

# LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 11 : 5 May 2011

ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.

Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.

Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.

B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.

A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.

Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.

Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.

G. Baskaran, Ph.D.

L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

## A Study on Language Creativity of College Students

Uvaraj. T., M.A. (Eng.), M.Sc. (Psy.), M.Ed. (Edn.), Ph.D. Scholar

---

### Introduction

Guilford opened the present era of research in creativity with his 1950 presidential address to the American Psychological Association. In this address, he alerted the psychologists to the need for work on creativity. His 'Structure of Intellect Model' has re-defined intelligence so as to include creative behaviour.

Freeman (1976) observed that it is necessary to differentiate between creative elements in several fields, each of which has its own special requirements as well as elements. The scientist, technicians, business person, etc. all have creative talent that pertains to the specific fields. Similarly poets, novelist and writers display a peculiar type of creativity in their writings that can be called as language creativity. Language creativity is very important to present the ideas effectively and clearly.

### Operational Definition

Malhotra and Sucheta Kumari (1990) defined **Language creativity** "as the multi-dimensional attitude that is differently distributed among the people and includes mainly the factors of fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration". **Fluency** is a quantitative aspect of creativity, i.e. coming up with large quantity of ideas, words, and ways of expressing them. **Flexibility** is

Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)

520

11 : 5 May 2011

Uvaraj. T., M.A. (Eng.), M.Sc. (Psy.), M.Ed.(Edn.), Ph.D. Scholar

A Study on Language Creativity of College Students

referred to as thinking up a variety of ideas and new way of dealing with situation. **Originality** is designated as uncommon with respect to figural, verbal of symbolic transformation. **Elaboration** is referred to ability by giving one or two simple lines on a complex object or given situation. Syed Malik refers “**College students** as those who are enrolled in three year under graduate course in Arts and Science College, in which first year Arts and Science group students are considered for the study.” (Dictionary of Education: 2008)

### **Objectives of the Study**

The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To find out the language creativity of Arts and Science College students.
2. To find out whether there is any significant difference between language creativity of male and female students in Arts and Science College.
3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between language creativity of Government and Private Arts and Science College students.
4. To find out whether there is any significant difference between language creativity of urban and rural students in Arts and Science College.
5. To find out whether there is any significant difference between language creativity of Arts group and Science group students in Arts and Science College.

### **Hypotheses**

The following are the null and directional hypotheses of the study:

1. H0. The language creativity of Arts and Science College Students is equal.  
H1. The language creativity of Arts and Science College Students is high.
2. H0. There is no significant difference between language creativity of male and female Students in Arts and Science College.  
H2. There is significant difference between language creativity of male and female Students in Arts and Science College.
3. H0. There is no significant difference between language creativity of government and private Arts and Science College students.  
H3. There is significant difference between language creativity of government and private Arts and Science College students.
4. H0. There is no significant difference between language creativity of urban and rural students in Arts and Science College.  
H4. There is significant difference between language creativity of urban and rural students in Arts and Science College.

5. H0. There is no significant difference between language creativity of Arts group and Science Group students in Arts and Science College.
- H5. There is significant difference between language creativity of Arts group and Science Group students in Arts and Science College.

### **Delimitations of the Study**

There are many factors depending upon creativity like fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration. But the researcher delimited his study only to measure total language creativity. The tool used by the researcher to measure Language Creativity is “Language Creativity Test” developed by Malhotra and Suchita Kumari.

The researcher confined his study to Arts and Science Colleges in Puducherry region which are affiliated to Pondicherry University. The data from First Year students of Arts and Science College in Puducherry region is considered for the study.

### **Review of Related Literature**

The researcher reviewed the previous studies conducted on the related problem area and articles related to the problem of the study.

### **Studies conducted Abroad**

Peter Carruthers (2002) in his article, “Human Creativity: Its Cognitive Basis, its Evolution, and its Connections with Childhood Pretence,” defends two initial claims. First, he argues that essentially the same cognitive resources are shared by adult creative thinking and problem-solving, on the one hand, and by childhood pretend play, on the other—namely, capacities to generate and to reason with suppositions (or imagined possibilities). Second, he argues that the evolutionary function of childhood pretence is to practice and enhance adult forms of creativity. The paper goes on to show how these proposals can provide a smooth and evolutionarily-plausible explanation of the gap between the first appearance of our species in Southern Africa some 100,000 years ago, and the ‘creative explosion’ of cultural, technological and artistic change which took place within dispersed human populations some 60,000 years later. The intention of the paper is to sketch a proposal which might serve as a guide for future interdisciplinary research.

Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy (2004) in their article “Talking, Creating: Interactional Language, Creativity, and Context” said when creative uses of spoken language have been investigated, the main examples have been restricted to particular contexts such as narrative and related story-telling genres. This paper reports on an initial investigation using the 5 million word CANCODE corpus of everyday spoken English and discusses a range of social contexts in which creative uses of language are manifested.

Mary Anne (2005) in her study on “Creativity and Language Planning: The Case of Indian English and Singapore English” examines creativity in Indian English and Singapore English. She highlights the differences between linguistic creativity and literary creativity in the two varieties and suggests that language planning policy and practice in the two countries are responsible for the differences found there. Implications for language planning are explored.

Gearóid Mac Eoin, Anders Ahlqvist, and Donncha Ó hAodha (2006), in their study on “Language minority children’s linguistic and cognitive creativity,” identified the effects of bilingualism on the linguistic and cognitive creativity of language minority children proficiently bilingual in Spanish and English. Specifically, they addressed the cognitive process of divergent and convergent thinking and the linguistic process of metamorphosing in the context of formulating scientific hypotheses. Together the linguistic and cognitive process is viewed as manifestation steps of common underlying creativity. The subjects were sixth grade students. The qualitatively high synthetic hypotheses expressed by the language minority children using complex metaphoric language in their second language, English, indicate that linguistic and cognitive creativity is enhanced by bilingual language proficiency.

Sayyed Mohsen Fatemi (2007) conducted a study on “Creative Language and Language Creativity”. The essence of creativity and critical thinking begins with questioning and challenging the boxes of clinging habits, ordinary and every day discourses, memory's impact, and the interference of association of ideas. It is here when the new horizons of thinking powerfully beam; it is here where the spectrum of looking into things in a novel way glows. Creativity starts with a journey inside and outside the existing values, prevalent practices, pervasive approaches and common modes and exercises. It begins with questioning the flux of order, the arrangement of presentation, the apparition of the happenings, the manner of unfolding, the ways of showering, the moments of satisfaction, the pleasures of certainty, the avenues of solutions, the mansions of conclusiveness, the comfort of sufficiency, the impressiveness of suppositions, the forcefulness of associations, the obviousness of realization and the easiness of acceptance. Creativity challenges the way things are and explores other ways things can be. Creativity fights for otherwise. Creativity targets the unknown, the unfamiliar and the unexplored. It searches for mystery within mastery, the opening within the closure, the possibility within actuality, the passage within the blockage, the revolution within stability, the disintegration within integration, the decomposition within the composition, the indeterminacy within determinacy and the light within the darkness.

H. G. Widdowson (2008), in his book “Language Creativity and the Poetic Function: A Response to Swann and Maybin” argues that the current renewal of interest in language creativity raises a number of intriguing problems. Strictly speaking, the reason for the problems is fencing the creativity in poetic form (p-142). According to the Formalist, Creativity is focusing how to express the content with appropriate words and sentence structures. But Creativity should not be restricted to a particular field or genre. It should be assessed in terms of fluency in usage of words, flexibility, Originality in thoughts and Elaboration in writing style. Hence the presents

study is going to assess the language creativity in terms of fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration.

### **Studies Conducted in India**

S.P. Malhotra (1990) conducted a study on “Effects of Synectics method of teaching on the development of Language creativity in Hindi.” The findings of the study were: Students who were exposed to the synectics method of teaching showed significant improvement on all the four factors viz. fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration as well as on the total scores of the plot building aspects of language creativity with the levels of intelligence in all the four factors i.e. fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration as well as their summated scores. The creativity affected improvement in all the four factors as well as their total scores in their descriptive style.

N. Sumangala (1990) conducted a study on “A Study of Language creativity of standard IX students in relation to intelligence, teacher involvement and gender.” The findings of the study were: There is relationship between the language creativity and the teacher involvement. Without the involvement of the teacher the components of the language creativity cannot be improved. The intelligent quotient is also a major cause for the creativity in language of the secondary students.

Sucheta Kumari (1990) conducted a study on “Instructional and nurturing effects of synectics model of teaching on the creative abilities in languages”. The findings of the study were: 1) Grade levels affected the improvement in language creativity (Hindi, English and general). In all the three spheres, the students of IX were found most creative and class VIII was found more creative than IX concerning fluency and flexibility. 2) The synectics model of teaching affected the improvement in all the five aspects of language creativity. The intelligent student was found more creative in fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration. 3) Improvement was noticed in all the forms of components e.g. Unity, coherence, originality and fallacies of essay/paragraph writing in increasing manner.

Shaahi Gautam (1992) conducted a study on “Development of creative thinking and leadership among Navodaya Vidyalaya students.” The findings of the study were: 1) There was no significant sex difference in the development pattern of creative thinking, though girls tended to be more creative than boys on the dimensional scores of fluency, flexibility and originality as well as on total scores on creative thinking. 2) The high and low socioeconomic students groups of subjects did not differ in creativity. 3) There was a significant development pattern from grade VI to VIII among students of Himachal Pradesh in total leadership behaviour.

Suresh Kumar (1995) conducted a study on “A study of creative thinking among boys and girls in relation to socio-economic status.” The findings of the study were: the sex difference is not a matter for the creativity. It is the family environment and the socio-economic status was the cause and consequence for the creative components.

Navin Dutta (1995) conducted a study on “A study in creativity, motor abilities and motor creativity of adolescent students.” The objectives of the study were: 1) to find out the relationship between creativity, motor ability and motor creativity. 2) to study whether motor creativity was dependent upon creativity or on motor ability or on both. The findings of the study were: There is a relationship between the motor creativity and motor ability. The motor creativity is completely depending upon the creativity.

Usha (2003) conducted a study on “A study on language creativity of IX standard urban students in Coimbatore District.” The findings of the study were: the findings of the study were: the language creativity of Urban private students is high rather than government students of IX standard.

### **A Summary of the Studies**

From the above reviews, the researcher concludes that not much research is done on language creativity and only two studies were done in India. But many of the concepts of the experts’ papers centered on the creativity in language. Hence the researcher confined his study to the language creativity of college students.

### **Method of the Study**

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher found normative survey method to be the best suited method, because the investigation is primarily concerned with the prevailing present condition.

### **Selection of the Sample**

The researcher selected four Arts and Science Colleges out of the eight Arts and Science College in Puducherry Union Territory. The list includes two government and two private Arts and Science Colleges. The researcher employed Stratified Random sampling technique. The total sample considered for the present study is 300 students from Arts and Science Colleges. The selected samples were tabulated according to the sub-samples of the study.

Table showing the selection of sample from Arts and Science Colleges:

Si. No	Variables	Sample	No of Sample	Total
1.	Gender	Male	150	300
		Female	150	
2.	Management	Govt.	150	300

		Private	150	
3.	Locale	Urban	150	300
		Rural	150	
4.	Discipline	Arts	150	300
		Science	150	

### Tools Used for the Study

The Researcher used the 'Language Creativity Test' developed by Suchita and Malhotra to collect the data. The Language Creativity Test (LCT) in English has been developed with the sole purpose of measuring the language creativity of school and college going students.

LCT has five sub-tests namely-

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

### Data Collection

The data was collected from the target sample. The tool LCT is administered to the sample. The time given for the students to finish the test is two hours forty seven minutes. The collected data was evaluated with the guidance of the language experts Dr. Clement Lourdes, Reader, Department of English, Pondicherry University and Dr. P. Raja, Lecturer, Tagore Arts College, Government of Puducherry, affiliated to Pondicherry University. With the help of the evaluated score, the hypotheses were tested by applying statistical techniques like descriptive and differential statistics.

### Level of Significance

The hypotheses formulated by the researcher in the study are tested. The testing of the hypothesis is done on the basis of result obtained through analysis. The Researcher has to decide the level of significance of rejection or acceptance of the hypothesis in advance. Therefore, in the present study only 0.05% of significance has been taken into account for testing the hypotheses.

### Analysis and Interpretations of Data:

Sub-sample	N	M	S.D	t	Level of significance
Male	150	162.56	34.1801	0.42	Significant at 0.05% level
Female	150	160.86	35.4827		



Government	150	165.05	35.2793	1.67	Significant at 0.05% level
Private	150	158.36	34.0847		
Urban	150	165.73	35.1962	2.02	Not significant at 0.05% level
Rural	150	157.68	34.0236		
Arts Group	150	162.22	37.3183	0.25	Significant at 0.05% level
Science Group	150	161.2	32.1803		

Table shows the Mean and S.D of different sub-samples (Gender, Management, Locale, and Discipline) on the scores of Language Creativity Test. From the mean and S.D value: It is understood that the language creativity of urban and rural students differ much than the other variables.

### Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The highest score in the language creativity test is 235 and the Mean score of Language Creativity of Arts and Science College students is 161.71, 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.

The Mean and S.D in Language Creativity of male students of Arts and Science Colleges were 162.56 and 34.1801 whereas the same for the female students were 160.86 and 35.4827. The calculated 't' value is found to be 0.42, which is less than the table value at 0.05% of Level of Significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between female and male students of Arts and Science Colleges in their Language Creativity.

The Mean and S.D in Language creativity of Government Arts and Science College students were 165.05 and 35.2793 whereas the same for the Private Arts and Science College students were 158.36 and 34.0847. The calculated 't' value is found to be 1.67, which is less than the table value at 0.05% Level of Significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between Government and Private Arts and Science Colleges Students in their Language Creativity.

The Mean and S.D in Language creativity of Urban Arts and Science College Students were 165.73 and 35.1962, whereas the same for the rural Arts and Science Colleges Students were 157.68 and 34.0236. The calculated 't' value is found to be 2.02, which is greater than table value at 0.05% Level of Significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference between urban and rural Arts and Science Colleges students in their language Creativity.

The Mean and S.D in language creativity of Arts Students in Arts and Science Colleges were 162.22 and 37.3183, whereas the same for the science students were 161.2 and 32.1803. The calculated 't' value is found to be 0.25, which is lesser than the table value at 0.05% Level of



Significance. Hence the null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between Arts students and Science students in Arts and Science Colleges.

The Mean difference table shows that there is no significant difference between the sub-samples in Language Creativity: (i) male and female (ii) government and private (iii) Arts group and Science group students. This table also shows that there is a significant difference between the urban and rural students of Arts and Science Colleges. This analysis and interpretation of data helps the researcher to proceed to the findings, recommendation and suggestion for further research on this area.

## Major Findings

The findings of the present study are discussed below:

- The language creativity of Arts and Science College students is low because the highest score is 235 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71
- The language creativity of male students in Arts and Science Colleges is high because the mean score is 162.56 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of female students in Arts and Science Colleges is low because the mean score is 160.86 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of government Arts and Science college students is high because the mean score is 165.36 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of private Arts and Science college students is low because the mean score is 158.36 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of urban students of Arts and Science College is high because the mean score is 165.73 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of rural students of Arts and Science College is low because the mean score is 157.68 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of Science group students of Arts and Science college students is high because the mean score is 162.22 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.
- The language creativity of Arts group students of Arts and Science college students is low because the mean score is 161.2 and the mean score of the total sample is 161.71.

- Male and female students of Arts and Science College do not show any significant difference at 0.05% level of significance. Hence there is no significant difference between language creativity of male and female students in Arts and Science College.
- Government and Private students of Arts and Science Colleges do not show any significant difference at 0.05% level of significance. Hence there is no significant difference between language creativity of Government and Private Students in Arts and Science College.
- Rural and Urban students of Arts and Science Colleges are show significant difference at 0.05% level of significance. Hence there is significant difference between language creativity of Rural and Urban students in Arts and Science College
- Science students and Arts students of Arts and Science College are not differing at 0.05% level of significance. Hence there is no significant difference between language creativity of Science students and Arts students in Arts and Science College

### **Recommendations/Educational Implications**

The researcher suggests some implications to be considered for the development of language creativity in students and for further improvement in their achievement:

- Opportunities should be provided to the students to express their thoughts, so that their fluency in thoughts will enhance.
- Teachers should adopt new method of teaching which should provoke the creativity of the students.
- Create curiosity and inventiveness in the minds of the student. This would make them to react creatively.
- Apart from imparting instruction by using creative methods, the teachers should enable students to think and react critically in the given situation to enhance originality.
- The acquisition of English should begin at the primary education level to better performance in this language.
- The students should improve their vocabulary by reading books, newspapers and playing word games.
- Unusual response to a given situation should be encouraged and rewarded. This motivates the students to think critically.
- Curriculum should be framed with plenty of opportunities for creative behaviour.
- Teachers may enable children to learn on their own, think and discover.
- Constant evaluation should be pursued to assess students' performance and the results should be used to improve their creative thinking.

- It is the responsibility of the teacher to provide the atmosphere for the students to express their ideas without the threat of evaluation.

### Suggestions for Further Research

The present study suffers from some limitations as already indicated

- Further research can be done by drawing a large sample covering different districts and different levels of students.
- Language creativity in association with other variables like intelligence, personality and achievement can be studied.

### Conclusions

According to the results of the study, the researcher finds that creativity in language is low in the students of Arts and Science Colleges in Puducherry Union Territory region. The male and female students' performance in language creativity in Arts and Science Colleges is low when compared to the norms set by the author of the tool. There is an average difference between the language creativity of rural and urban students of Arts and Science Colleges. The language creativity of the students in Government Arts and Science College and Private Arts and Science College slightly differs in their mean scores. The difference is understandable. The students who score high marks in the Higher Secondary do not join the Arts and Science Colleges and they are much interested in professional courses. However, it is imperative that all students are adequately equipped in all aspects of creativity, whatever may be the subject they may pursue in their studies. When they come out of any course or institution, they should have inherent capacity to create.

=====

### References

- Best, John.W and James, V. Kahn. (1992). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Pvt.
- Bhatnagar, O.P. (1987). *Human conscious and Creativity: Some Orthodox Reflection*: Creative Writing: Writers Views (p-11). Gandhigram: Gandhigram Rural Institute.
- Buch, M.B. ed. (1973). *A Survey of Research in Education*. Baroda: Center of Advanced Study in Education.

- Buch, M.B. ed. (1979). *Second Survey of Research in Education*. Baroda: Society For educational Research and Development.
- Buch, M.B. ed. (1987). *Third Survey of Research in Education*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Buch, M.B. ed. (1993). *Fourth Survey of Research in Education*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Buch, M.B. ed. (2006). *Fifth Survey of Research in Education*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Carruthers, Peter. (2002). *Human Creativity: It's Cognitive Basis, its Evolution and its Connections with Childhood Pretence*. British Journal for the Philosophy of Science. Vol 53; No 2; Year 2002. 225-249. USA: University of Maryland.
- Carter, Ronald. (2007). *Response to Special Issue of applied Linguistics Devoted to language Creativity in Everyday Contexts*. Applied Linguistics. Vol 28; No 4; Year 2007. 597-608. University of Nottingham.
- 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.
- Dennis, Hocevar. (2008). *Ideational Fluency as a Confounding Factor in the Measurement of Originality*. Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol 71(2), April 1979, 191-196.  
<http://psycnet.apa.org>
- Dutta, KL. (1989). *Difference in Scientific Creativity Among High School Students*. Phd. Edu. University of Jammu. Fifth Survey of Research in Education.(p-1042). New Delhi: NCERT
- Dutta, Navin. (1995). *A Study in Creativity, Motor Abilities and Motor Creativity of Adolocent Students*. Phd. Edu. University of Kalyani. Research in Psychology. Vol: 52, Year 1996: New Delhi
- Eoin, Gearóid Mac, Anders Ahlqvist and Donncha Ó hAodha. (2002). *Language Minority Children's Linguistic and Cognitive Creativity*. University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78285, USA
- Garrett, Henry.E. (2006). *Staticis in Psychology and Education*. Delhi. India: Surjeet Publication.
- Gautam, Shaahi. 1992. *Development of Creative Thinking and Leadership Among Navodaya Vidyalaya Students*. Phd. Edu. Himachal Pradesh University. Educational Review: New Delhi: NCERT

Gibaldi, Joseph and Achtert, Walter.s. (1988). *MLA Handbook For Writers of Research Papers*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edi. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Gay, Greg. (2004). *Creativity in Language*. Oxford University. London.  
[http://www.ldrc.ca/contents/view\\_article/147/#lang](http://www.ldrc.ca/contents/view_article/147/#lang)

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

Koul, Lokesh. *Methodology of Educational Research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edi. New Delhi: Vikas Publication

Kumar, Girijesh. 1989. *A Follow-up Study of creatively Talented College Students*. Independent Study. Moradabad: Hindu College (ERIC Funded). Fifth Survey of Research in Education.(p-1054). New Delhi: NCERT

Kumar, Suresh. (1995). *A Study of Creative Thinking Among Boys and Girls in Relation to Socio-Economic status*. M.Phil. Univ of Kashmir. Review of Educational Reserch.vol-22. Year 1996.  
[www.edupsy.article.org](http://www.edupsy.article.org)

Kumari, Sucheta. (1990). *Instructional and Nurturing Effects of Synectics Model of Teaching on the Creative Abilities in Languages*. Phd.edu. Kurushetra university (CKL 0330), Fifth Survry of Research in Education. New Delhi: NCERT.

Malhotra,S.P. 1990. *Effects of Synectics Method of Teaching on the Development of Language Creativity in Hindi. Independent Study*. Kuruhshestra University. (Eric funded ). Author 1186. Fifth Survry of Research in Education. New Delhi: NCERT. (p-1416)

Malhotra,S.P and Kumari, Sucheta.1990. *Language Creativity Test*. New Delhi: National Psychological Corporation.

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.

Rao, C. (2004). *An Analysis of Creative Writing Skills in English among College Students and Development of CreativityMobilisation Technology*. Ph. D., English Education, Alagappa University, Karaikudi. Guide: Dr. R. Karpaga Kumaravel and Krishnaraj.

Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)

532

11 : 5 May 2011

Uvaraj. T., M.A. (Eng.), M.Sc. (Psy.), M.Ed.(Edn.), Ph.D. Scholar  
A Study on Language Creativity of College Students

Rather, A.R. (1998). *Creativity: Its Recognition and Development*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.  
Sachidanandam, V. (1987). *The Creative Process: Creative Writing: Writers Views* (p-19).  
Gandhigram: Gandhigram Rural Institute.

Shan, Hans Raj. (1993). *Identification and Development of Creativity*(A Study of High School Students of Jammu). New Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers, India.

Sumangala,N. (1990). *A Study of Language Creativity of Standard IX Students in Relation to Intelligence, Teacher Involvement and Gender*. M.Phil, Edu. Bangalore university.

Fifth Survey of Research in Education. New Delhi: NCERT.

Torrance, E.P. (1966). *Torrance Test of Creative Thinking*. Princeton, New Jersey: Personnel Press.

Usha. (2003). *A Study on Language Creativity of IX Standard Students in Coimbatore District*.  
University of Madras.

=====

Uvaraj. T., M.A. (Eng.), M.Sc. (Psy.), M.Ed. (Edn.), Ph.D. Scholar  
Junior Research Fellow  
School of Education  
Pondicherry University  
Puducherry – 605014  
Puducherry Union Territory  
India  
[tuvaraj@gmail.com](mailto:tuvaraj@gmail.com)