



## A STUDY ON LANGUAGE CREATIVITY OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT

**S. T. Aruna Thevi**

Ph.D Research scholar (Education), Alagappa University College of Education, Alagappa University, Karaikudi.

**Dr.R. Portia\***

Assistant Professor in Education, Alagappa University College of Education, Alagappa University, Karaikudi.\*Corresponding Author

### ABSTRACT

Today's education is not same as yesterday similarly today's will not be the same as tomorrow's education. There is a need for updating of modern techniques time to time. Young people of today are very much creative and innovative. As the education system changes according to the new generation the students are more creative and intelligent. We are living in a technological era the word creativity is not new it is as old as man. Each individual shows in one way or other a special kind of creativeness or originality or intensiveness. In all actions of life. It includes such as facility, initiative, ingenuity, adaptability, spontaneity.

**KEYWORDS** : facility, initiative, ingenuity,

### Introduction

Man is a creative animal and he is predestined to thrive consciously for a object and to engage in engineering incessantly to bring changes and new things. We are all born very creative and screaming. God is the creator by his creation some are creative, imaginative, intellectual and foolish all depends upon the situation, environment, and heredity plays a vital role. Language is one of the most important and characteristic forms of human behavior. This article focuses mainly on language creativity of high school students. Language is a special state of the mind and it has a well defined structure and system for man.

### Concept of language creativity:

The term creativity is one of the vaguest, most ambiguous and most confused terms in psychology and education today. This is particularly unfortunate because teaching of creativity has become one of the latest and most flourishing fads and catch phrases on the current educational scene. Pupils are learning language, creatively the teacher of today must know their creativity and make them prosper by teaching them effectively for effective learning.

### Review of literature

The review of related literature helps the research worker in making him think about the research possibilities that have been over looked. According to Ronald carter (2007) in the topic "Respect to special issue of applied linguistics devoted to language creativity in every context" suggests that three main areas are identified as of special significant need for more empirical participant based research into processes and contexts of everyday language with contextual frame of aesthetics, the need for further exploration of different critical and salient moments in discourse when creativity is a key component in social interaction and finally the need for creativity link between language and literature teaching.

### Methodology:

#### Location of the study:

For the present study Kanyakumari district in the state of Tamil Nadu was selected and the researcher conducted the final study in this district only.

#### Sample of the study:

For the present study 425 sample were adopted among them rural and urban are the two different zones. In which they are subdivided on the basis of gender management and locality. The rural based boys are 69 and rural based girls are 125. And in the same way the urban boys are 140 and girls are 92 overall total of the both are 425. The rural schools are numbered as 5 and urban schools are numbered 6 and totally 11 schools were chosen for the research work. Random sampling technique is being adopted.

### Tools used for the study:

The tool used was the language creativity constructed and standardized by Dr.S.P. Malhotra, Department of Education Kirushetra University and MS. Sucheta Kumari

### Description:

Language creativity consist of sub tests like Plot Building, DialogueWriting, Poetic Diction, descriptive style and vocabulary test when as only plot building and dialogue writing are taken into consideration for the present research work.

### Administration of the Inventory:

It is administered as a group test. Therefore there is no right or wrong answers. So copying from your neighbor will also not help you in any way. It is mainly out of interest, imagination and honesty. As far as plot building is concerned it is of writing short stories for the given topic and framing consequent dialogues, and in Dialogue writing equal conversation among two persons. Suitable the topic. The maximum time given for plot building is 50mts and then for Dialogue writing its 15mts Only.

### Scoring Method

The nature of Language creativity test is totally different. The teacher are considered to be the judge. The tests are based on four factors fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration. First when one item is valid for fleecy 6 marks is awarded if it is good or less than 6 for flexibility 5marks is awarded, then for originality 4marks and then for elaboration 5marks so totally 20marks for each item the overall totally is 200marks and the marks are awarded accordingly.

### Reliability and Validity:

The reliability established by test – retest method is found to be for plot building is 0.87 and for dialogue writing it is 0.76 respectively.

### Objectives of the study:

The following are the objectives of the study

1. To study the language creativity of high school students
2. To find out if there is any significant difference in language creativity of plot building high schools students with respect to management, locality, gender, religion and caste.
3. To find out if there is any significant difference in language creativity of dialogue writing of high school students with respect to management, locality, gender, religion and caste.

### Hypothesis of the study

1. The investigator of the present study has framed the following hypotheses for investigation. To study the language creativity of high school student is high.
2. There exists a significant difference in language creativity of plot building of high school student with respect to type of management, locality, gender, religion and caste.

- There exists a significant difference in Language creativity of dialogue writing of high school students with respect to type of management, locality, gender, religion, gender and caste.

**Statistical technique used :**

Descriptive Analysis (mean & S.D)  
 Differential Analysis ('t' test & 'F' test)  
 Correction Analysis ('r' coefficient of correlation)

**Analysis & Interpretation**

Mean and Standard Derivation of Plot Building Scores of Language creativity of high school students of entire and sub samples

**Table 1 Mean and Standard Derivation of Plot Building Scores of Language creativity of high school students of entire and sub samples**

SL. No	Variables	Sub variables	Number	Mean	S.D
1.	Management	Government	389	91.56	17.91
		Private	36	96.94	12.04
2.	Locality of school	Urban	249	93.29	16.78
		Rural	176	90.22	18.46
3.	Gender	Boys	208	92.30	18.50
		Girls	217	91.75	16.57
4.	Religion	Hindu	357	91.29	16.86
		Christian	57	96.05	19.77
		Muslim	11	94.81	24.67
5.	Caste	OC	38	91.86	16.69
		BC	341	91.25	17.53
		MBC	15	100.20	14.08
		SC / ST	36	90.69	17.54
<b>Entire Sample</b>			<b>425</b>	<b>92.02</b>	<b>17.54</b>

From the table 1 it is evident that the calculated value of plot

**Table 3 Significant difference between the means of the plot building scores of Language creativity of high school students**

SL. No	Variables	Sub variables	Number	Mean	S.D	't' Value	Level of significant
1.	Management	Government	389	91.56	17.91	1.76	NS
		Private	36	96.94	12.04		
2.	Locality	Urban	249	93.29	16.78	1.77	NS
		Rural	176	90.22	18.46		
3.	Gender	Boys	208	92.30	18.50	0.327	NS
		Girls	217	91.75	16.57		

From the above table (3) it concluded that there is no significant difference in the plot building scores of Language creativity of high school students with respects to type of management, locality and gender hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4 'F' ratio for the Language creativity of plot building scores religion of high school students**

Sources	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	'F' ratio	Level of region
Between Groups	2	124.74	622.87	1.98	NS
Within Groups	422	1325562.14	314.12		
Total	424	133807.882			

From the above table (4) The calculated 'F' Value is found to be 1.98 which is not significant at 0.05 level Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in

**Table 6 Significant difference between the mean of the dialogue writing scores of language creativity of high school students**

SL. No	Variables	Sub variables	Number	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significant
1.	Management	Government	389	91.56	17.91	4.48	NS
		Private	36	96.94	12.09		
2.	Locality of School	Urban	249	40.59	11.91	4.12	NS
		Rural	176	36.04	10.09		
3.	Gender	Boys	208	39.16	13.03	0.80	NS
		Girls	217	38.27	9.60		

building of scores of language creativity of high school students of private school students mean score is high than the mean of govt. School students urban students mean score is higher than the mean of rural students scores. Girls mean score is higher than the mean score of boys. Christians mean score is higher than the others and it is found that plot building of language creativity of high school students is high.

**Table 2 Mean and standard deviation of dialogue writing score of language creativity of high school students of the**

SL. No	Variables	Sub variables	Number	Mean	S.D
1.	Management	Government	389	37.96	11.33
		Private	36	46.69	8.98
2.	Locality of school	Urban	246	40.59	11.91
		Rural	176	36.04	10.09
3.	Gender	Boys	208	39.16	13.03
		Girls	217	38.27	9.60
4.	Religion	Hindu	357	38.63	11.35
		Christian	57	38.40	11.65
		Muslim	11	42.81	12.29
5.	Caste	OC	38	40.24	11.24
		BC	341	38.30	11.43
		MBC	15	42.33	9.95
		SC / ST	36	39.63	11.87
<b>Entire Sample</b>			<b>425</b>	<b>38.70</b>	<b>11.40</b>

From the above table 2 it is evident that the calculated mean value of dialogue writing of private school students score is higher than govt school students Boys mean score is higher than the mean score of girls, Muslim students mean score is higher the other; MBC is higher than other castes so it is found that dialogue writing of Language creativity is average.

the plot building scores of language creativity if high school students with respect to their religion.

**Table 5 'F' ratio for the Language creativity of plot building Scores for caste of high school students**

Sources	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	'F' ratio	Level of region
Between Groups	3	1901.43	633.81	2.02	NS
Within Groups	421	131906.44	343.31		
Total	424	133807.88			

From the table the (5) the calculated 'F' Value is found to be 2.02 which in not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in plot building scores of Language creativity of high school students with respect to caste.

From the table 6, it is noted that there is no significant difference in dialogue writing scores of language creativity of high school students with respect to type of management, locality and gender. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 7 'F' ratio of the Language creativity of dialogue writing scores for religion of high school students**

Sources	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	'F' ratio	Level of Significant
Between groups	2	266.20	133.104	0.79	NS
Within groups	422	70610.26	167.323		
<b>Total</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>70876.47</b>			

From the table 7, it is found that there is no significant difference in the dialogue writing scores of Language creativity of high school students with respect to their religion. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 8 'F' ratio for the Language creativity of dialogue writing scores for castes of high school students**

Sources	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	'F' ratio	Level of Significant
Between groups	3	716.019	238.67	1.43	NS
Within groups	421	6916.45	166.652		
<b>Total</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>7071.47</b>			

From the table 8, it is found that there is no significant difference in the dialogue writing scores of Language creativity of high school students with respect to their caste. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Findings of the Research**

1. The mean and standard derivation of plot building of Language creativity of high school students of private management, urban locality, boys of Christian religion and caste of MBC are high.
2. The mean and standard derivation of dialogue writing of Language creativity of high school students of private management urban locality, Muslim boys of MBC are average.
3. There is no significant difference found between government and private high school students with respect to plot building of language creativity.
4. There is no significant difference found between rural and urban high school students with respect to plot building of Language creativity.
5. There is no significant difference found between boys and girls of high school students with respect to plot building of Language creativity.
6. There is no significant difference found in plot building of Language creativity of high school students with respect to religion.
7. There is no significant difference found in plot building of language creativity if high school students with respect to caste.
8. There is no significant difference found between government and private of high school students with respect to dialogue writing of language creativity.
9. There is no significant difference found between rural and urban locality of high school students with respect to dialogue writing to language creativity.
10. There is no significant difference found in dialogue writing of language creativity of high school students with respect to religion and caste.

**Conclusion**

The study reveals that the students of high school students have language creativity ever then the school teachers, parents and the

government should also take positive step to improve language creativity. So that the students may be aware about the importance of language creativity. The better use of language help us the individual to express their feelings rightly and also beads them to right version.

**Acknowledgement**

The author expresses deep sense of gratitude to the Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India for the financial assistance through Alagappa University Research Fellowship-Grant No. Ph.D. /1245/AURF Fellowship/2015, to carry out this research work.

**Reference:**

1. Attenson I, Berne F and wood worth R.S "Dictionary of Psychology " New Delhi, Geoylsaah publishers
2. H.G widdourson, "Language, Creativity and the poetic functions" Applied Linguistics, Sep 2008, 29 503-508.
3. Rosemont Mitchell, Cynthia martin, Rote Learning, creativity and understanding in the classroom for Language teaching "Language teaching research, Jan 1997, 1 1-27
4. Ronald carter, common Language corpus creativity and rendition 8: 195-216
5. Ronald carter and Michal Mccarthy (2006) talking creating, interactional language creativity and context applied linguistics 25 : (62-88)