



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### STUDY OF TEACHERS' AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' AWARENESS AND PRACTICES IN FOSTERING CHILDREN CREATIVITY.

**Kasahun Tadesse.**

Lecturer at Mettu University, Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies, Department of Early Childhood Care and Education.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 30 November 2016

Final Accepted: 28 December 2016

Published: January 2017

##### Key words:-

Creativity, Creative climate, children creativity, awareness, and practice

#### Abstract

In order to cope up with fast changing world, creativity development from early life is essential. Thus, primary school teachers are required to foster children ability in discovery, solving problems, being creative in writing, art, music, developing their self-confidence as learners and maturing socially and emotionally. In establishing classroom and school environment conducive to creative thinking of children, teachers and school principals have great roles and responsibilities. The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' and school principals' awareness and practice in fostering children creativity. A total of 54 samples (45 teachers, 3 principals, 3 vice principals, and 3 supervisors) were selected from Debre Tabor Town elementary school teachers, principals, vice principals, and supervisors (281, 7, 4, and 4 respectively). Stage random sampling technique was used to select samples from the population. Data were collected through questionnaire, observations and focus group discussion. Results revealed that the level of teachers', Principals' and supervisors' awareness of characteristics of creative person such as tendency to practice with alternative solutions, synthetic ability, insight ability, sensitivity to problems, tolerance of anxiety, passionate involvement in tasks, affective pleasure in challenge, tolerance of ambiguity, risk taking, openness to experience, unconventional values, curiosity, preference for challenges and complexity, and independence of judgment was below the average. And also regarding their familiarity with statements indicating characteristics of creative person, teachers were more familiar with self- confidence ( $M=4.98$ ,  $S=0.51$ ) and least familiar with tolerance of ambiguity ( $M=2.65$ ,  $S=0.79$ ). Under affective processes teachers were more familiar with statements indicating affective fantasy in play ( $M=4.10$ ,  $S=0.66$ ) and least familiar with affective pleasure in challenge ( $M=2.99$ ,  $S=0.61$ ). From cognitive processes, teachers were more familiar with practical contextual ability ( $M=4.91$ ,  $S=0.58$ ) and least familiar with tendency to practice with alternative solutions ( $M=3.56$ ,  $S=0.52$ ). Regarding children creativity, teachers were focused more on the products than processes – missing to consider what is happening in children's mind. The school observation showed that 33.3% ( $N=1$ ) of the school has not stored children creative products and 66.7 % ( $N=2$ ) of the schools have stored some of children

**Corresponding Author:- Kasahun Tadesse.**

Address:- Lecturer at Mettu University, Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies, Department of Early Childhood Care and Education.

products. Inversely, 66.7% (N=2) of the school never used different colors in children creative products and 33.3 % (N=1) of the schools used different colors. The focus group discussion result also showed that, there were lack of materials provision like different color chalk, marker, play materials, charts and the like. In measuring children creativity, teachers have been focused more on product. Teachers had been motivating children more to recall what they have learnt rather than motivating them to communicate their idea, imagination and creative work with other students. Suggestions were made on the ways of promoting teachers awareness and practice in fostering children creativity by organizing training for them, providing required materials and support.

*Copy Right, IJAR, 2016,. All rights reserved.*

## ..... **Introduction:-**

In literature, creativity is defined differently by different researchers. According to Runco (2003) and Runco, (2004), creativity is usually tied to originality – the development of original ideas that are useful or influential, ability of problem solving and problem finding, any thinking or problem solving that involves the construction of new meaning is creative. For Rymmar and Brolin (1999), creativity is exceptional human capacity for thought and creation. National Curriculum Handbook for Primary and Secondary Teachers (1999) as cited in Craft (2001) on the other hand describe Creativity as a thinking skills enable pupils to generate and extend ideas, to suggest hypotheses, to apply imagination, and to look for alternative innovative outcomes.

Creativity has clear benefit for individual and society as a whole. The current fast changing world places high demands on schools all over the world that students need to be creative and problem solver. Therefore, care should be given for students starting from their early life.

Researchers relate creativity development to the four generally acknowledged locations or expressions such as a creative person, creative product, creative process and creative environment (see Lemons, 2005; McCammon et al., 2010). These findings also suggested that young children's creativity can be nurtured through educational settings in three respects: the creative environment, creative programs and creative teachers and ways of teaching.

It was suggested that a process rather than a product orientation would be much more adequate for our understanding of creativity of children (Glăveanu, 2011). In this research, teachers' awareness and practice in fostering children creativity were assessed. In assessing so, the focus was on: person, process, product and press (environment) perspective of children creativity. In person perspective, teachers and school principals' level of awareness to the term indicating the creativity characteristics were assessed through questionnaire and focus group discussion. In the case of product perspective, teachers' familiarity and practice to the creative product were assessed through questionnaire, focus group discussion, and school observation. Similarly in the case of process perspective, methods in which teachers use to enhance children creativity and observing their creative outcome also assessed through both open ended questions and focus group discussion. In press perspective, teachers practice in creating conducive environments for children to foster creativity was assessed through questionnaire, observation checklists and focus group discussion. Data gained from these techniques were triangulated and summarized.

It is a worldwide concern to have creative and entrepreneur citizens. It could surprise people to think children as creative. Children play, sing, draw, tell stories and build blocks in such a natural and creative way that it goes without saying that there is such a thing as "children creativity" (Glăveanu V. P., 2011)

Creativity facilitates late-life adaptations and growth. It plays an important role in technological advance, in the social and behavioral sciences, and in the humanities and arts. Because of its role in innovation and entrepreneurship, creativity has become one of the key concerns of organizations and businesses (Runco, 2004)

When considering young children, it is appropriate to adopt a broad, democratic definition of creativity. In this way, every child can be considered to have creative potential and to be capable of creative expression (Sharp, 2004). There are two notions adults should consider on children creativity. The first is that, child creative ability will be

related to his or her personal stage of development. For example a young child's work may be adaptive and original for that particular child and/or in relation to children in their class or age group. The second is to put the emphasis on the creative process, rather than to judge the quality of their 'products'. This is because young children may not have developed all the skills they need to achieve a successful creative outcome (see Sharp, 2004, Craft, 2003 & Runco, 2003). On the other hand on Discussion document and proceedings of the Consultative Conference on Education 2009, children creativity discussed as follows:

Creativity can be understood as having the power or quality to express yourself in your own way. Children are naturally creative. They see the world through fresh, new eyes and then use what they see in original ways. One of the most rewarding aspect of working with children is the chance to watch them creative. Every child is born with creative potential, but this potential may be stifled if care is not taken to nurture and stimulate creativity. Young children are naturally curious. They wonder about people and the world. Even before they enter primary school, they already have the variety of learning skills acquired through questioning, inquiring, searching, manipulating, experimenting, and playing. Children need opportunities for a closer look; they need time for the creative encounter (p. 12).

As indicated in Sharp (2004), the creative process involves a number of components, most commonly: imagination, originality (the ability to come up with ideas and products that are new and unusual), problem solving (application of knowledge and imagination to a given situation) and the ability to produce an outcome of value and worth.

Creativity is manifested in the interplay of different processes (see Ferrari, et al, 2009; Amabile, 1998; Russ, 1996 & Runco, 2003): a) personal traits (i.e. tolerance of ambiguity, openness to experience, independent of judgment, unconventional values, curiosity, preference for challenge and complexity, self-confidence, risk-taking, intrinsic motivation); b) emotional or affective processes (i.e. affective fantasy in play, passionate involvement in tasks, affective pleasure in challenge, tolerance of anxiety) ; c) cognitive abilities (i.e. divergent thinking, transformation abilities, sensitivity to problems, tendency to practice with alternative solutions, wide breadth of knowledge, insight ability and evaluative ability) and d) intellectual abilities (i.e. synthetic, analytic and practical- contextual abilities).

Creativity thrives in the environment that allow questions, observing, exploring, skill-building, communicating, and self-expression. To develop creativity, the home or classroom environment should contain a variety of materials and encourage lots of different experiences (Davidson, 2003). The classroom learning will be democratic which emphasize taking the individual as the reference for the originality and value pillar (Ferrari, et al, 2009). Current pedagogical discourses attempt to view learners as the center of teaching and learning processes, with an active role in the production of knowledge and meaning, democratically bringing their expertise, experiences and ideas into the classroom (Williamson & Payton, 2009). Teaching for creativity implies allowing people to take responsibility for their own learning. Pupils out not to be considered as merely receivers of information: on the contrary, it is important that they assume the role of discovery, but support and guidance are needed in order for them to succeed. For this, teachers need to be prepared both on the pedagogical side, being aware of the ways and means to foster autonomy and student-centeredness (Simplicio, 2010). The thinking of children at all levels of ability is significantly influenced by the type of opportunities they are given (Runco, 1990). Offering the learners the right chances to develop their cognitive and creative potential should be a priority in the design of this project.

The government of Ethiopia has recognized the fundamental importance of care and education of children for holistic development (MoE, MH, MoWA, 2010a). In Ethiopia, there is a need to ensure a healthy start in life for children, enabling and stimulating environment for developing their talents and stimulating and help them to become caring and productive citizens (MoE, MH, MoWA, 2010b). Thus, this study was intended to assess the extent to which theories of children creativity development are implemented in the school. This was by examining teachers' and school principals' awareness and practice in fostering creativity. Hence, this is intended to describe the awareness and practices of teachers' and school principals in fostering children creativity. More specifically, the following objectives were intended to be achieved:

- To describe the level of teachers familiarity with creativity characteristics (person)
- To explain the level of teachers' awareness and practice on children creative product (product)
- To evaluate the characteristics of children creative product (product)
- To describe awareness and practice of teachers on the process of children creativity development. (process)
- To evaluate practices of teachers in creating conducive environments for children to foster their creativity (press)

- To measure the familiarity of teachers with creativity measurement criteria (assessment of creativity)

## Materials and Methods:-

### Sample and Sampling Techniques:-

Sample for the research was selected from elementary school teachers (n = 281), principals (n = 7), vice principals (n = 4), and supervisors (n = 4) found at Debre Tabor Town. Through simple random sampling technique, 54 samples (45 teachers, 3 principals, 3 vice principals, and 3 supervise) were selected from Fitawurari gebriyye primary school, Tewodros primary school, and Tabor primary and especial needs education school from government school. This is by using stage random sampling techniques in which samples of the study selected from selected schools.

### Research Design:-

The research design was survey study method. In this method there were different techniques used such as questionnaire, observation, and focus group discussion to triangulate the finding.

### Instruments:-

Different instruments were used in data collection. These are rating scale, open-ended questions, observation checklists, focus group discussion guides, and photo camera.

### Validity of the instrument:-

The validity of questionnaire was assessed by measurement experts. Experts have evaluated the extent to which each questionnaire are able to measure what they intended to measure.

### Reliability of questionnaire:-

The reliability of questionnaire was tested by Chronback alpha after pilot testing. After poor items are discarded, Chronback alpha for teachers familiarity to creativity characteristics, product and creativity assessment criteria rating scale was  $\alpha = .78$  ; and for classroom and school environment characteristics rating scale the reliability was  $\alpha = .73$ .

### Data Collection Technique:-

Data were collected through direct observation, focus group discussion and questionnaire. During observation, students' work products were observed in the store. The process of producing the output also discussed during focus group discussion.

## Results:-

### Person related Results:-

#### Teachers' familiarity to the statements indicating characteristics of creative person:-

**Table 1:-** Result of teachers' familiarity to the statements indicating characteristics of creative person

Characteristics	Mean	Standard deviation
<b>Personal traits</b>		
Tolerance of ambiguity	2.65	0.79
Openness to experience	3.01	0.66
Independence of judgment	2.91	0.92
Unconventional values	2.87	0.54
Curiosity	2.77	0.69
Preference for challenges and complexity	3.24	0.73
Self confidence	4.98	0.51
Risk- taking	2.98	0.67
Intrinsic motivation	3.96	0.59
<b>Emotional or affective process</b>		
Affective fantasy in play	4.10	0.66
Passionate involvement in tasks	3.97	0.71
Affective pleasure in challenge	2.99	0.61
Tolerance of anxiety	3.01	0.59
<b>Cognitive ability</b>		

Divergent thinking	4.78	0.62
Transformation ability	4.10	0.72
Sensitivity to problems	3.81	0.62
Tendency to practice with alternative solutions	3.56	0.52
Wide breadth of knowledge	4.84	0.53
Insight ability	3.69	0.91
Evaluative ability	4.21	0.93
Synthetic ability	3.94	0.79
Analytical ability	4.01	0.87
Practical-contextual ability	4.91	0.58

From the above table which indicates that the level of teachers' familiarity with statements indicating characteristics of creative person, teachers are more relatively familiar with self- confidence ( $M=4.98$  ,  $S=0.51$ ) and least familiar with tolerance of ambiguity ( $M=2.65$ ,  $S=0.79$ ) under personal trait. Under affective processes teachers are more familiar with affective fantasy in play ( $M=4.10$  ,  $S=0.66$ ) and least familiar with affective pleasure in challenge ( $M=2.99$ ,  $S= 0.61$ ). From cognitive processes, teachers are more familiar with practical contextual ability ( $M=4.91$ ,  $S= 0.58$ ) and least familiar with tendency to practice with alternative solutions ( $M=3.56$ ,  $S= 0.52$ ). More importantly, teachers' awareness to terms indicating creative personal trait such as tolerance of ambiguity, risk- taking, unconventional values, curiosity and independence of judgment are below average. Moreover, focus group discussion with directors, vice directors, some teachers, and supervisors also strength this finding.

There were two questions raised for the focus group discussion: (1) what are the characteristics of creative person? (2) What are the sources of these creative characteristics? In their discussion to the first question, participants have raised three important characteristics of creative children. These are neatness of their handwriting, ability to create new thing (for example physical play) that teachers are even not familiar with, and need of different colors and materials. For the second question a debating issues were raised in each group between the effect of nature and environment on children creativity. Some of them from each group argued that nature takes important part in creativity. In their argument, they raised an example of individuals getting enough care from their parents but not creative and individuals lack care from poor family but shows creative ability in the school. On the other hand others have supported the effect of the environment (such as the school and home environment) on children creativity. As they have argued, there are children in their schools who had got material support from siblings and showed excitement and improvement in drawing ability.

### Product of Children Creativity:-

#### Teachers' familiarity to the characteristic of children creative product:-

Teachers' response to 5 point likert scale about characteristics of children creative product was presented in the following table here after.

**Table 2:-** the result of teachers' familiarity to the characteristics of children creative product.

Products	M	SD
Creativity outcome by drawing	4.67	0.56
Creativity outcome by creating models	4.84	0.87
Creative outcome by coloring	3.58	0.69
Creative outcome by playing with peers	3.33	0.54
Creative outcome by playing with different materials	4.11	0.77

The above table indicates that teachers are most familiar with creativity of children by model ( $M = 4.84$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ) and least familiar with creativity of children by playing with their peers ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.54$ ).

#### Focus group discussion result on product:-

To measure the level of teachers' familiarity and practice on characteristics of children creative product, focus group discussion with directors, vice directors, supervisors and some teachers was conducted. The discussion was based on the following questions: (1) Can we gain some original products from children? (2) In what ways we can observe children creativity?

To the response of the first question, group members have raised two distinct issues. The first one was as children creative product could be original and the second one was as every work of children is based on what they have seen and learnt from older person. Teachers who were agreed with the first issue raised the product of exceptional children as an example. On the other hand those teachers who were agreed with the second issue have raised children product such as drawing, model, picture and the like as they are not original but the result of modeling or imitating others to produce similar products. In the discussion on the second question, participants have raised ways they can observe children creativity. These are by allowing children to draw pictures, construct models, write letters in different modes, write poems, create drama and sing. However, they said so, they witnessed as they hadn't applied these ways to foster and observe children creativity as a result of scarcity of materials.

#### Result of school observation:-

Children creative products in sampled schools were also assessed through observation checklists and photo camera.

**Table 3:-** the result of observation checklists which indicates children creativity practice at school

Checklists	Never	Some	Most
Stored products of children creativity	33.3	66.7	0
Preparation of creative product in the school	100	0	0
Product show originality	100	0	0
Use of different colors	66.7	33.3	0

The above table shows that 33.3% (N=1) of the school has not stored children creative products and 66.7 % (N=2) of the schools have stored some of children products. Inversely, 66.7% (N=2) of the school never used different colors in children creative products and 33.3 % (N=1) of the schools used different colors. On the other hand, no schools ever allowed children to produce their creativity in the school. They used home assignment rather than creating conducive environments at school. Similarly no products of children creativity showed originality.

#### Process of children creativity development:-

##### Responses of participants to open ended questions asking the way they follow to observe children creative ability:-

The open ended question was asked participants to explain the methods they follow to observe children creative ability. Their responses were analyzed by using content analysis. Their responses were categorized into similar characteristics. As a result, the major category of methods in which teachers used to observe children creativity were belongs to the product not to the process.

**Table 4:-** Teachers response to open ended questions

<b>From their creative product of assignment/ home work</b>	From drawing pictures
	From creation of blocks, letters, and models
	From writing of poem/arts
	From modeling machines

#### Focus group Discussion process:-

The first discussion question was limited to ask understanding of participants' about the indication of children product. During the discussion, participants were asked to discuss on whether the products of children are the indications for their creative ability. In their discussion, some of the participants were said that the products of children are the indication of their creative ability. Their argument was based on the comparisons between children who had no involved in the creating products and who had involved in the product creation. They said that whatever the quality and type of the product, unless they have the interest and ability to create they couldn't participated in such activity. On the other hand others were arguing as products of children may/may not be the indication of their creative ability. They raised the main reason that as children can copy and perform what older person performed and as a result it will be considered as reproductive ability rather than creative ability.

#### Press (Environment):-

This perspective concerned about the eminence of classroom and school environment on children creative ability development.

**Practice of teachers in creating conducive environments for children to foster creativity: response of teachers on 3 point scale (average = 2):-**

**Table 5:-** the result of teachers practice in creating conducive environment which motivate students/children to create

Teachers practice in creating conducive environment which motivate students/children to create	Mean	Standard deviation
To question	1.98	0.62
To summarize what I have thought them in classroom	2.89	0.55
To explore the solution to a given problem	2.54	0.71
To skill-building	2.37	0.65
To communicate their idea, imagination and creative work with other students	1.49	0.89
To self-expression	2.23	0.58
To recall what they have learnt	2.96	0.54
To create different models, pictures, drawing and shapes	2.11	0.99

Table 5 indicates that teachers were slightly practicing in motivating children to communicate their idea, imagination and creative work with other students ( $M = 1.49$ ,  $S = .89$ ) which is below average and highly practicing in motivating children to recall what they have learnt ( $M = 2.96$ ,  $S = .54$ ) which is above average.

**Teachers practice in using different materials which can foster creativity in children: teachers response on 3 point scale:-**

**Table 6:-** the result of teachers practice in using different materials which can foster creativity in children

Teachers practice in using different materials which can foster creativity in children	M	S
Different color chalk	1.89	0.58
Different chart	2.56	0.98
Different Marker	1.67	0.67
Model	2.19	0.49
Picture	2.91	0.77
Graphs	2.96	0.55

Table 6 indicates that teachers were practicing slightly in providing different marker ( $M = 1.67$ ,  $S = .67$ ) and different color chalk ( $M = 1.89$ ,  $S = .58$ ) for children in order to enhance creativity which are below average, and highly practicing in providing graphs ( $M = 2.96$ ,  $S = .55$ ) which is above average. The result reveals that teachers practice in using different color chalk, marker, and model to enhance children creativity is very low when it is compared with the use of graphs, pictures and charts. This show us as there is a need of some training or intervention for teachers on how to use different materials to foster children creativity.

**Teachers practice in allowing children to involve in creative tasks:-**

**Table 7:-** the result of teachers practice in allowing children to involve in creative tasks

Teachers practice in allowing children to involve in creative tasks	M	S
Allowing children to use different color chalk	1.53	0.65
Allowing children to draw Different picture, graphs and charts	2.95	0.57
Allowing children to use different color (marker)	1.31	0.77
Allowing children to design different models	1.21	0.66

As the table 7 indicates teachers were working intensely on allowing children to draw different picture, graphs and charts ( $M = 2.95$ ,  $S = .57$ ). However, in allowing children to design different models ( $M = 1.21$ ,  $S = .66$ ), to use different color (marker) ( $M = 1.31$ ,  $S = .77$ ), and to use different color chalk ( $M = 1.53$ ,  $S = .65$ ), teachers are working below average. The resultrevealed that teachers are not effective in allowing them to use different materials such as color chalk, different markers in preparing different materials and models.

**School observation:-**

**Table 8:-** the result of school environment assessment

School environment are suitable	Mean	Standard deviation
To use different colors	1.91	.94
To play with different materials	1.26	.97

To construct different models, picture, graphs, and charts	2.54	.55
To celebrate and exhibit their creative product	2.43	.99
To solve different problems	2.47	.84
To work collaboratively	1.96	.73

Table 8 indicates that schools environment was conducive for children to work collaboratively ( $M = 2.89$ ,  $S = .73$ ) and to construct different models, pictures graphs, and charts ( $M = 2.54$ ,  $S = .55$ ). In contrast the result shows that there is lack of conducive school environment to encourage children to play with different materials ( $M = 1.26$ ,  $S = .97$ ) and solve different problems ( $M = 1.87$ ,  $S = .84$ ).

The discussion with participants of this research revealed that, lack of resources such as paper, color pencil, drawing chart, simple machines, school infra structures and others determine children creativity. On the other hand they have raised also the effect of social interaction among children and their peers, family, and the teacher. For example, they said, children motivated to do things and to play in group; they most of the time influenced by their peers; if any person from their family is out standing in education, they probably influenced by their older siblings; if the teacher assist, motivate and support children with material provision, their creative ability could be enhanced.





**Creativity Measures:-****Teachers' familiarity to creativity measurement criteria:-****Result from questionnaire:-****Table 9:-** result on criteria of creativity measures

Criteria	M	SD
Fluency	4.33	0.66
Flexibility	3.00	0.75
Elaboration	3.58	0.53
Originality	4.57	0.74
Resolution	4.01	0.69

Table 9 indicates the familiarity of teachers to criteria of measuring creativity. As the result reveals, teachers are familiar with each criteria almost at average and above average. Teachers are familiar with originality ( $M = 4.57$ ,  $S = .74$ ), fluency ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $S = .66$ ) and resolution ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $S = .69$ ) above average.

**Result from focus group Discussion:-**

The discussion questions for this part were: (1) can children creativity be measured? How? (2) What criteria should be considered in evaluating children creativity? Regarding the first question participants said that creativity can be measured by evaluating their product critically. However some of them were raised the difficulty of observing children creative ability while they create the product doubting the contribution of older person to the preparation of their children creative product. At the same time they were discussed on the second question. To the responses of the question, the criteria to evaluate children creativity raised by each focus group were summarized. There are two criteria raised by them: the ability of children to create something new in relation to other children, and the ability of creating similar object to the original – the ability of drawing picture similar to the real object.

**Discussion:-**

Teachers are familiar with some creative person characteristics such as cognitive ability and affective characteristics. But there was awareness gap in other cognitive characteristics such as tendency to practice with alternative solutions, synthetic ability, insight ability and sensitivity to problems. Regarding terms of emotional or affective processes, such as tolerance of anxiety, passionate involvement in tasks and affective pleasure in challenge, teachers' awareness was low. And also regarding terms indicating personal traits such as tolerance of ambiguity, risk taking, openness to experience, unconventional values, curiosity, preference for challenges and complexity, and independence of judgment, teachers need awareness creation training.

The result of this research also indicates that teachers awareness of how children's creative product demonstrated through coloring, how playing with peers indicate children creative products was below average. Although they have hints about children creative product, how children produce their creativity, they had not practiced in allowing children to produce creative products due to lack of raw materials. Regarding teachers' familiarity with criteria of creative evaluation, the result showed us the need of awareness creation and further involvement in evaluating children creative product. Thus in any support that will be provided on creativity measures, discussion on criteria such as flexibility and elaboration will be prioritized. From the conducted focus group discussion with participants, the result about measurement of children creativity revealed that most of teachers had been using product as an indication of children creativity. Others argued that children product might not use as indication of creativity because they may imitate produce what older children produced. This gives us insight to search for training on how to enhance, monitor, and measure children creativity through continuous improvement techniques.

On the other hand this research revealed that, elementary school teachers and principals' awareness and practices on how to enhance children creativity by allowing them to practice in the school, providing different colors, observing while they perform, supporting while they perform and storing their products need improvement. As participants of this research argued, observing children product is a method of measuring children creativity. This finding show that teachers have been focusing on the product perspective not on the process one. However it is impossible to know the totality of children creativity by observing only at their product because it is impossible to know what is happening in their mind. As Glaveanu, (2011) discussed, if we restrict creativity to products we are bound to miss out on much of what creativity is or can be.

Hence, this finding also showed that teachers need support on how to help children to question, create different product and communicate their thought with their college. Whatever the case, teachers are not effective in allowing them to use different materials such as color chalk, different markers in preparing different materials and models. From the result we can also conclude that there is a need to make school environment conducive by providing different colors for children, allowing them to play with different materials, work collaboratively with their college, solve different problems creatively and exhibit their creative product. In line with this study, Jeffrey and Woods (2003) discussed that the learning environment at school can either support or limit creativity so that teacher's creativity and ability helps to offer a creative learning environment with creative experiences.

### **Conclusion:-**

To strength the finding of this research, data from questionnaire, observation and focus group discussion result were triangulated. In general the findings of this research were summarized as follows.

Although teachers are aware of some characteristics of creative person, they lack knowledge about other characteristics such as tendency to practice with alternative solutions, synthetic ability, insight ability, sensitivity to problems, tolerance of anxiety, passionate involvement in tasks, affective pleasure in challenge, tolerance of ambiguity, risk taking, openness to experience, unconventional values, curiosity, preference for challenges and complexity, and independence of judgment.

Teachers awareness of how children's creative product demonstrated through coloring, how playing with peers indicate children creative products is below average. Their practice in allowing children to produce creative products is very low due to lack of raw materials.

Teachers' knowledge about observing and measuring children creativity is by considering children products as an indication of their creative ability. Elementary school teachers and principals' awareness and practices on how to enhance children creativity by allowing them to practice in the school, providing different colors, observing while they perform, supporting while they perform and storing their products need improvement.

The practice of using different materials such as color chalk, different markers in preparing different materials and models was another area which seeks improvement. And also, there is a need to make school environment conducive by providing different colors for children, allowing them to play with different materials, work collaboratively with their college, solve different problems creatively and exhibit their creative product. Thus, the result showed the great need of awareness creation and further involvement in evaluating children creative process and product.

### **Recommendation:-**

As a result of this finding the following recommendation should be taken in to consideration. First, to enhance children creativity teachers' knowledge and skill are mandatory. So, any concerned body especially educational institutions and professionals should provide training on how to enhance children creativity, and how to monitor the process of children creativity development. Second, it is important to make school environment conducive enough to scale up children creativity. Therefore material provision which contribute to children creativity should be provided by any organization.

### **Reference:-**

1. Amabile, T.M. (1998). How to kill creativity. Harvard business review, 76 (5), 76-87.
2. Baek, Y.K. (2008). What hinders teachers in using computer and video games in the lassroom? Exploring factors inhibiting the uptake of computer and video games. Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 11(6), 665-671.
3. Beghetto, R.A. (2007). Does creativity have a place in classroom discussion? Prospective teachers' response preferences. Thinking skills and creativity, vol. 15, no. 3, 158-177.
4. Besemer, S. P. & Teffinger, D. J., (1981). Analysis of creative products: Review and synthesis. The journal of creative behavior, Vol. 15, no. 3, 158-177
5. Bottino, R.M. (2003). ICT, national policies, and impact on schools and teachers' development. Paer presented at the ICT and the teacher of the future.
6. Craft, A. (2001). An analysis of research and literature on creativity in education,
7. Craft, A. (2003). Creativity in schools: tension and dilemmas. London: Routledge.

8. Craft, A. (2005). Creativity in schools: tension and dilemmas. London: Routledge.
9. Davidson, D.H. (2003). Developing creativity. Cooperating extension service. Manoa.
10. Discussion Document and Proceedings of the Consultative Conference on Education (2009). Creativity and the Arts in the primary school. Iris national teachers organization.
11. Esquivel, G.B. (1995). Teachers behaviors that foster creativity. Educational psychology review, 7(2), 185-202.
12. Ferrari, A., Cachia, R., and Punie, Y. (2009). Innovation and creativity in education and training in the EU members state: Fostering creativity learning and supporting innovative teaching – literature review on innovation and creativity in E&T in the EU member states. European commission joint research center.
13. Glaveanu, Vlad Petre (2011) Children and creativity: a most (un)likely pair? Thinking skills and creativity, 6 (2). pp. 122-131.
14. Glaveanu, Vlad Petre (2011) Children and creativity: a most (un)likely pair? Thinking skills and creativity, 6 (2). pp. 122-131.
15. Jackson, N. (2002). A guide for busy academics: Nurturing creativity. York, UK: LTSN Generic center. Retrieved October 2014, from <http://www.palatine.ac.uk/files/1029.pdf>
16. Kleiman, P. (2008). Towards transformation: conceptions of creativity in higher education. Innovation in education and teaching international, Vol. 45, No. 3, 209-217.
17. Knight, P. (2002). The idea of a creative curriculum. Retrived November 4, 2014, from <http://www.palatine.ac.uk/files/999.pdf>
18. Lemons, G. (2005). When the horse drinks: enhancing everyday creativity using the elements of improvisation. Creativity Research Journal, 17(1), 25–36.
19. McCammon, L.A., O’Farrell, L., Saebø, A.B. & Heap, B. (2010). Connecting with their inner beings: an international survey of drama/theatre teachers’ perceptions of creative teaching and teaching for creative achievement. Youth Theatre Journal, 24, 140–159.
20. Moe, Moh, and Mowa (2010): Policy document for Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE). Ultimate printing press.
21. Moe, Moh, and Mowa (2010): Strategic operational plan and guidelines for early childhood care and education in Ethiopian. Ultimate printing press.
22. Runco, M.A. (1990). The divergent thinking of young children: Implications of the research. Gifted child today (GCT), 13(4), 37-39.
23. Runco, M.A. (2003). Education for creative potential. Scandinavian journal of education research, 47 (3), 317-324.
24. Russ, S. (1996). Development of creative processes in children. New directions for child development, 72, 31-42.
25. Ryhammar, L. & Brolin, C, (1999) ‘Creativity research: historical considerations and main lines of development’ in Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, vol.43, no.3, pages 259-273
26. Sawyer, R.K. (2000). Improvisation and the creative process: Dewey, Collingwood, and the aesthetics of spontaneity. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 58(2), 149-161.
27. Sharp, C. (2004). Developing young children’s creativity: what can we learn from research? Topic, 32, 5-12.
28. Simplicio, J.S.C. (2000). Teaching classroom educators how to be more effective and creative teachers. Education, 120 (4), 675-680.