

Language Creativity in English Among Student-Trainee Teachers

Dr. T. Uvaraj*

ABSTRACT

The multi-dimensional attitude towards any language in communicating the thoughts and ideas is referred as language creativity. The present study examined the language creativity of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers. A sample of 300 Student-Trainee Teachers were selected from Colleges of Education in Puducherry Region. The Language Creativity Tool was administered to Trainee Teachers. The investigation confirmed that there is a significant difference between student-trainee teachers with respect to male and female, urban and rural. In conclusion, the language creativity of the B.Ed. Trainees were low. Therefore, the Language Teachers at all stages of education system play a pivotal role in enhancing the language creativity of B.Ed. Student-Teacher Trainees.

Key words: Language Creativity, Fluency, flexibility, Originality and Vocabulary.

Introduction

Creativity in language is one among the secret of success for an effective teaching of the content in any discipline. Creativity is acquired as well as developmental in nature; whatever the case may be, whether acquired or development, creativity in any nature has to be practiced for fine tune. Thus Language creativity may be defined as the “multi-dimensional attitude that is differently distributed among the people and includes mainly the factors of fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration”. Past two decades, i.e. from 2010, there were only a little number of researches done on language creativity. In this line, Guilford, who opened the research on creativity in the Presidential Address to the American Psychological Association in 1950 where, he insisted the psychologist to conduct more researches on creativity and its associated areas. Stein (2012) associated creativity with several agents of constructs. The scientist, technicians, business man, etc. all have creative talent in their field of working knowledge. Similarly, one who teaches to a mass has a variety of language styles and usages which are termed as language creativity. Thus language creativity is an essential component to be enhanced for the better communication.

In the contemporary period teachers are less creative in the usage of language in the

* Assistant Professor, AKT Memorial College of Education, A.K.T. Nagar, Neelamangalam, Kallakurichi – 606202, Villupuram Dt, Tamil Nadu.

teaching learning process. All the teachers are more concerned about the performances of the students in the examinations. Due to this reason, many of the teachers fail to execute their creativity and to inculcate the same in the learners. Hence the creativity remains to be hidden within the teacher. Therefore, the teachers should know how to inculcate language creativity during the teaching learning process. But the prime concern of the investigator is to check the level of the English language creativity of the teachers. In this context the investigator conducted a research to identify the level of the creativity in English language among the teachers, especially B.Ed. Students. Henceforth the investigator framed the statement of the problem as “**Language Creativity in English among Student Trainee-Teachers**”. Teacher’s creativity is tuned well in the training period. So, the investigator selected B.Ed. Students as the sample for the study.

Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To find out the B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.
2. To find out whether there is any significant difference between male and female B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.
3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between urban and rural B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.
4. To find out whether there is any significant difference between Arts group and Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses are the tentative solutions to study the objectives of the study. The hypotheses were framed based on the results of the related studies. They were,

1. The creativity in language of B.Ed. Students are equal.
2. There is no significant difference between male and female B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.
3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between urban and rural B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.
4. To find out whether there is any significant difference between Arts group and Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainees creativity in language.

Delimitations of the Study

Though creativity is multi-dimensional, the investigator delimited his study only to measure language creativity. The investigator used “Language Creativity Test” developed by Malhotra and Suchita Kumari to assess the level of language creativity of B.Ed. Students. The investigator selected the B.Ed. Colleges in Puducherry region, affiliated to Pondicherry University, as the site for investigation.

Insights Gained From The Related Studies

The Researcher gained insights from the related studies conducted in relation to creativity in language. From the insights gained, the investigator identified the research gap. The creativity

in language was not incorporated properly in the teaching learning process in the mainstream schools. Thus the research gap was identified here, i.e. whether the researcher, acquired the creative process during the training or not.

Method of the Study

The normative survey method was adopted by the investigator in the present study. The investigator selected Three Colleges of Education out of seven Colleges in Puducherry Union Territory Region. Purposive sampling technique was employed to select the sample from the selected Colleges of Education. 300 B.Ed. Students from the Colleges of Education were selected for the investigation, i.e. to identify the level of language creativity.

Tools used for the Study

The Researcher used the 'Language Creativity Test' developed by Suchita and Malhotra to collect the data. It has five sub-tests, namely:

- (i) Plot Building
- (ii) Dialogue Writing
- (iii) Poetic Diction
- (iv) Descriptive Style and
- (v) Vocabulary Test.

Altogether, all the subtests will measure the level of language creativity of the B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers.

Data Collection

The tool LCT is administered to the sample. Two hours and forty seven minutes were given to the B.Ed. Students to finish the LCT. The collected data were evaluated with the guidance of the language experts like Dr. Clement Lourdes, Reader, Department of English, Pondicherry University and Dr. P. Raja, (Retired). The hypotheses were tested at 0.05% significance level.

Analysis and Interpretations of Data

Table

Mean and S.D. of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers in relation to Gender, Locale, and Discipline on Language Creativity Test

Sample: B.Ed. Students	N	M	S.D	t	Level of significance
Male	145	161.25	28.12	0.03	Significant at 0.05% level
Female	155	145.22	33.51		
Urban	142	163.56	31.25	1.25	Not significant at 0.05% level
Rural	158	161.39	30.71		
Arts Group	137	160.45	27.36	0.02	Significant at 0.05% level
Science Group	163	151.24	34.51		

The table shows the Mean and S.D. of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers in relation to Gender, Locale, and Discipline on the scores obtained in Language Creativity Test. From the mean and S.D. value: It is understood from the mean and SD of urban and rural B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language did not differ. In case of Gender and discipline, there was a difference in the performance of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The highest score on the language creativity test is 235 and the Mean score of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language is 153.71, which is low when compared with the high score given in the norms. Therefore the Language creativity of Arts and Science College student is low. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and the language creativity of Arts and Science College Students is low.

The Mean and S.D. of male B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language are 161.25 and 28.12 where as female are 145.22 and 33.51. The calculated 't' value is found to be 0.03, which is less than the table value at 0.05% of Level of Significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference between female and male students of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language.

The Mean and S.D. of Urban B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language are 163.56 and 31.25, whereas rural B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language are 161.39 and 30.71. The calculated 't' value is found to be 1.25, which is greater than the table value at 0.05% Level of Significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between urban and rural B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language.

The Mean and S.D. of Arts group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language are 160.45 and 27.36, whereas the science group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language are 151.24 and 34.51. The calculated 't' value is found to be 0.02, which is lesser than the table value at 0.05% Level of Significance. Hence the null Hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference between Arts group and Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language.

The Mean difference table shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers on creativity in language in relation to: (i) male and female (ii) Urban and Rural Students (iii) Arts group and Science group students. This table also shows that there is a significant difference between male and female, and Arts and Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers. This analysis and interpretation of data help the Researcher to proceed to the findings, recommendation and suggestion for further research in this area.

Major Findings

The findings of the present study are discussed below:

- The language creativity of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is low because the highest score is 235 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71
- The language creativity of male B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is high because the

- mean score is 161.25 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.
- The language creativity of female B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is low because the mean score is 145.22 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.
 - The language creativity of urban B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is high because the mean score is 163.56 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.
 - The language creativity of rural B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is high because the mean score is 116139 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.
 - The language creativity of Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is high because the mean score is 160.45 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.
 - The language creativity of Science group B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers is low because the mean score is 151.24 and the mean score of the total sample is 153.71.

Educational Implications

The investigator suggested some implications to be considered for the development of the factors related to language creativity and improvement in the achievement of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers:

- Opportunities must be given to the B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers for expressing their thoughts, so that the fluency in thoughts will enhance.
- Teacher Educator must initiate new strategies of teaching which must provoke the creativity of the B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers.
- Teacher Educator must create curiosity and innovations among B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers which make them react creatively.
- B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers are allowed to think and react critically in the given situation to enhance originality.
- Stress on acquisition of the English language must be one of an important task of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers.
- A strange response to a given situation must be rewarded. This motivates the B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers to think critically.
- Curriculum must be reformed accordingly to enhance the language creativity.

Suggestions For Further Research

The following are the suggestion for further research:

- Further research can be done by drawing a large sample of B.Ed. Student-Trainee Teachers by covering different districts and different levels of student.
- Further research can be done by drawing a large sample from various other disciplines by covering different districts and different levels of student.
- Language creativity must be studied in association with other variables like intelligence, Personality and achievement.

Conclusions

The Contemporary trends in Language creativity, focus on the development of the Student-Trainee Teachers to thinking critically. The teacher Educator should play a major role in bringing out the innate abilities of Student-Trainee Teachers. According to the results of the study, the investigator finds that the student-trainee teacher's creativity in language is low in respect of

female gender and rural teacher-trainees. There is an average difference between the language creativity of urban and rural student-trainee teachers, and male and female student-trainee teachers on language creativity. The student-trainee teachers who scored high marks in LCT have good achievement academic record too. Therefore, it is high time and the need of an hour to make the student-trainee teachers to be creative in all aspects of teaching behaviour. Henceforth it is recommended to enhance the language creativity of the student-trainee teachers for the betterment of the effective teaching and learning processes.

References

- Best, John. W and James, V. Kahn. (1992). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Pvt.
- Buch, M.B. Ed. (1979). *Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Survey of Research in Education*. Baroda: Society for Educational Research and Development.
- Carter, Ronald and McCarthy, Michael. (2004). *Talking, Creating: Interactional Language, Creativity, and Context*. Applied Linguistics. Vol. 25; No 1; Year 2004. 62-88. University of Nottingham.
- Garrett, Henry. E. (2006). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Delhi. India: Surjeet Publication.
- Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental Statistic in Psychology and Education*. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Jones, Victor. (1979). *Creative Writing*. London: St. Paul's House Publication
- Parthasarathy, N. (1987) *Rural India and Creative Writing*: Creative Writing: Writers Views (p-42). Gandhigram: Gandhigram Rural University.
- Radhakrishnan, N. Ed. (1987). *Creative Writing: Writers Views*. Gandhigram: Gandhigram Rural Institute.
- Rather, A.R. (1998). *Creativity: Its Recognition and Development*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
- Torrance, E.P. (1966). *Torrance Test of Creative Thinking*. Princeton, New Jersey: Personnel Press.
- Usha. (2003). *A Study on Language Creativity of College Students in Coimbatore District*. University of Madras.