

**THE DISTINCTIVE CREATIVITY ENDEAVOUR MODEL FOR CREATIVE  
THINKING, AN EXPANSION OF THE OSBORN-PARNES CREATIVE  
PROBLEM SOLVING APPROACH**

**By**

**BAPTIST STEVEN**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,  
in Fulfilment of the Partial Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**April 2006**

## DEDICATION

To  
**Professor E.Paul Torrance, PhD**  
(October 8, 1915 – July 12, 2003)

The late Professor Torrance, the Father of Creativity was a sheer source of inspiration and encouragement in my pursuit of this study in the field of Creative Thinking. During my correspondence with him the past few years, he was always providing valuable support, encouragement and suggestions in making this study meaningful and become reality. His replies were always comforting and prompt right up to his last days. Professor Torrance's generosity in wanting this research to succeed, had forwarded many of his writings and publications, and guiding me in the right path in realising my dream of making a contribution to the field of creativity.

Sadly, I could not present him with my completed work as his passing on July 12, 2003 at the age of 82 was surely a great loss to the creative domain. I never had an opportunity to meet this great man in person but understand and believe that he is a truly wonderful teacher, a teacher of love and compassion, giving selflessly to others with the sole aim of assisting them realise their dreams.

No words can sum up my deepest gratitude and admiration to the man who had given his life to the betterment of others. May God Bless you always and may your legacy be cherished forever and ever.

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the partial requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**THE DISTINCTIVE CREATIVITY ENDEAVOUR MODEL FOR CREATIVE THINKING, AN EXPANSION OF THE OSBORN-PARNES CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING APPROACH**

By

**BAPTIST STEVEN**

**April 2006**

**Chairman: Professor Aminah Ahmad, PhD**

**Faculty: Educational Studies**

Creative Destruction a termed coined by Joseph Schumpeter in 1942 where new businesses, products and services are being created and in turn immediately self destruct to cater for newer models and like as consumers have become highly demanding and brand loyalty is almost impossible to attain. This phenomenon is taking the world by storm especially so in this new millennium of globalisation where businesses operate at such excruciating pace and stiff competition has become a norm. Demand for new inventions coupled with higher performance and speed have forced corporations to be able to keep pace with the rapid changes or be deemed obsolete and insignificant. Human resources that are highly creative yet critical and able to perform consistently under pressure are much sought after. However, the exact educational system that the human capital is subjected to in Malaysia has been consistently criticised to be overly rote in approach and exam-oriented which does not encompass the elements of creativity and exploration. How than are we to achieve fully developed nation status come year 2020 where a workforce that is dynamic, creative and able to face up to the challenges if the catalyst to progress is the very system that they are subjected to is non creative in nature?

The research was borne from the notion that for creativity to flourish within a work environment that is constantly faced with pressure to perform and meet the challenges of the highly competitive business environment, employees need to be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to solve problems effectively as well as creatively as opposed to freedom from pressure. The need for acquiring skills pertaining to one's pressure threshold level as well as being creatively inspired is necessary to access one's preconscious level where active creativity lies. Many of the creative problem solving models seems not to take these two highly crucial elements (pressure threshold realisation and creative destruction) into consideration and the Distinctive Creativity Endeavour (DCE) Model proposes an alternative. The DCE model is an enhancement of the much acclaimed Osborn-Parnes Creative Problem Solving (CPS) approach.

Various versions of the CPS and DCE programs were developed and subsequently tested via an experimental approach to determine the exact effect of incorporating those two new factors into a CPS framework. The use of a control group (PLA) was introduced where the program administered was a non-creative problem solving program done to determine the comparative effect of undergoing a creative problem solving program with a non-creative program. Testing was carried out at two intervals, mainly the pretest and posttest with the use of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) to determine creativity levels of participants undergoing the creativity programs. Two research hypotheses were used in the study, the first where there exists no significant differences between the various creativity programs and second there exists no significant difference between the various creativity programs on creativity measures of the TTCT.

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA);  $F(16,320)=3.396$ ,  $p=0.005$ , Pillai's Trace=0.581 that shows there is statistically significant difference between the posttest scores on the combined dependent variables. As such, there exists a significant difference between the programs that had incorporated either or both of the pressure threshold realisation and creative inspiration elements in a creative problem solving program as opposed to Osborn-Parnes CPS program void of the said elements or for the control group (PLA). The size effect,  $\eta^2=0.145$  is very large and significant. The results shows that the variation in the creativity scores associated to the creativity programs are significant, which means that the pressure threshold realisation and creative inspiration factors does have a strong bearing on the difference in creativity scores rendering the DCE, CPSI and CPSP programs effective.

When the programs with the pressure and/or creative inspirational elements were analysed together (CDP program) compared to the standard CPS and PLA programs, there was significant differences;  $F(8,160)=4.18$ ,  $p=0.005$ , Pillai'S Trace=0.35, with a very large effect size of  $\eta^2=0.173$ . This proves that the incorporation of pressure threshold realisation and creative inspiration have a significant effect on participants creative ability compared to the CPS and PLA program. The Scheffe post-hoc multiple comparison indicate significant differences between the CDP-PLA program ( $p=0.001$ ) and CDP-CPS ( $p=0.002$ ) for the Creativity Index (CI) scores as well as the Average Standard Score (ASS).

The Creativity Index (CI) scores shows that the DCE program was most effective in bringing about overall creativity with an approximate of 48% increase from pretest to posttest. When the two elements of pressure threshold realisation and creative

inspiration were introduced separately via the CPSP and CPSI programs respectively, the percentage increase was approximately 15% each. However, hypothetically if the independent results of the two programs were combined it sums up to only 30% which is lower compared to having both factors combined together as in the DCE program. Thus, we conclude that there could be a cumulative effect when both those elements are presented together in a creative problem solving program as it enhances one's creative ability.

For the Norms Referenced measures of the TTCT, the standard fluency, originality and elaboration dimensions showed a marked increase from pretest to posttest for the DCE program as opposed to the other programs. All three measures show that having the pressure threshold realisation and creative inspiration elements together in a creative problem solving gives an enhanced effect on creative ability as compared to having them individually incorporated into a CPS program as in the case of the CPSI and CPSP program.

There is reason to believe that performing at one's pressure threshold level while being in a creatively inspired state does have a positive relationship with creative endeavour provided one is able to access the preconscious state. Creativity does not take place by mere compliance to some simple and common techniques but has more to do with the preconscious where inspiration and insight emerges and learning to access and tap that rich source of creative energy is proposed via the DCE Model.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi sebahagian keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**MODEL SIFAT DAYA CIPTA TERSENDIRI UNTUK PEMIKIRAN SECARA  
KREATIF, PENGEMBANGAN MODEL PENYELESAIAN MASALAH  
SECARA KREATIF OLEH OSBORN-PARNES**

Oleh

**BAPTIST STEVEN**

**April 2006**

**Pengerusi : Profesor Aminah Ahmad, PhD**

**Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan**

Pemusnahan secara kreatif adalah suatu istilah yang dikemukakan oleh Joseph Shumpeter pada tahun 1942, dimana sejurus selepas kemunculan perniagaan, produk atau servis yang terkini ia akan pupus secara tersendiri. Ini disebabkan pelanggan masa kini sentiasa menuntut yang terbaru dan ketaatan kepada sesuatu jenama susah dikekalkan. Fenomena ini makin menjadi terutama sekali dalam era globalisasi yang berlaku zaman ini dimana tahap perniagaan dan persaingan sukar dibendung. Permintaan untuk barangan yang canggih dan terbaru dengan tahap prestasi tinggi tidak dapat dielakkan dan syarikat tempatan maupun antarabangsa terpaksa turut bersaing atau tidak akan mengalami kepupusan. Tenaga pekerja kreatif dan dapat bekerja dalam situasi penuh tekanan makin dituntut. Walau demikian, sistem pembelajaran di Malaysia dianggap terlalu bergantung pada peperiksaan dan penghafalan dan ini akan secara tidak langsung mengkongkong kebolehan berfikir secara kreatif. Jika langkah-langkah drastik tidak diambil demi merobah system pengajaran maupun pembelajaran, aspirasi mencapai status negara membangun akan

tergugat kerana tenaga kerja yang dinamik dan kreatif adalah mungkin kearah pencapaian Wawasan 2020.

Tenaga pekerja perlu memiliki kebolehan untuk menyelesaikan masalah kerja secara kreatif sambil dapat bekerja dalam keadaan tertekan jikalau masyarakat ingin mampu bersaing dilapangan antarabangsa. penyelidikan yang kami jalankan adalah berdasarkan kepercayaan bahawa manusia perlu berhadapan dengan tekanan yang optimum untuk seseorang berada dalam keadaan paling fokus sambil dilamuni perasaan inspirasi untuk mereka secara kreatif. kebanyakan model pemikiran secara kreatif tidak mengambil kedua-dua aspek in dalam model mereka. oleh hal demikian, kami mencadangkan suatu model yang mengambil kira kedua-dua faktor tersebut iaitu faktor merelaksasikan tahap tekanan kerja yang boleh dikawal bersama dengan situasi-situasi yang menjadi ilham dan inspirasi kepada seseorang dimana pemikiran mereka bagaikan bebas untuk berfikir secara kreatif. Model Sifat Daya Cipta Tersendiri (DCE) untuk pemikiran secara kreatif adalah berdasarkan model penyelesaian masalah secara kreatif (CPS) oleh Osborn-Parnes.

Pengubahsuaian dibuat kepada program CPS Osborn-Parnes dimana dua faktor baru iaitu tekanan and inspirasi dimasukkan kedalam program tersebut. Segala variasi terhadap program CPS dikaji dengan melakukan eksperimen terhadap sampel yang dipilih dari pelbagai syarikat antarabangsa di Malaysia. Pengukuran dijalankan sebelum permulaan program dan seurus selepas sesuatu program tamat demi memastikan perbezaan yang wujud adalah ketara atau tidak dan tahap keberkesanan dua faktor terbaru itu terhadap kebolehan berfikir secara kreatif.



Analisis melalui MANOVA;  $F(16,320)=3.396$ ,  $p=0.005$ , Pillai's Trace=0.581 menunjukkan bahawa wujudnya perbezaan yang ketara antara ukuran sebelum menjalani program tersebut dengan selepas antara semua program penyelesaian masalah secara kreatif. Kesan saiz pada  $\eta^2=0.145$  adalah sangat besar dan ketara. Kesimpulan yang boleh dibuat adalah perbezaan dalam ukuran kreativiti pada skala TTCT adalah ketara dan boleh dirumuskan kepada faktor tekanan dan inspirasi yang dimasukkan kedalam program DCE, CPSI dan CPSP yang menyebabkan program-program tersebut lebih berkesan.

Bila program-program yang mempunyai salah satu atau kedua-dua faktor tekanan dan inspirasi kreatif dianalisis secara satu gabungan berbanding dengan program CPS dan PLA, didapati perbezaan dalam kreativiti amat ketara:  $F(8,160)=4.18$ ,  $p=0.005$ , Pillai's Trace=0.35, dengan kesan saiz yang sangat besar ( $\eta^2=0.173$ ). Ini menunjukkan bahawa kesan yang dibawa oleh kedua-dua faktor tekanan dan inspirasi adalah amat ketara sekali bagi program penyelesaian masalah secara kreatif. Ukuran perbandingan Scheffe menunjukkan perbezaan yang signifikan antara program CDP-PLA ( $p=0.001$ ) dan CDP-CPS ( $p=0.002$ ) pada keputusan Index Kreativiti (CI) dan keputusan Ukuran Purata (ASS).

Dari keputusan kajian, didapati bahawa program DCE adalah paling efektif dalam meningkatkan tahap kreativiti seseorang dengan peningkatan sebanyak 48%. Didapati juga, jika kedua-dua faktor tekanan dan inspirasi dimasukkan kedalam program penyelesaian masalah secara kreatif secara berasingan seperti dengan CPSI dan CPSP, peningkatan tahap kreativiti adalah hanya 15% untuk setiap program. Jika keputusan untuk program CPSI dan CPSP ditambahkan ia hanya berjumlah 30%, iaitu kurang berbanding dengan program DCE yang mempunyai kedua-dua faktor tersebut didalam

satu program. Ini menunjukkan bahawa wujudnya kesan yang amat ketara sekali jika kedua-dua faktor tekanan dan inspirasi digabungkan sekali dalam sebuah program penyelesaian masalah secara kreatif.

Ukuran pada skala TTCT mendapati dimensi kelancaran, keunikan dan penghuraian menunjukkan peningkatan yang amat ketara untuk program DCE berbanding program-program yang lain. Kesemua tiga ukuran dimensi TTCT menunjukkan bahawa gabungan faktor tekanan dan inspirasi mempunyai kesan sampingan yang amat ketara jika dibandingkan dengan program-program lain yang hanya mempunyai salah satu dari faktor tersebut atau tanpa faktor dan tekanan seperti program CPS dan PLA.

Kesimpulan dari kajian yang dijalankan adalah bekerja pada tahap tekanan yang optimum sambil berada dalam keadaan berinspirasi secara kreatif, iaitu penuh dengan tenaga untuk mereka membolehkan seseorang melangkah kealam kesedaran spara mental yang mendalam. Kreativiti jarang muncul dengan hanya mematuhi beberapa prinsip dalam sesuatu program kreativiti tetapi lebih kepada kebolehan untuk mereda jauh kedalam alam kesedaran spara yang penuh dengan tenaga kreatif.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It gives me great pleasure to humbly pen down my deepest appreciation to all who have contributed in any way whatsoever during the difficult and challenging past five years in my quest for my doctorate.

First and foremost, I would like to extend my most gracious appreciation to my Theses Supervisory Committee Chairperson and Academic Supervisor, Professor Dr. Aminah Ahmad in taking me under her tutelage right from the onset of my Ph.D studies and providing me with countless hours of scholarly counsel, encouragement, constructive ideas and direction, patience and care despite her extremely busy schedule and workload. Without that level of friendship and guidance I would not be able to reach this final stage of my studies.

I would also like to extend my deepest gratitude to Professor Dr. Rahim Haji Muhammad Sail, Associate Professor Dr. Jegak Uli and Dr. Shamsuddin Ahmad who are members of my Theses Supervisory Committee. They had spent countless hours deliberating on the issues of my research, besides providing loads of constructive criticisms, encouragement, guidance, ideas and support throughout. Their understanding and patience despite my frequent delays and acts of procrastination were always greeted with warm words of support to battle on and persevere despite the challenges faced. This was truly a sense of self belief that was inculcated within throughout the past few years at the department.

I would not be befitting if I were to exclude lecturers and staff at the Department of Professional Development and Continuing Education, UPM where I had spent the past

five years of my life. The knowledge gained from the various modules and lectures were immensely beneficial to my own professional career as well as personal development as a whole. It has surely opened up my mind to issues of adult education and extension studies in particular youth development, gender studies and professional development. The whole perspective of human resource development has taken over a completely new meaning from the experience and to that I sincerely thank all for contributing in one way or another.

My special gesture of love and indebtedness to my mother who has been nothing short of an icon of inspiration in instilling in me the importance of learning and education ever since a young boy. Today, I can safely profess that I carry that torch ever since, passing it on to others I come across in my life. Gratitude also extended to my brother and sisters who have always stood by me in all my life pursuits.

To all my former students whom I had given my all and in return received encouragement, support and love throughout the past years, in particular Fahrudin Najumudeen, Doris, Michele Ho, Emphanie Gan, Chan Yiyin, Jesmin, Joo Lee, Lena Gong and not forgetting also my former student and wife-to-be Miss Yap Chiu Mei. It gives me a great sense of joy and pride that you have all wonderful careers and it is a source of inspiration while I pursue my dream of a Ph.D.

My sincere gratitude and appreciation extended to my friends Ganesh, Rajan, Vijaya, Silen, Gunaseelan, Muniandy, Delip, Kalai, Andy, Ghandimathi, Ramesh, Banu, Julie Blaskie, Renie Ling, Tarzan, Heli, Mummy and Mr. Pullikuthy and family for being a

rich source of encouragement and support besides putting up with my unpredictable moods the past few years.

Last but not least a big thank you to my Master and friend Mr Sathasivam Guru who has always been there as a friend and a guiding hand in helping me weather the storm in trying times and showing the path when the future looked bleak.

I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2006 to conduct the final examination of Baptist Steven on his Doctor of Philosophy thesis entitled “The Distinctive Creativity Endeavour Model For Creative Thinking, an Expansion of the Osborn-Parnes Creative Problem Solving Approach” in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

**Azahari Ismail, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Ghazali Mustapha, PhD**

Lecturer  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**Khairuddin Idris, PhD**

Lecturer  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**John P. Dolly, PhD**

Professor  
College of Education  
The University of Alabama  
(External Examiner)

---

**ZAKARIAH ABDUL RASHID, PhD**

Professor/Deputy Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the partial requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

**Aminah Ahmad, PhD**

Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Rahim Md. Sail, PhD**

Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**Jegak Uli, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**Shamsuddin Ahmad, PhD**

Lecturer  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

---

**AINI IDERIS, PhD**

Professor/Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

**BAPTIST STEVEN**

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> June 2006



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>Page</b> ii
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	iii
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	viii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	xiii
<b>APPROVAL</b>	xv
<b>DECLARATION</b>	xvii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xxiii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xxv
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/NOTATIONS/GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b>	xxvi

### CHAPTER

<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
	Background of the Study	1
	Competition and Changing Environment	4
	Creative Workforce	5
	Educational Systems	6
	Statement of the Problem	9
	Objective of the Study	13
	Research Hypotheses	15
	Significance of the Study	15
	Assumptions and Limitations of the Study	16
	Definition of Terms	17
<b>II</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	21
	Importance of Creative Thinking	21
	Definition of Creativity	22
	Person	23
	Product	26
	Process	27
	Press	29
	Problem Solving View	33
	Comprehensive View	34
	Our Research View	34
	Theories of Creativity	35
	Domain Knowledge and Creativity	38
	Degrees and Categories of Creative Thinking	40
	Problem Solving	43
	Problem-Solving Cycle	43
	Categories of Problem	45
	Newell and Simon's Problem-Solving Model	47
	Algorithm	48
	Heuristic	49
	Insight	51

Pressure	55
Stress	56
Types of Work Related Pressure	58
Performance and Pressure	60
Creativity and Pressure	65
Creativity and Time Pressure	68
Incubation Process	70
Incubation Model of Teaching	72
Inspiration	75
Neuro-Linguistic Programming	79
Principles of Neuro Linguistic Programming	81
Practicality, Adaptation and Innovation	81
Experimentation, Objective Observation, Empiricism and Ecology	81
Client Centered	82
Clarity of thought and multiple Viewpoints	82
Mind and Body	83
Neuro Linguistic Programming Mechanism	83
Representational Systems	84
Anchoring	84
Strategies	85
Models of Creative Thinking	85
Wallas's Creativity Model	86
Guildford's Creativity Model	87
Barron's Psychic Creation Model	88
Rosman's Creativity Model	89
Koberg and Bangnall's Universal Traveler Model	90
Creative Strategic Planning Model	91
Robert Fritz' Process for Creation	91
Lateral Thinking Model	92
Synectics Group Approach	94
Japanese Problem Solving Methods	96
KJ Method	97
NM Method	98
Comparison of KJ and NM Method	100
Osborn's Seven-Step Model	100
Directed Creativity Cycle	101
Summary of Creativity models	102
Generalisations of the Creativity Models	104
Creativity Programs	105
Osborn-Parnes Creative Problem Solving Model	105
Distinctive Creativity Endeavor (DCE) Model	110
Objective-finding Stage	115
Fact-finding Stage	117
Problem-finding Stage	120
Pressure Threshold Realisation Stage	122
Creative Inspiration Stage	123
Idea-finding Stage	124
Solution-finding Stage	127
Acceptance-finding Stage	128

Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Approach	131
Divergent and Convergent Thinking	134
Divergent Thinking in Society	142
Psychometric Approach and Creative Thinking Test	145
Summary	147
<b>III METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>150</b>
Introduction	150
The Sample	151
Research Design	152
Solomon Four-Group Experimental Design	152
Experimental Program	154
Experimental Design Criteria	160
Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT)	164
TTCT Testing Procedures	168
TTCT Streamlined Scoring	171
Statistical Analysis	174
Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	175
Box's Test	175
Levene's Test	175
Bonferroni Adjustments	176
Eta-squared	176
<b>III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>178</b>
Demographic Profile	178
Significance of Creativity Programs	180
Box Test	181
Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances	182
Multivariate Tests-Pillal's Trace	183
Between-Subject Effect	184
Significance of Proposed Creativity Factors	186
Multivariate Tests-Pillal's Trace	186
Between-Subject Effect	187
Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons	188
Profile of Creativity Performance	189
Average Standard Score (ASS) Performance Comparison	190
DCE Program	190
CPS Program	191
CPSI Program	191
CPSP Program	192
PLA Program	192
Creativity Index (CI) Performance Comparison	193
DCE Program	193
CPS Program	194
CPSI and CPSP Program	195
PLA Program	195
Creative Performance Comparison	196
Creativity Index (CI) Results	196

DCE Program	196
CPS Program	198
CPSI and CPSP Program	198
PLA Program	200
Discussion on Creative Performance (CI)	200
DCE Program	201
CPSP Program	205
CPSI Program	207
National Percentile Creativity Index (NPCI)	
Results	208
DCE Program	208
CPS Program	209
CPSI and CPSP Program	210
PLA Program	211
Discussion on Creative Performance (NPCI)	211
TTCT Norms-Referenced Measures	213
Standard Fluency Results	213
DCE Program	213
CPS and PLA Program	214
CPSP Program	215
CPSI Program	215
Discussion on Standard Fluency	216
Standard Originality Results	218
DCE Program	218
CPS Program	219
CPSI and CPSP Program	220
PLA Program	221
Discussion on Standard Originality	221
Standard Elaboration	224
DCE Program	224
CPS and CPSI Program	225
CPSP and PLA Program	225
Discussion on Standard Elaboration	226
Standard Resistance to Premature Closure	229
DCE Program	229
CPS Program	230
CPSI and CPSP Program	231
PLA Program	232
Discussion on Standard Resistance to Premature Closure	232
Standard Abstractness of Title	234
DCE Program	234
CPS Program	235
CPSI and CPSP Program	236
PLA Program	236
Discussion on Standard Abstractness of Title	237

<b>IV</b>	<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	238
	Summary	238
	Significance of Creativity Programs	243
	Significance of Proposed Creativity Factors	245
	Creative Performance Comparison	246
	TTCT Norms Referenced Measures	247
	Conclusion	249
	Deduction and Explanation	250
	Limitation	253
	Recommendation	255
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	256
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	278
	<b>BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR</b>	314