

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND CREATIVITY:

The Relationship in a New Zealand Population of
Parents and Children (10-16 years.)

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Education
at Massey University.

Philip Hann
1989

ABSTRACT

The present report documented an empirical investigation which aimed to investigate the extent of any relationship between authoritarianism in parents and creativity attainment in their children under the general hypothesis:

"That high authoritarian levels in parents would be associated with low creativity attainment in their children."

The study addressed the construct relationship within a New Zealand population of children (10 - 16 years) attending two private schools situated in a multi-cultural metropolitan area.

Statistical analyses showed a low magnitude relationship in the hypothesized direction, particularly between mother dogmatism and daughter creativity, although no statistically significant result was obtained.

A rationale was established from the literature supporting the notion that creativity levels were dependent to an extent on social environmental influences. The specific results of the study were discussed and implications were advanced.

DEDICATION

I am indebted to my wife
Lyn and daughter Melissa
who sacrificed valuable social interaction
during the time it took to complete
this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the expertise and willing contributions of the following people in the completion of this study:

Mr Eric Archer for his guidance and excellent supervision.

Without Dr Don McAlpine's interest, supervision and patient but incisive thinking, this study would not have been possible.

The co-operation and interest of the principals and staff in the two South Auckland schools were much appreciated.

The parents and children who willingly participated in the study.

Mr Dave Williamson who willingly assisted with the statistics and computer technology.

Dr Mike Tarburton for his guidance and assistance with the multivariate analyses.

Mrs Linda Stuart who patiently typed the first draft.

My wife Lyn who spent long hours typing and editing the final draft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of the Study	1
1.2 Context of the Study	1
1.3 Sample Characteristics	1
1.4 Nature of the Study	2
1.5 Aims	2
1.6 Procedural Aims: Scope and Sequence	4
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Background	5
2.2 Authoritarianism	5
2.3 Authoritarianism and Creativity	8
2.4 Environmental Influences and Creativity	
Indices	11
2.5 Cognitive Factors and Parent Authoritarianism	14
2.6 Construct Relationship	15
2.7 Summary	16
CHAPTER THREE: CREATIVITY: THE CONSTRUCT	18
3.1 Creativity: Definition	18
3.2 Creativity: Behaviour	18
3.3 Creativity: Product or Process	20
3.4 Creativity: Self Actualization	22
3.5 Creativity: Implications	23
3.6 Summary	24
CHAPTER FOUR: AUTHORITARIANISM: THE CONSTRUCT	26
4.1 Background and Definitions	26
4.2 Authority and Authoritarianism	30
4.3 Authoritarianism and Creativity Discontinuity:	
Empirical Support	32
4.4 Summary	37
CHAPTER FIVE: HYPOTHESES	38
5.1 Dogmatism (Mother and Father) and Creativity	38
5.2 Dogmatism (Mother) and Creativity	38
5.3 Dogmatism (Father) and Creativity	39
5.4 Polynesian Parents and Creativity	39
5.5 Statistical Procedures	40

CHAPTER SIX: INSTRUMENTATION	42
6.1 Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (D Scale)	42
6.2 D Scale Use in New Zealand	44
6.3 Biographical Data	46
6.4 Wallach and Kogan Creativity Instrument	46
CHAPTER SEVEN: METHODOLOGY	53
7.1 Procedural Sequence: Summary	53
7.2 Population Characteristics	53
7.3 Sample Selection	54
7.4 Environmental Factors	55
7.5 Parent Cohort	57
7.6 Creativity Assessment	58
7.7 Creativity Test Scoring	59
7.8 Manipulation of Data	59
7.9 Statistical Procedure	60
CHAPTER EIGHT: RESULTS	65
8.1 Chi Square Analyses	65
8.2 Multivariate Analyses	72
8.3 Father/Mother Dogmatism Correlation	77
8.4 Scattergram Trend Analysis: Illustration and Directions	78
CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	87
9.1 Introduction	87
9.2 Research Design Factors	88
9.3 Analogous Parent Dogmatism	95
9.4 Summary	96
9.5 The Study Population: Implications	96
9.6 Within the Study Culture	98
9.7 The Polynesian Cohort	99
9.8 Authoritarian Causation	99
9.9 Comparative Study	100
9.10 Constraints on Creativity	100
9.11 Conclusion	101
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS	103
APPENDIX B PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	105
APPENDIX C CHILD CREATIVITY ASSESSMENT	112
APPENDIX D RAW DATA	117
APPENDIX E STATED OCCUPATIONS OF PARENTS IN SAMPLE	120
APPENDIX F RAW DATA - SCATTERGRAM TREND ANALYSES	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY	129

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page No.</u>	
TABLE I	Frequency Distribution: Total Creativity Responses of Children with Two (2) Parents Responding to the D Scale	66
TABLE II	Frequency Distribution: Unique Creativity Responses of Children with Two (2) Parents Responding to the D Scale	66
TABLE III	Frequency Distribution: Unique/Total Responses From Children with Two (2) Parents Responding to the D Scale	67
TABLE IV	Frequency Distribution: Total Creativity Responses of Children with Mothers Responding to the D Scale	68
TABLE V	Frequency Distribution: Unique Creativity Responses of Children with Mothers Responding to the D Scale	69
TABLE VI	Frequency Distribution: Unique/Total Creativity Responses of Children with Mothers Responding to the D Scale	69
TABLE VII	Frequency Distribution: Total Creativity Responses of Children with Fathers Responding to the D Scale	70
TABLE VIII	Frequency Distribution: Unique Creativity Responses of Children with Fathers Responding to the D Scale	71
TABLE IX	Frequency Distribution: Unique/Total Creativity Responses of Children with Fathers Responding to the D Scale	71
TABLE X	Correlation Matrix: Mother Sample All Mothers Responding to the Questionnaire	73
TABLE XI	Correlation Matrix: Father Sample All Fathers Responding to the Questionnaire	75
TABLE XII	Correlation Matrix: Both Parents Responding to the Questionnaire (Fathers & Mothers)	76
TABLE XIII	Percentage of Unique Responses in Comparison to Total Responses	90

LIST OF FIGURES

		<u>Page No.</u>
FIGURE 1a	Scattergram: Father Dogmatism and Daughter Unique/Total Responses	80
FIGURE 1b	Scattergram: Father Dogmatism and Son Unique/Total Responses	81
FIGURE 2a	Scattergram: Mother Dogmatism and Daughter Unique/Total Responses	82
FIGURE 2b	Scattergram: Mother Dogmatism and Son Unique/Total Responses	83
FIGURE 3a	Scattergram: Mother Dogmatism and Children Unique/Total Responses	84
FIGURE 3b	Scattergram: Father Dogmatism and Children Unique/Total Responses	85
FIGURE 4	Trend of Parent Dogmatism and Children Unique/Total Responses	86