20.0)	39 (13.0)	13.85**
	Private Sector Job	32 (10.7)	32 (10.7)	22 (7.3)	
	Govt. Employee	10 (3.3)	33 (11.0)	16 (5.3)	
8.	Monthly Family Income				
	Less than 10,000	37 (12.3)	45 (15.0)	32 (10.7)	13.32**
	11,000-30,000	21 (7.0)	16 (5.3)	10 (3.3)	
	31,000-50,000	23 (7.7)	21 (7.0)	20 (6.7)	
	51,000 and more	17 (5.7)	43 (14.3)	15 (5.0)	
9.	Land Holding				
	Marginal	52 (17.3)	58 (19.3)	39 (13.0)	8.79*
	Small	24 (8.0)	33 (11.0)	22 (7.3)	
	Medium	14 (4.7)	31 (10.3)	11 (3.7)	
	Large	08 (2.7)	03 (1.0)	05 (1.7)	
10.	Parenting Style Adopted by Parents				
	Authoritative	21 (7.0)	33 (11.0)	26 (8.7)	9.66*
	Authoritarian	11 (3.7)	10 (3.3)	09 (3.0)	
	Permissive	53 (17.7)	53 (17.7)	32 (10.7)	
	Neglectful	13 (4.3)	29 (9.7)	10 (3.3)	
11.	Role of Parents in Adolescent's Creativity Enhancement				
	High	23 (7.7)	41 (13.7)	23 (7.7)	20.06**
	Medium	47 (15.7)	33 (11.0)	15 (5.0)	
	Low	28 (9.3)	51 (17.0)	39 (13.0)	

**Significant at 0.05, **Significant at 0.01 , Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage

Conclusion

From the study of it can be concluded that highly significant associations of Seeing Problem (SP) abilities of young adolescents were observed with various personal and home environmental variables such as, birth order, sleep disorder, monthly disease frequency, health risks, family size, number of siblings, maternal occupation, paternal occupation, monthly family income, role played by parents' in adolescents' creativity enhancement, type of family, land holding and parenting style adopted by parents were significantly associated with the seeing problem abilities of the respondents. Results of the present research study imply that creative abilities of the students can be improved. Hence, educators and parents must focus on enhancing students' creative abilities.

References

Aqil, Z. and Ahamad, E. (2015). Creativity and achievement motivation in adolescents as influenced by their mother's professionalism. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 6 (8), 56-58.

Awoyemei O, A., Adekunmi, A. O., Oyeyinka, R. A , O., & Ayansina O., A. (2019). Adolescent girls awareness of climate change in southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Extension Systems*, *35*(2), 1–8. https://acspublisher.com/journals/index.php/jes/article/view/902

Baral, R. (2018). Impact of home environment and institutional climate on creativity of high school students. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research.* 9 (6), 27520-27525.

Bronson, R. A. and Merryman, J. C. (2009). Do we all have multi-creative potential? *International Journal on Mathematics Education,* 41(1), 39-44.

Couros, P.K. (2015). Development and evaluation of creativity training programme for eighth grade students. *Indian Educational Review,* 9 (1), 95-98.

Deolal, P. B., & Nayal, P. M. L.(2021). Effect of Mother's Employment on Aggression of Board Students. *Journal of Extension Systems*, *37*(1), 67–71. https://doi.org/10.48165/JES.2021.37110.

Harris, A. and Goodall, J. (2012). Engaging parents in raising achievement: Do parents know they matter? (DCSF research report RW004), London. Retrieved from http://library.bsl.org.au/ jspui/bitstream/1/3469/1/Engaging%20parents%20and%20raising%20achievement_Alma%20Harris_2007%20.pdf.

Jules, E. P., and Sundberg, E. (2019). Teaching for creativity in universities. *Journal of Education and Human Development,* 3(4), 131-154.

Layman, N. (2013). A study of creative thinking of secondary school students in relation to parental disciplinary practices, school climate and need achievement. *Creativity Research Journal*, 8 (3), 309–315.

Lew, H. K and Cho, J. (2013). Creativity analysis for smart specialist of the Ubiquitous Era. *International Journal of Smart Home*, 7(4), 183-194.

Miller, J. (2019). Factors affecting higher order thinking skills of students: A meta-analytic structural equation modeling study. *Journal of Educational Research and Reviews,* 10 (19), 2639-2652.

Passi, B. K. (2006). Passi tests of creativity. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.

Robinson, S. (2011). Impact of demographical variables on non-verbal creativity among high school students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology,* 2(4), 105-115.

Schreiber, T. (2015). Level of student's creative thinking in classroom mathematics. *Educational Research and Review,* 6(7): 548-553.

Tehlan, B. I. (2015). A comparative study of creativity of students in relation to their home environment. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences,* 4 (4),189-197.

West- Knights (2017). The efficacy of play on divergent thinking of adolescent learners. *Journal of Studies in Education,* 2(4), 67-78.

Xi Jinping (2017). Creative thinking ability of Government and private school children: A comparative study. *Pedagogy of Learning,* 2 (1), 29-36.

Zhao, V. J. L. (2012). A study on factors affecting creativity and teachers impact on it: Students perspectives. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies,* 4 (6), 64-66.