



# **Journal of Vocational Studies**

## **Ahmadu Bello University**



A Publication Of The Department of  
Vocational And Technical Education,  
ABU, Zaria.

**Vol. 3 No. 1A Aug. 2009**



GBADEGBE CHRISTIANA T. ENIOLO

DEPT OF Home Economics & Food

ISSN 1597-3840

Science. Faculty of Agric. University of Ilorin  
Kwara State

**ABUJOVS**

Pg 120-126

see pg 120

120-126.

**AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL STUDIES**

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

*A Publication of the Department of Vocational and  
Technical Education, ABU Zaria.*

VOL. 3 NO. 1A AUG. 2009

**AHMADU BELLO JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT OF  
VOC. & TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

**AHMADU BELLO JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL STUDIES**

- |    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1. | <b><u>Editorial Members</u></b><br><b><u>Chairman / Editor-In-Chief</u></b> | - | <b>Prof. F.D. Kolo</b><br>Dept. of Education ABU, Zaria |
| 2. | <b><u>Secretary Editorial Board</u></b>                                     | - | Okeh, B.I<br>Dept. of Voc. & Tech. Ed. ABU, Zaria       |

**Members of Editorial Board**

- |                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Dr. Ahmed Ben               | - | Dept. of Agric Ext. & Rural<br>Sociology ABU, Zaria |
| Dr. Sadiq Mohammed          | - | Dept. of Edu. ABU, Zaria                            |
| Dr. M.M. Aliyu              | - | Dept. of Voc. & Tech. Ed. ABU, Zaria                |
| Dr. (Mrs.) V.O. Babalola    | - | Dept. of Voc. & Tech. Ed ABU, Zaria                 |
| Dr. (Mrs.) I.M. Onyemulukwe | - | Dept. of French, ABU, Zaria                         |
- 

**Editorial Consultants**

- |    |                              |   |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Prof. K. Venkateswarlu       | - | Dept. of PHE ABU Zaria                    |
| 2. | Dr. Edwin Igbokwe (Reader)   | - | Dept. of Agric Extension UNN              |
| 3. | Dr. L. E. Ekpenyong (Reader) | - | Dept. of Voc. & Tech Ed Uniben University |
| 4. | Prof. Bamikunle A.           | - | Dept. of English, Fac. Of Art, ABU, Zaria |
| 5. | Prof. S. O. Ezeji            | - | Dept. of Vocational Teacher, Ed. UNN      |
| 6. | Prof. (Mrs.) F. B. Adeyanju  | - | Dept. of PHE, Fac of Ed, ABU, Zaria.      |

# **INFLUENCE OF TELEVISION AND INTERNET USE ON CREATIVITY OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ZARIA EDUCATIONAL ZONE, KADUNA STATE**

**BY**

**GBADEBO C.T.**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS & FOOD SCIENCE  
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN, KWARA STATE**

**AND**

**E. IKE. PhD**

**DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL  
EDUCATION AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study was to investigate the Influence of time spent for Television and Internet on Creativity of Senior Secondary School Students in Zaria Educational Zone, Kaduna State. Descriptive research design using survey method was adopted. The population for the study was 5853 senior secondary school students from six (6) senior secondary schools in Zaria, Sabon Gari and Giwa Local Government Areas of Zaria Educational Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria. Three hundred and fifty (350) students were randomly selected as the sample for the study, using proportional sampling technique. The instruments used for the collection of data were the questionnaire, and standardized creativity test administered by the researcher. The data collected were statistically analyzed using One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), at 0.05 significant levels. The result revealed that there were some differences in the creativity of heavy, light, and non-users of internet and television though the difference was not significant. Based on the findings, recommendations made included that parents regulate children's television and internet time and their choice of programmes.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Gem (2001) defined televisions as an electronic device for receiving, broadcasting signals and converting them to sound and pictures. Television can be a powerful tool and by means of it one can learn about lands and people who may never be visited. Television presents adolescents with a world that is different from the one they live in. The internet on the other hand is made up of millions of computers linked together around the world in such a way that information can be sent from any of the computers to any other 24 hours a day. These computers can be seen in homes, schools, universities, government departments or companies where they are well exposed to young people. Santrock (2005) defined creativity as the ability to think in novel way and discover unique solutions to problems, creative thinkers are flexible, objective, fluent, original, have inner motivations and are divergent in thinking, producing many answers.

Adolescence is the period of transition between childhood and adulthood and involves biological, cognitive and socio-emotional

changes. Adolescence begins at approximately 10 to 13 years of age and ends between the ages of about 18 and 22 years. The biological, cognitive and socio-emotional changes of adolescence range from the development of sexual functions to abstract, idealistic and logical thinking processes, to independence. Children at this age are experiencing the technological revolution with increased use of the television, computer and internet. The 24 hours services provided by various television stations all over the world via satellite, accelerates young people's use of them. Socially, early adolescents generate quest for independence, and desire to spend more time with peers and in front of television and internet, and this can have effect on their creativity (Santrock 2005).

Okeke (2006) explained that television is negatively related to children's creativity as excessive viewing prevent play which help to develop their unique potentials and creativity. Otokhine (2002), however stated that television and internet can stimulate adolescents imagination, creation and invention of new things, making them to be innovative, using new materials around them

for artistic and self expression especially in sciences. Excessive viewing is however, negatively related to creativity as it makes adolescent to become passive learners (Okeke 2006). Approximately 1½ hours to 3 hours spent on television or internet per day is heavy. Light viewing could be said to be 30 minutes to one hour daily (3½ hours to 7hours weekly) as this does not have much effect on time use (larson and verma 1999) Creativity can be fostered through viewing of profitable and educational television programmes and browsing safe websites on the internet. The problem is creativity can be deadened during the school years by students being glued to television and exploring dangerous and unprofitable websites on the internet. If man's only educational tasks were to recall what others told them or to imitate what others did, then he would never be able to generate new ideas. This makes some believe that television and internet does not encourage creativity in children since users most of the time view other people's input. True creativity and innovation consists of SEEING what everyone else has not seen, THINKING what no one else has thought of and DOING what no one else has dared to do. The researcher intends to determine the extent to which deferent levels of internet and television use would influence adolescent's creative behaviors or abilities.

**Objective of the Study:-** To ascertain the influence of excessive, light and non-use of television and internet on adolescents' creativity.

**Research Question :-** How do heavy, light and non-use of television and internet influence adolescents' creativity?

**Hypothesis :-** There is no significant deference in the creativity of heavy, light, and non-users of television and internet.

## METHODOLOGY

**Research Design:-** Descriptive research design was used in form of survey, and the data were collected from subjects using a questionnaire.

### Instrument for Data Collection

The instruments that were used for data collection for this study were:

- a. Questionnaire
- b. Creativity test designed and assembled by Raudsepp (1998). a standardized test

**Population for the Study: -** The total population for this study comprised of all adolescents in senior secondary schools in Zaria, Sabon Gari and Giwa Local Government Areas of Kaduna State. The total population of the senior secondary school students for this study was twenty one thousand four hundred and forty nine (21,449) from twenty five (25) senior secondary schools in Zaria educational zone.

**Sample and Sampling Technique** Two senior secondary schools each were randomly selected from Zaria, Sabon Gari and Giwa Local Government Areas in Zaria Educational Zone using hat drawn method of random sampling techniques. These made up the six (6) senior secondary schools from the existing twenty five (25) senior secondary schools in the area. The population of the six schools was five thousand eight hundred and fifty three (5853), according to the Ministry of Education, Planning, Research and Statistics Department Headquarter, Kaduna. Three hundred and fifty (350) respondents were used as sample for the study based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970)'s recommendation that three hundred and fifty (350) is accepted for a large population and that five percent (5%) of the selected population is alright, and, 350 is 1/5 of 5853. Proportional sampling technique was used to select the sample for the study as described by Miles (2001) that it gives every member of the population equal and independent chance of being selected or included in the sample.

**Reliability of the Instrument** To determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire split half method, selected within the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the pilot study. The reliability coefficient obtained was 0.835 and the internal consistency coefficient obtained for the instrument was 0.794. This suggested that the instrument was reliable

**Procedure for Data Analysis:** Data collected were statistically analyzed using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. The Null Hypothesis for the study was tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The Hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significant.

## DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected are shown in Tables 2-4

Table 1:- Length of Time Spent Daily/Weekly on Internet and Watching Television

Time Spent Daily/Weekly			Internet		Television	
S/No.	Daily	Weekly	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
a	<b>Light users</b>					
	30 mins-1hr/day	3½ -7 hrs./week	90	25.7	71	20.3
b	<b>Heavy users</b>					
	1½ -2 hrs/day	10½ -14 hrs./week	92	26.3	154	44.0
c	3-4 hrs/day	21-28 hrs/week	20	5.7	52	14.9
d	4-5 hrs/day	28-35 hrs/week	16	4.6	14	4.0
e	6-7 hrs/day	42-49 hrs/week	09	2.6	20	5.7
f	8 hrs. and above/day	56 hrs and above/week	10	2.9	20	5.7
g	<b>None (non-users)</b>		113	32.3	19	5.4
Total			350	100	350	100

Table 1 shows the length of time spent daily/weekly by respondents on the television and internet. 147(42.5%) and 260(84.3%) of the respondents were heavy users of internet and television respectively. This could be seen from the breakdown of the students who claimed to spend between 1½ - 8 hours and

above on internet and television daily, which added up to 10½ - 56 hours and above weekly. Light users of internet were 90 (25.7%) of the sample, while non-users were 113 (32.4%) of the sample. Light users of television were 71 (20.4%) and non-users were 19 (5.4%) of the sample

# **Influence of Television and Internet on Creativity of Senior Secondary School Students.**

**Research Question :-** How does television and internet use influence adolescents creativity?

**Table 2 :- Summary of Performances in the Creativity Tests by the Respondents**

Score Range in creativity tests	Internet			Television		
	Heavy Users	Light Users	Non-Users	Heavy Users	Light Users	Non-Users
75-100	06 (4.1)	02 (2.2)	03 (2.7)	03 (1.2)	01 (1.0)	-
50-74	75 (51.0)	59 (65.6)	62 (54.9)	156 (60.0)	38 (53.5)	12 (63.2)
25-49	64 (43.5)	27 (30.0)	45 (39.8)	96 (36.8)	32 (45.1)	07 (36.8)
0-24	02 (1.4)	02 (2.2)	03 (2.7)	05 (1.9)	-	-
Mean	51.21	54.09	51.78	51.08	51.92	51.24
Sample Size	147	90	113	260	71	19
Percentage	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

## **KEY**

- 75-100 - Highly creative  
 50-74 - Creative  
 25-49 - Less creative  
 0-24 - Non-creative

## **INTERNET USE**

Table 2 shows that 4.1% (6) of heavy users, 2.2%(2)of the light-, and 2.7%(3) of the non-users scored 75-100% in the creativity test. These were highly creative. On the other hand, 51% (75 of the 147 heavy users), 65% (59 of the 90 light users), and 54% (62 of the 113 non-users) scored 50-74. These percentages were creative. From these data light users seem to be more creative (65%) of them, followed by non-users (54%). Heavy users ( 51% ) seem to have lagged behind.

At the bottom of the scores is 0-49 which was scored by 44.9% (66) of the heavy users, 32.2% (29) of light users and 42.5% (48) of the non-users of internet. These data also indicate that a smaller percentage of light users scored the low marks in creativity, followed by non-users with 42.5%.

## **TELEVISION USE**

Out of 260 heavy viewers of television 1.2% (3) scored 75-100, followed by 1.0% (1) of the light users. No non-user scored 75-100%. But 60% (156 of the heavy users), 53.5% (38 out of 71 light users) and 63.2% (12 of the non-users) scored 50-74 in creativity test. These are the creative students. The non-users were the most creative, followed by heavy users. Viewed from the low scores -0- 49 the light users were more 45.1% (32 out of 71) followed by heavy users 38.7% (101 out of 260) Non-users were the least 36.8% (7 out of 19) From the data obtained in this study the light users of internet and non-users of television seem to be more creative than the heavy -users.

The test of hypothesis will establish the significance of the observed difference.

## **Test of Null Hypotheses**

**Null Hypothesis  $H_0$ :-** There is no significant difference in creativity among heavy, light and non-users of television and internet.



**Table 3:- Analysis of Variance on Differences in Creativity Level of Respondents based on Internet Usage**

Source of Variation	Df	Sum of Square	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	f. prob.	F critical	Remark
Between groups	2	84.6964	42.3482	1.4218	.2433	3.48	NS
Within Groups	347	7297.2028	29.7845				
Total	349	7381.8992					

P=0.05

The value of the computed F. ratio was 1.4218 at the alpha level of 0.05 and 2, 347 degree of freedom (df) and the probability significance level of 0.2433 while F-critical is 3.48. Going by the decision rule, with the  $F(\text{calculated}) = 1.4218$ , less than  $F(\text{critical}) = 3.48$  and  $F(\text{probability})$  significance level = 0.2433, greater than the alpha value of 0.05, the null

hypothesis of no significant difference could be retained. Thus there is no significant difference in the creative abilities of students in the three groups of heavy, light and non-users of internet. In other words, the use of internet did not significantly influence how creative an adolescent would be.

**Table 4 :-Analysis of Variance on Differences in Creativity Level of Respondents Based on Television Usage**

Source of Variation	Df	Sum of Square	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	f. prob.	F critical	Remark
Between groups	2	5.3148	2.6574	.3262	.7224	3.48	NS
Within Groups	347	945.122	8.1476				
Total	349	950.4370					

P= 0.05

In table 4 the calculated value of (calculated=0.3262) less than  $F(\text{critical}) = 3.48$  and the P. value (0.7224) is greater than 0.05 alpha level. at 2, 347 degree of freedom, the null hypotheses cannot be rejected. The result proves that there is no significant difference in the creative ability of heavy, light and non-users of television.

### Discussion

The main objective of this study was to investigate the influence of television viewing and internet usage on creativity of senior or secondary school students.

The finding revealed that non- users of television were the most creative, followed by heavy users while, light users of internet were the most creative followed by non-users.

Heavy users of internet or television were not found to be most creative. However, the test of hypothesis showed that the differences were not significant. On the whole the performances of the three groups were almost equal and it was concluded that the groups were not significantly different in creative ability. These findings were contrary to Otokhine (2002) who explained that television and internet stimulated adolescents' imagination, invention of new things and make them to be innovative and creative, showing a tendency that newer technologies can motivate adolescents to learn and become exploratory in solving problems, thus encouraging creativity. The fact that the three groups (heavy lights and non-users) showed no significant difference in creativity seem to also be contrary to the findings of Kalb (2003) and Santrock (2005)



who stated that watching television general entertainment led to less participation in creative activities in high school, like Art classes or Creative writing. But the present study did not specify the types of programme students spent their time on.

The researchers also observe that the fact that non-users of television and internet were not less creative than heavy and light users proves that both internet and television could not be the sole determinant of adolescents' creativity. This finding was a reflection of Adeyanju (1996) who reiterated that several factors were involved in creative process namely, environmental factors (physical, material and psychological environment), social values (peer group and teachers) and personality of the child (the person's self-worth). Internet and television are probably items that can help creativity and not the sole determinant of creativity.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

- Even though television and internet usage does not significantly affect adolescents' creativity, the time spent by heavy users of these media can be made more lucrative by the adolescents if they should spread such time among other activities also. After all they did not show themselves to be better than the light and non-users in any way.
- Parents should regulate the time their adolescents spend on television and internet and encourage them to spend that time not only on pleasurable programmes but also on programmes that can build their intellect, for example public affairs, science, social problems, ethics, politics and other reality topics so that they will be convinced of their importance and get to love to find out more about such on internet and television. Also commentaries, interviews of heroes and good personalities, press conferences, topics related to

their subject in school, documentaries and special events can help boost their creativity.

- Teachers and child psychologists can talk to parents groups, school boards and other organizations about the impact of media on children and youth, thereby becoming information managers, educators and trainers for the young people

### REFERENCES.

- Adeyanju G.A. (1996). Creativity Learning and Learning Styles. Zaria, Nigeria. Isela and Sons pp. 1-4, 31-40, 45-5
- Gem, C. (2001). *Gem English Dictionary* view. Great Britain Harper Collins Publishers, p. 558.
- Kalb C. Laudia (2003). The end of make believe. *Newsweek*. August 25-September 1, pp. 54-57.
- Kjreccie, R.K. and Mogan D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Education and Psychological Measurement, New York, Academic Press pp. 608-609.
- Larson, R.W. and Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world. *Work Play and Developmental Opportunities*. *Psychological Bulletin*. 125, 701-736.
- Miles J. (2001). *Research Methods and Statistics Success in your psychology degree*. Bell and Brain Ltd., Glasgow, pp. 55-60.
- Okeke, C.A. (2006). Developing creativity skills in children through play. *Journal of Home Economics Research* (Special edition) 85 -88.
- Otokhine, E. (2005). Technologies – New Ways to Raise Super Smart Children. *The Punch*. Sept. 2, p. 22.
- Raudsepp, E. (1998). Creativity and innovation. <http://www.hs++u.edu/>.

chim5200/htm.files/0029.htm.retrieved  
28 Sept. 2006

Santrock J.W. (2005). *Adolescence* (10<sup>th</sup> edition). Boston. McGraw-Hill Company Inc. pp. 493, 485-494.