International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities (IJIRAH)
Impact Factor: 4.675, ISSN (Online): 2456 - 3145
(www.dvpublication.com) Volume 2, Issue 2, 2017

ENHANCING INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP AND MOTIVATION THROUGH CREATIVITY TRAINING: AN INTERVENTIONAL STUDY

K. U. Nimisha* & K. N. Jayakumar**
* M.Phil Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Periyar University, Salem, Tamilnadu
** Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Periyar University, Salem, Tamilnadu

Cite This Article: K. U. Nimisha & K. N. Jayakumar, "Enhancing Interpersonal Relationship and Motivation through Creativity Training: An Interventional Study", International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities, Volume 2, Issue 2, Page Number 18-22, 2017.

Abstract:

The present study examined the effect of creativity training on interpersonal relationship and motivation. For this, 90 young adults from Periyar University, Salem (male = 45 and female = 45) were selected for this study. In this interventional study the participants were equally divided into 3 groups (Female group, male group and heterogeneous group). Fundamental interpersonal relationship orientation - behavior scale (FIRO-B) developed by William Schutz (1950) and situational motivation scale (SIMS) developed by E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan (1991) were used to assess their motivation and interpersonal relationship before and after the creativity intervention and also a sustained effectiveness assessment was also done. Creativity intervention involved a set of creative exercises for a period of 14 days. The results revealed that there was a positive change in interpersonal relationship and motivation among the participants due to creativity intervention programme.

Introduction:

In this competitive world people are striving hard to succeed in life. Each one has to face many challenges to overcome the adversities placed by the social environment. The need to adjust in important areas of personal as well as professional life such as education, job, and family are crucial. In this context, developing and maintaining a healthy interpersonal relationship and motivation has got significant importance in proper functioning of an individual in all the areas of our life and it is been proved that interpersonal relationship is the key for success. Reviews have suggested that goal oriented training program enhances individuals' interpersonal relationship and motivation and the role of creativity interventional program needs to be researched adequately.

Ackermann (1997) has defined creativity as having the ability to solve problems and create anything in life in a unique way-up like anyone else. Jeffrey and Craft (2004) conducted a study to find the distinction and relationship between teaching and creativity and explored the effects and effectiveness of the Arts in making meaning and relevance for both children and university students. The project used challenging, outdoor experiences shared equally by students and pupils in an attempt to generate creative thinking. As a result they concluded that the relationship exists between teaching creatively and creative learning.

An interpersonal relationship is a brief or enduring, strong, deep or a close acquaintance between two or more individuals. Relationship with others (whether social, familial, intimate or sexual) could be said to have a major impact upon people's experience and perception of happiness (Laura Hyman, 2014). When we are happier we are more flexible and creative in the way we work. Teacher-student interpersonal relationships play an important role in the establishment of student's autonomous motivation (Opdenakker & Marie-Christine, 2012). Several determinants like subject taught, class type, teacher gender, and student gender can explain differences in developmental trajectories of both interpersonal behavior and academic motivation over time. There are many factors that influence individual's creative ability. Motivation is one of the most important factors which are essential for creativity (Steve and Marie, 2014). Motivation is a theoretical construct which is used to explain individual's behavior. Motivation gives a reason for individual's actions, desires and need but, the present study examines the role of creativity in affecting the motivation and interpersonal relationship among the participants.

Methodology:

Aim: To assess the effect of creativity training on interpersonal relationship and motivation scores across male, female and heterogeneous groups.

Objectives: The main objective of this study is to assess the effect of creativity training program on interpersonal relationship and motivational scores among young adults.

Hypotheses:

H_1: Creativity training program will not significantly differentiate the participant's motivational scores

H_2: Creativity training program will not significantly differentiate the participant's interpersonal scores

Tools Used: The following tools were used to collect data

- ✓ *Fundamental interpersonal relationship orientation - behavior scale (FIRO-B)* developed by William Schutz (1950). This scales measures the interpersonal needs to express and wants of the participant. The reliability varies from $\alpha = 0.85$ to 0.96 and has a very high face validity.

- ✓ *Situational motivation scale (SIMS)* developed by E.L. Deci and R.M. Ryan (1991). This scale measures the level of motivation of the individual and has reliability value of α = 0.75 to 0.93 and has satisfactory level of face validity.

Research Method: The study adopted experimental method. The change in interpersonal relationship and motivation is assessed by the above FIRO-B and SIMS tools. The study assessed the effect of creativity training program on interpersonal relationship and motivation across different group. i.e, male group, female group and heterogeneous group.

Creativity Training Intervention: The participants were randomly divided into 3 groups i.e., male group, female group and heterogeneous group. Each group consisted of 30 members. The creativity program module was derived by referring to creativity trainers manual and it was decided to have a 14 days creativity training for 45 minutes per day as it was considered to be ideal. Each group members were assembled together at a fixed place and time and were made to participate in activities and exercises conducted by the researchers. This activity comprised of games which intended to think creatively. They were expected to come up with creative solutions for problems posed by the researchers and these activities promoted a lot of self reflection and discussion in the groups.

Data Analysis: Along with the mean and SD, statistical tool like ANOVA was also used for analysis through SPSS Version 20.

Results and Discussion:

Table 1: Shows the no of Samples across the Demographic Variables

S.No	Demographic Variables N=90		No. of Samples Taken
1	Gender	Male	45
		Female	45
2	Birth Order	First born	22
		Second born	38
		Third born	18
		Fourth born	9
		Fifth born	2
3	Family Type	Nuclear	59
		Joint	31
4	Area of Living	Urban	39
		Rural	51
5	Age Group	Below 27 years	90
6	Departments	Biochemistry	29
		Zoology	1
		MBA	12
		Chemistry	17
		Micro biology	3
		Physics	10
		Botany	1
		Biotechnology	4
		Statistics	1
		Tamil	2
		Environmental Science	2
		Mathematics	4
		computer science	4

The above table shows the distribution and description of the demographic details of the sample. The sample taken for the study consists of 90 young adult participants in which 45 were males and 45 were females. The participants were selected from various departments in Periyar University and the willingness to actively take part in the exercises is the inclusion criteria of the sample. The tables shows that the sample was heterogeneous and truly represents the various strata on all the basis of diversity like age, gender, birth order, geographical aspects as well as the academic disciplines. This only enhances the representation of the true population of any university. The chances are higher that the findings of this study will not be skewed and will reflect the spirit of diverse university population.

From the table no.2 it is understood that there is a significant difference in motivation which involves; intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and a motivation across all the 3 stages of assessment i.e., before creativity intervention program, after creativity intervention program and effectiveness assessment stage. To complete a task, to do something creative or to initiate something intrinsic motivation is

essential. Before creativity training programme participants were curious to know about themselves and after attending the programme participants were able to recognize their level of abilities and aspirations.

Table 2: Shows the mean, SD, F-value for SIMS scores across the stages of intervention

N=90		Mean	SD	F - value
Intrinsic motivation	Before creativity	15.61	3.87	61.39*
	After creativity intervention	20.57	3.21	
	Intervention effectiveness test	20.49	3.14	
	Total	18.89	4.13	
Identified regulation	Before creativity	16.20	4.06	34.80*
	After creativity intervention	19.78	3.06	
	Intervention effectiveness test	19.96	2.98	
	Total	18.64	3.81	
External regulation	Before creativity	13.51	3.79	13.53*
	After creativity intervention	15.26	3.64	
	Intervention effectiveness test	16.36	3.64	
	Total	15.04	3.86	
Amotivation	Before creativity	11.72	4.93	8.45*
	After creativity intervention	9.02	5.06	
	Intervention effectiveness test	9.04	5.19	
	Total	9.93	5.20	
NS= not significant ,* = significant				
Hypothesis 1: Creativity training will not significantly differentiate the participants SIMS scores				

Participants were aware of the importance of the programme and they assume it as essential for their own development. Results found a significant difference in identified regulation. It may be because that the participants had understood the importance of the programme and they gained creative ideas and this would have enhanced better relationship approaches.

Study shows a significant difference in external regulation. This could be due to the training programme as all of them need to spend roughly one hour each day for 14 days. The way one projects oneself to others gets very much influenced by the thought how others will think about them. Hence, there is a great deal of external regulation that comes from outside and influences ones motivation as well. This may affect their regular routine and sometimes makes someone to stay away from others, but still due to the socialization need fulfillment, their involvement in this training gets externally regulated to attend the program. There is a significant difference in a motivation. The level of a motivation has decreased. This is because when they are spending significant time in groups of heterogeneous nature and solve many a problems during participation they feel their esteem bolster and results in reduced a motivation. On the other hand it increases the drive to achieve things. There is a significant difference in the overall as well as individual dimensions of the SIMS score and hence, the stated hypothesis "Creativity training will not significantly differentiate the participants SIMS scores" is not confirmed by the results. This proves the point that creativity training program has increased the motivation level of the participants across different levels of the intervention.

From the table no.3 it is understood that there is a significant difference in all the 3 stages of assessment i.e., expressed inclusion, expressed control, want inclusion and wanted control. The reason for significant difference in expressed inclusion before creativity, after creativity intervention and creativity effectiveness assessment may be when the groups were asked to perform a task they started to initiate to talk with others in order to complete the task. The level of interactions had increased as they can solve the creativity problems only by expressing themselves and involving others in the group.

The reason for significant difference in expressed control across the 3 stages may be due to the design of the training programme. To complete the task an individual needs to express control over the members of the group as this lead to complete the task in a more efficient manner than an undisciplined group. Control is just not restricting, but also includes giving direction and motivation to stay on focus to achieve the goal.

When seeing the overall expressed dimension scores, the groups have an improved expressed inclusion, affection, and control. After the creativity intervention they started to initiate something, in certain situations they controlled others and they become close to each other and they considered their group as a family. They would have joined the group as strangers but as the program progressed, socialization process evolved and has resulted in blunting the individual identity and resulted in a group identity. Hence participants could have felt more and more open to express themselves at every stage of assessment.

Table 3: Shows the mean, SD, F-value for FIRO scores across the stages of intervention

N=90		Mean	SD	f- Value
Expressed Inclusion	Before creativity	5.23	2.19	5.78*
	After creativity intervention	6.12	1.61	

	Intervention effectiveness test	5.94	1.70	
	Total	5.77	1.88	
Expressed Control	Before creativity	4.29	2.30	25.67*
	After creativity intervention	5.86	2.20	
	Intervention effectiveness test	6.44	1.69	
	Total	5.53	2.26	
Expressed Affection	Before creativity	3.77	1.69	2.35^{NS}
	After creativity intervention	4.03	1.78	
	Intervention effectiveness test	4.32	1.67	
	Total	4.04	1.72	
Expressed Sub Total	Before creativity	13.23	4.24	18.19*
	After creativity intervention	16.01	4.15	
	Intervention effectiveness test	16.71	3.63	
	Total	15.33	4.27	
Want Inclusion	Before creativity	3.29	2.34	6.75*
	After creativity intervention	4.46	2.34	
	Intervention effectiveness test	4.24	2.01	
	Total	4.00	2.31	
Want Control	Before creativity	5.11	1.99	19.46*
	After creativity intervention	6.31	1.89	
	Intervention effectiveness test	6.86	1.86	
	Total	6.09	2.04	
Want Affection	Before creativity	2.61	1.60	1.02^{NS}
	After creativity intervention	2.90	1.43	
	Intervention effectiveness test	2.87	1.38	
	Total	2.79	1.47	
Want Sub Total	Before creativity	11.01	4.33	12.67*
	After creativity intervention	13.66	4.42	
	Intervention effectiveness test	13.96	4.24	
	Total	12.88	4.51	
NS= Not Significant ,* = Significant				
Hypothesis 2: Creativity training will not significantly differentiate the participants FIRO scores				

Again, there is a significant difference in want inclusion across the 3 stages of assessment. This may be because when the participants are put in a group, they get the feeling that they are part of the group and wish that the group reciprocates by involving them in all the activities. During the training they all have started to express their opinions, suggestions, decisions etc in their group and they desired to accept it by the group member. This leads to group cohesion as groups and members feel that they are dynamically cohesive. The mean score obtained for want control across all the 3 stages shows that there is a significant difference. This may be because the participants are open for the group members to direct them and are ready to accept suggestions or assistance while solving a problem in a creative way. During the program, they all assisted each other at different levels and filtered the good suggestions from the not so good ones within the group and tried to complete the task.

When seeing the overall want dimensions scores of FIRO, the groups have an increased want inclusion and control. After the creativity intervention they started to express their opinions and ideas. They expected to be included in group and the change that happened at every stage of the program only showed that creativity training program has enhanced the interpersonal skills among the participants. This is evident from the significantly increased FIRO scores at every stage of the assessment. Hence, it is inferred from the result that there is a significant difference in participants score after creativity training. Thus the hypothesis "Creativity training will not significantly differentiate the participants FIRO scores" is not confirmed as it has been noted that the participants have improved their interpersonal skills due to creativity programme.

Conclusion:

The main purpose of the study was to enhance the interpersonal relationship and motivation through creativity training. The present study found that creativity training improved interpersonal relationship and motivation of the participants. It's been suggested that motivation as well as interpersonal skills can be improved if group intervention on creativity is administered. An exercise on group not only enhances the social skills, but also the personal skills in motivating oneself.

References:

1. Ackerman, F. (Ed.). (1997). Human well-being and economic goals (Vol. 3). Island Press.
2. Hyman, L. (2014). Happiness: Understandings, narratives and discourses. Springer.

3. Jeffrey, B., & Craft, A. (2004). Teaching creatively and teaching for creativity: distinctions and relationships. Educational studies, 30(1), 77-87.
4. Kaufman, J.C., Plucker, J. A., & Baer , J. (2008). Essentials of Creativity Assessment. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
5. Kaufman, J.C., & Sternberg, R.J. (2010). The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Opdenakker, M. C., Maulana, R., & Den Brok, P. (2012). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships and academic motivation within one school year: Developmental changes and linkage. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23(1), 95-119.
7. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). When Rewards Compete with Nature: The Undermining. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance, 13.
8. Schutz, W.C. (1958). FIRO: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
9. Steve, B. (2014). Positive Psychology. India: Pearson Education.