

3rd Edition

Creativity in PRIMARY EDUCATION

Edited by
Anthony Wilson



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC



Learning Matters
An imprint of SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Amy Thornton
Development editor: Geoff Barker
Production controller: Chris Marke
Project management: Deer Park Productions,
Tavistock
Marketing manager: Lorna Patkai
Cover design: Wendy Scott
Typeset by: C&M Digitals (P) Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed by: Henry Ling Limited at The Dorset
Press, Dorchester, DT1 1HD



© 2015 Rob Bowker, Mary Briggs, Simon Catling,
Liz Chamberlain, Sue Chedzhoy, Hilary Claire, Hilary
Cooper, Anna Craft, Teresa Cremin, Dan Davies,
Tony EAUde, Emese Hall, Sarah Hennessy, Alan
Howe, Jane Johnston, Paul Key, Avril Loveless,
Alison Peacock, Anthony Wilson, Elizabeth Wood
and Richard Woolley

First published in 2007 by Learning Matters Ltd
Second edition published in 2009
Reprinted in 2009, 2010 and 2011
Third edition 2015

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of
research or private study, or criticism or review,
as permitted under the Copyright, Design and
Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be
reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form,
or by any means, only with the prior permission
in writing of the publishers, or in the case of
reprographic reproduction, in accordance with
the terms of licences issued by the Copyright
Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning
reproduction outside these terms should be sent
to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014952505

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4462-8064-5
ISBN 978-1-4462-8065-2 (pbk)

At SAGE we take sustainability seriously. Most of our products are printed in the UK using FSC papers and boards. When we print overseas we ensure sustainable papers are used as measured by the Egmont grading system. We undertake an annual audit to monitor our sustainability.

PART 1

SETTING THE SCENE

1

Changes in the landscape for creativity in education

Anna Craft and Emese Hall

Chapter objectives

By the end of this chapter you should have:

- **understood that creativity is no longer the preserve of arts education;**
- **explored how creative teaching focuses on the teacher;**
- **seen how creativity is critical for individuals to thrive in a rapidly changing world.**

This chapter addresses the following Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2012a):

- **establish a safe and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect;**
- **have a secure knowledge of the relevant subject(s) and curriculum areas, foster and maintain pupils' interest in the subject, and address misunderstandings;**
- **promote a love of learning and children's intellectual curiosity;**
- **fulfil wider professional responsibilities.**

Introduction

In the last part of the twentieth century and the start of the twenty-first, creativity in education has increasingly become a focus in curriculum and pedagogy. It is now embedded in the Early Years Foundation Stage Curriculum and the National Curriculum for schools (England). There has been a substantial investment in staff development and the creation of teaching resources for school teachers.

This chapter explores why the landscape has altered so radically from the policy context which immediately preceded it. It also explores current concepts of creativity in use in education, and strategies used to enhance opportunity for pupils to be creative.

Finally it raises some fundamental tensions and dilemmas that face teachers fostering creativity in education.

What has changed?

The last twenty-five or so years have seen a global revolution so that in many places creativity has moved from the fringes of education and/or from the arts to being seen as a core aspect of educating. No longer seen as an optional extra, nor as primarily to do with self-expression through the arts, early twenty-first century creativity is seen as generative problem-identification and problem-solving, across life (Craft, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2005).

Three waves of creativity in education

We can describe the change in creativity policy as occurring in three 'waves'.

- The 'first wave' of creativity in education was perhaps in the 1960s, codified by Plowden (CACE, 1967), drawing on child-centred philosophy, policy and practice.
- The second wave began in the late 1990s, about ten years after the introduction of the National Curriculum.
- And the third is well under way in the early years of the twenty-first century.

The first wave: Plowden and beyond

The recommendations of the Central Advisory Council in Education in 1967 (which became known as the Plowden Report), formed thinking about creativity in education for the generation which followed it (CACE, 1967). Drawing on a large body of so-called liberal thinking on the education of children, it recommended that children learn by discovery, taking an active role in both the definition of their curriculum and the exploration of it. Active and individualised learning was strongly encouraged, as well as learning through first-hand experience of the natural, social and constructed world beyond the classroom. A core role was given to play.

Plowden made a significant contribution to the way in which creativity in education was understood. It influenced the early years of education but had an impact on the later primary years and secondary education, too. It provided an early foundation for the more recent move in creativity research towards emphasising social systems rather than personality, cognition or psychodynamics.

Through Plowden, creativity became associated with a range of other approaches: discovery learning, child-centred pedagogy, an integrated curriculum and self- rather than norm-referencing.

However, within the Plowden 'take' on creativity, there are several problems.

The first is the role of knowledge. For while we cannot exercise imagination or creativity in any domain without knowledge if we are to go beyond the given or assumed, Plowden nevertheless implies that a child may be let loose to discover and learn without any prior knowledge.

Secondly, there is a lack of context implied in the rationale for 'self-expression'. Plowden appears to conceive of the child's growth and expression in a moral and ethical vacuum. It has been argued more recently that encouraging children and young people to have ideas and express them should be set in a moral and ethical context within the classroom (Craft, 2000, 2006; Fischmann *et al.*, 2004; Gardner, 2004).

Thirdly, Plowden suggests that play provides the foundation for a variety of other forms of knowledge and expression and in doing so appears to connect play creativity within the arts only and not with creativity across the whole curriculum.

Related to the third point is a further problem, which is that play and creativity are not the same as one another, for not all play is creative.

Such conceptual and practical problems, it has been argued (NACCCE, 1999), were in part responsible for creativity being pushed to the back of policy-makers' priorities in curriculum development. Until, that is, the late 1990s, which saw a revival of official recognition of creativity in education: the second wave (Craft, 2002, 2003a, 2004).

The second wave of creativity in education

During the late 1990s, there was a resurgence of interest in psychology and education research. This accompanied policy shifts reintroducing creativity into education.

Three major curriculum-based initiatives occurred.

The National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education Report

The report linked the fostering of pupil creativity with the development of culture, in that original ideas and action are developed in a shifting cultural context. It suggested that the fostering of pupil creativity would contribute to the cultural development of society, since creativity rarely occurs without some form of interrogation of what has gone before or is occurring synchronously. The Report proposed the idea of democratic creativity, i.e. 'all people are capable of creative achievement in some area of activity, provided the conditions are right and they have acquired the relevant knowledge and skills' (paragraph 25). This notion has some connection with Plowden, in that children's self-expression is valued and all people are seen as capable of creativity. But it *contrasts* with the Plowden approach too. First, it argues for the acquisition of knowledge and skills as the necessary foundation to creativity – reflecting the wider research context in the 'situating' of knowledge. Secondly, it has a great deal more to say on creativity than Plowden since that was its main focus. Criticisms of the NACCCE Report are very few. Since its publication, it has increasingly informed the way that creativity is being developed in the codified curriculum for Foundation Stage and beyond.

'Creative development' in Foundation Stage and Early Years Foundation Stage

The codifying of this part of the Early Years curriculum for children up to the age of five in 2000, reinforced in 2007, meshed closely with the existing norms and discourse about early education. 'Creative development' in both sets of policy guidance encompasses art, craft and design, imaginative play, music and dance, all of which have traditionally formed a core part of Early Years provision. It emphasises the role of imagination and of children developing and deepening a range of ways of responding to experiences and expressing and communicating ideas and feelings through a wide range of media and

materials. In the 2007 guidance, creativity and critical thinking is seen as a core aspect of provision, allowing children to make connections, transform understanding and develop sustained, shared thinking. It involves valuing creativity and critical thinking right across the curriculum and balancing freedom with structure. In addition, creative development continued to be named as one of the six areas of learning and development and comprised being creative (responding to experiences, communicating and expressing ideas), exploring materials and media, creating music and dance, and developing imagination and imaginative play. It emphasised the need to support children in exploratory risk-taking, absorption in their activities, initiating ideas, choices and decisions, and recognising novelty in children's explorations. It includes, very significantly, offering children opportunities to 'work alongside artists and other creative adults' (DfES, 2007, card Creative Development, side 2).

In the 2012 update of the Early Years Foundation Stage (DfE, 2012b), there was some re-naming of the areas of learning and development, with 'Expressive Arts and Design' replacing what was 'Creative Development'. In essence, the learning content did not change a great deal – other than condensing the statutory requirements – and a desire for children's creative learning is still evident. However, this new name can be seen to reflect the top-down influence of the coalition Government's educational vision; in this case, there is a clear link to the primary National Curriculum, with its distinct subject areas.

Codifying creativity within the early learning curriculum has been a significant landmark: particularly in the 2007 and 2012 versions which acknowledge that problem-finding and problem-solving using imagination and posing 'what if?' questions occur within a whole range of domains. On the other hand there are at least two difficulties with seeing creativity in terms of 'development'.

Firstly, conceiving of creativity as something which may be 'developed' implies that there is a ceiling, or a static end-state, and that, given the appropriate immediate learning environment, children will 'develop'. Both presuppositions are problematic.

Secondly, the implication is that play and creativity are the same. As already suggested, they are not. Play may be, but is not necessarily, creative. For example, 'Snakes and Ladders', being dependent upon a mix of chance and a set structure, is not creative, but 'Hide and Seek' may well be. Similarly, imaginative play may be imitative but it may equally be highly creative.

'Creative thinking' named as a key skill in the National Curriculum – for a short time

This contrasts with the Early Years formulation in seeing a cross-curricular role for creativity in the aims of the school curriculum, suggesting that creativity is not the preserve of the arts alone but that it arises in all domains of human endeavour.

Criticisms of the National Curriculum focused on the lack of exploration of how this skill was manifest in different curriculum areas. At the time of writing the third edition of this text (Summer, 2014), the new primary National Curriculum (DfE, 2013b) has been published and will become statutory from September 2014. Contrary to earlier predictions, the new formulation does not reflect the 2007 formulation of the KS3 curriculum (DfES, 2007), which was implemented from September 2008. This included six personal learning and thinking skills (PTLS), one of which was creative thinking, reflecting the NACCCE definition.

When the coalition Government's proposals for education were set out in their white paper (DfE, 2010), it was stated that the old National Curriculum was constraining creativity. However, despite this argument, there was no indication of how creativity was going to be conceptualised or supported in any new policies, perhaps other than lessening the content of the programmes of study for the foundation subjects to allow teachers to exercise more autonomy. Fortunately, the period between the review of the National Curriculum in late 2011 and the implementation of the new policy in 2014 presented opportunities. Although it seemed that the emphasis on creativity that had been so visible for the past decade had come to an end, schools were free to explore creative pedagogies on their own terms (Craft *et al.*, 2013).

It is encouraging that the new National Curriculum framework for primary schools (DfE, 2013b) specifically mentions creativity in connection to a wide range of subject areas, including: mathematics, science, art and design, computing, design and technology, and music. Indeed, one of the document's opening statements encourages 'an appreciation of human creativity and achievement' (*ibid*, p3). It thus appears that both Big C (major impact) and little c (everyday) creativity (Craft, 2001) have been recognised, albeit to varying degrees, in this new curriculum.

All kinds of other policy initiatives have flowed from these major developments in the second wave. These include the following:

- *Excellence in Cities*, a scheme to replace Education Action Zones and designed to raise achievement particularly in the inner city, was launched in 1999. Targeted to start with secondary schools and then introduced to primary schools too, this programme was believed to have led to higher attainment in both GCSEs and vocational equivalents for pupils whose schools were in the scheme. Some schools and action zones focused on creativity (DfES, 2005a; OFSTED, 2004).
- For several years at the end of the 1990s and start of the 2000s, DfES Best Practice Research Scholarships and Professional Bursaries for teachers enabled teachers to research creativity in their classrooms (DfES, 2005b). From 2004 the theme was continued through the Creativity Action Research Awards offered by Creative Partnerships and DfES (Creative Partnerships, 2004).
- OFSTED took a positive and encouraging perspective on creativity through two reports published in August 03: *Improving City Schools: How the Arts Can Help* (OFSTED, 2003b) and *Raising Achievement Through the Arts* (OFSTED, 2003b).
- DfES published *Excellence and Improvement* in May 2003 (DfES, 2003), exhorting primary schools to take creative and innovative approaches to the curriculum and to place creativity high on their agendas following this in 2004 with materials.
- DfES established the Innovation Unit with the brief to foster and nurture creative and innovative approaches to teaching and learning.
- DfES funded research, development and CPD initiatives including the Creative Action Research Awards (Craft *et al.*, 2007).
- The Arts Council and DCMS became integrally bound into the delivery of Creative Partnerships and associated activities (Creative Partnerships, 2005).
- A creativity strand was established within the DTI from the end of the 1990s (DTI, 2005).
- The National College for School Leadership developed the notion of Creative Leadership for fostering creativity in pupils (NCSL, 2005).
- DfES introduced 'personalised learning' (DfES, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c).
- QCA developed creativity CPD materials for Foundation Stage through to KS2 (QCA, 2005a, 2005b).

The work of the QCA in this second wave is particularly significant as a landmark. It attempted to both describe and promote creativity in schools, through its creativity

curriculum development and research project launched in 2000, Creativity: Find it! Promote it! Drawing on the NACCCE definition of creativity, QCA added an emphasis on purposeful shaping of imagination, producing original and valuable outcomes. It aimed to exemplify creativity across the curriculum, through a framework providing early years and school settings with both a lens and strategies for finding and promoting creativity. Specifically, the QCA suggest that creativity involves pupils in thinking or behaviour involving:

- questioning and challenging;
- making connections, seeing relationships;
- envisaging what might be;
- exploring ideas, keeping options open;
- reflecting critically on ideas, actions, outcomes.

(QCA, 2005a, 2005b)

There are many other aspects to the framework, including suggestions for pedagogical strategies and ways in which whole schools might develop their creativity.

The model of learning which underpins the QCA framework, is found commonly in what might be called second-to-third-wave work in creativity, including that which focuses on creative partnerships of a variety of kinds. For it assumes, perhaps unsurprisingly, that creativity is situated in a social and cultural context. A situated perspective, then, it emphasises the practical, social, intellectual and values-based practices and approaches involved in creative activities. From this perspective, 'creative learning' is seen as an apprenticeship into these, a central role being given to the expert adult, offering induction to the relative novice.

Aspects of apprenticeship include:

- *modelling expertise and approaches*

When the adults taking a lead role in stimulating young people to work creatively are creative practitioners in their own fields, they offer novices ways into their own artistic practices. This model of teaching and learning could be seen as quite different to that of the traditional classroom teacher in a school (Craft *et al.*, 2004).

- *authenticity of task*

The more closely the activities generated by the adult expert correspond to those that form part of their normal professional life, the greater the likelihood that pupils will be able to effectively integrate propositional and procedural knowledge, and the greater the chances of learners finding personal relevance and meaning in them too. This is sometimes referred to as 'cultural authenticity'.

- *locus of control*

It is very important that the locus of control rests with the young person (Jeffrey, 2001a, 2001b, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Jeffrey and Woods, 2003; Woods 1990, 1993, 1995, 2002). Connected with this, the quality of interactions between adults and pupils determines, in large part, the decision-making authority.

- *genuine risk-taking*

If the locus of control resides with the pupils, this can facilitate greater and more authentic risk-taking than might otherwise have been undertaken.

When creative practitioners lead the apprenticeship, children can see work created as part of the leader's own artistic or commercial practices, and are therefore engaged in coming to understand the artist's own ways of working.

The model of creative learning as apprenticeship implies ownership by children of ideas, processes and directions, together with engagement in and motivation toward, their own creative journey. But an apprenticeship is finite. Ultimately the novice becomes a newly fledged expert, taking off without the scaffolding, travelling alone or with others, making their own map. Griffiths and Woolf (2004) document the ways in which skilful creative practitioners are sensitised to when it is appropriate to encourage young people to move to the edge of, and then beyond, the scaffolding.

There are two other issues touched on but perhaps not yet adequately explored, by the QCA framework in this particular incarnation.

- *What is the relationship between individual and collective work?*

How do the two interact? Although this question has been examined by researchers over some twenty years at least (Amabile, 1983, 1988, 1996, 1997; Craft, 1997; John-Steiner, 2000; Miell and Littleton, 2004; Sonnenburg, 2004; Wegerif, 2004), it is still not well understood.

One aspect of the individual/collective negotiation is negotiating the balance between the creative needs of the individual and the collective creative needs of a group. Nourishment and support for the individual occurs in a wider social context. Seeing how ideas are responded to is a part of this, and therefore so is evaluative two-way feedback in written, dramatic, symbol-based and other forms. The creator should be able to negotiate meaning and possible implications with evaluators.

- *Models of how creativity can be fostered*

It may not be fruitful to consider creativity as being 'triggered' in any simple or direct way. As with all social science, it is very hard to be sure of cause-effect relationships. But we do have some working hypotheses implied in some key terms: teaching for creativity, creative teaching and creative learning.

Creative teaching is focused on the teacher. Studies suggest that teachers feel creative when they control and take ownership of their practice, are innovative and ensure that learning is relevant to learners, envisaging possibilities and differences, seeing these through into action (Jeffrey and Woods, 2003; Woods and Jeffrey, 1996).

Teaching for creativity by contrast focuses on the child and is often 'learner inclusive' (Jeffrey and Craft, 2004; Jeffrey and Woods, 2003). A learner inclusive pedagogy involves giving the child many choices and a great deal of control over what is explored and how. It is, essentially, learner-centred (Jeffrey and Craft, 2004; Craft *et al.*, 2013).

Research suggests that a teacher who is successful in stimulating children's creativity does some or all of the following:

- encourages development of purposeful outcomes across the curriculum;
- develops children's motivation to be creative;
- fosters the study of any discipline in depth, developing children's knowledge of it, to enable them to go beyond their own immediate experiences and observations;
- offers a clear curriculum and time structure to children but involves them in the creation of new routines when appropriate;
- provides an environment where children are rewarded for going beyond what is expected;
- uses language to both stimulate and assess imaginativeness;
- helps children to find personal relevance in learning activities;
- models the existence of alternatives while also helping children to learn about and understand existing conventions;
- encourages additional and alternative ways of being and doing, celebrating, where appropriate to do so;

- their courage to be different;
- gives children enough time to incubate their ideas.

(Sources: Balke, 1997; Beetlestone, 1998; Craft, 2000; Edwards and Springate, 1995; Fryer, 1996; Halliwell, 1993; Hubbard, 1996; Jeffrey and Woods, 2003; Kessler, 2000; Shallcross, 1981; Torrance, 1984; Woods, 1990, 1993, 1995; Woods and Jeffrey, 1996.)

OFSTED (2003a, 2003b) would add to this the significance of:

- partnership;
- authentic relationships with the social, economic, cultural and physical environment.

The middle ground between creative teaching and teaching for creativity has been gradually expanded to include a relatively new term in the discourse: 'creative learning', which has been described as a 'middle ground' between teaching for creativity and creative teaching, emphasising the learner's experience (Jeffrey and Craft, 2006). So what does this term mean? European work (Jeffrey and Craft, 2006) suggests that it involves learners in using their imagination and experience to develop learning, that it involves them strategically collaborating over tasks and contributing to the classroom pedagogy and to the curriculum, and it also involves them critically evaluating their own learning practices and teachers' performance. It offers them, in many ways, a form of apprenticeship.

Nevertheless, the teaching profession and other collaborative partners still have a long way to go in characterising creative learning as distinct from other kinds of learning (Cochrane *et al.*, 2008).

During the second wave of creativity, then, there were common themes to many of the policy initiatives, for example:

- role of the arts;
- social inclusion;
- raising achievement;
- exploration of leadership;
- place of partnerships.

Within the research community both prior to and during the second wave, there was a matched growth. After a relatively fallow period from the 1970s until the late 1980s, the last part of the twentieth century saw greatly increased activity in creativity research as applied to education.

Research foci included the conceptualising of creativity (Craft, 1997, 2001, 2002; Fryer, 1996), exploring how creativity could be fostered and maintained (Jeffrey, 2001a, 2001b), investigation of creativity in specific domains such as information and communications technology (Leach, 2001), documenting creative teaching (Woods and Jeffrey, 1996) and exploring creative leadership (Imison, 2001; NCSL, 2005).

In common with other educational and social science research a significant direction of research into creativity, both within education and beyond it, has been to situate within it a social psychological framework which recognises the role of social structures and collaborative practices in fostering individual creativity (Jeffrey and Craft, 2001; Miell and Littleton, 2004; Rhyammar and Brodin, 1999).

Since the 1990s, research into creativity has focused more on the creativity of ordinary people within aspects of education, what Boden calls 'p' creativity (Boden, 2001). The

methodology for investigating creativity in education has also shifted, from large-scale studies aiming to measure creativity toward ethnographic, qualitative approaches to research focusing on the actual site of operations and practice, again contextualising creativity in the social and cultural values and practices of both the underlying disciplines and the particular setting. There has also been a move toward philosophical discussions around the nature of creativity (Craft, 2002).

This was – and is – quite distinct from the earlier climate, in its changed emphasis on:

- characterising, rather than measuring;
- ordinary creativity rather than genius;
- complexity rather than simplicity;
- encompassing views of creativity which include products but do not see these as necessary;
- emphasis on the social system rather than the individual;
- recognition of creativity as situated, not ‘universalised’.

The third wave: a tsunami?

The first years of the twenty-first century have, then, seen a gradual move from a second to a third wave, which goes beyond seeing creativity as universalised, to characterising it as everyday (Craft, 2001, 2002, 2005; Feldman, 1999) – seeing creativity as necessary for all at a critical period for our species and for our planet. For the children in our schools will help to shape the world in which they grow up and in which we grow old. Their ability to find solutions to the problems they inherit from us and to grow beyond the restrictions we have placed upon our own world-view will, more than in any other generation, define the future of our species and our planet.

The third wave can be viewed as a ‘tsunami’, or tidal wave, of change, reflecting underpinning seismic shifts that now see creativity as fundamental to 21st century learning and living. The third wave policies all have their foundations in the second wave, and include:

- The Roberts Review (2006)
- Select Committee (2007)
- Creative Economy Strategy (2008)
- The Henley Review (2012)

The Roberts Review (2006) and the Government’s response (2006)

The Roberts Review was perhaps the most significant of the third wave policies, in further codifying creativity in the curriculum and channelling the tsunami of change into an economic position and one which would also enhance learner engagement and inclusion. The review was established in late 2005 by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Department for Education and Skills (DfES). Led by Paul Roberts, a civil servant, it was established to consider initiatives under way to support the creative and cultural development of young people and creativity in schools since the 1999 NACCCE Report, as well as considering how creativity as a set of skills could be poised to feed the creative and cultural industries, helping to establish Britain as the world’s ‘Creative Hub’ (Purnell, 2005).

The Roberts Review (DfES, 2006a) mapped out a framework for creativity, including provision in the early years, extended schools, building schools for the future, leadership in creative teaming, initial teacher education, professional development, partnerships, frameworks of regulation and support, and introduced the idea of the individual creative portfolio, arguing creativity is a key part of the development of young citizens.

The Government's response, in late 2006, committed to the recommendations made in the Roberts Review. It emphasised the cross-curricular approach to creativity as broader than the arts, and indicated the need to retain high standards alongside creative engagement. This should include opportunities across the curriculum, some of these involving creative partnership, and creativity should be nurtured through teacher development and school leadership; support for developing these priorities was to come from both DfES and DCMS. It confirmed the QCA version of the NACCCE definition of creativity, stating:

We believe, as QCA makes clear, that:

- Creativity involves thinking or behaving – imaginatively;
- This imaginative activity is purposeful: that is, it is directed to achieving an objective;
- These processes must generate something original;
- The outcome must be of value in relation to the objective.

(DCMS/DfES, 2006b, p4)

The eight areas of commitment made by Government at this point were:

- the development of a Creative Portfolio, in a wide range of settings and reflecting creative industries-related activities;
- a commitment to the Early Years, ensuring that creativity remains at the heart of the Foundation Stage, and that creative practice is encouraged and rewarded;
- development of creativity within Extended Schools, paying attention to supporting schools to mirror this within formal provision;
- closer attention to the development of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme to provide inspirationally designed built environments to nurture creative engagement, involving young people in this process;
- developing further support for Leading Creative Learning through head teachers and other school leaders, to regard 'every subject as a creative subject', considering how both initial teacher education and continuing professional development may contribute to this;
- fostering appropriate and systemic Practitioner Partnerships between schools and creative industries and partnerships with particular attention to the future of the Creative Partnerships programme;
- mapping access and progression routes of Pathways to Creative Industries, through apprenticeship frameworks and diplomas;
- further development of Frameworks and Regulation such that the holistic, enquiry-based approaches of the Primary and Secondary National Strategies are supported through development of the Ofsted subject surveys and other regulatory frameworks.

A Board (The Cultural and Creative Education Board – CCEAB) was established in late 2006 to progress the recommendations of the Roberts Review and over the year of its existence, laid increasing emphasis on 'cultural learning' rather than 'creative learning'. It was perhaps unsurprising, then, that the McMaster report (2008), commissioned by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, to explore how the public sector might encourage innovation, risk-taking and excellence, describes it as a 'cultural' rather than

'creative' learning programme, and that in February, 2008, Government launched the 'Cultural Offer', ten regional pilots for which were to sit within the Youth Culture Trust, within a slimmed-down Creative Partnerships organisation (DCMS, Feb 2008).

The Education Select Committee report (2007) and the Government's response (2008)

The House of Commons Education and Skills Select Committee (2007), was focused on creative partnership in particular. Entitled *Creative Partnerships and the Curriculum*, it argued creativity was a set of skills relevant across the curriculum, broader than the arts, and suggested there was an 'urgent' need to prioritise 'developing new methods of assessing incremental progress' stating that 'existing measures of progress which focus on the attainment of Key Stages, are unlikely to capture small but steady improvements, or progress in areas such as self-confidence, and team-working' (*ibid*, para 28, p17).

The Government response to this report, recognised that 'creativity is not just about the arts . . . it applies across all subjects.' (House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee, January, 2008, Appendix, page 1), also stated that 'both Departments consider that Creative Partnerships' principal focus should remain on the arts and culture' (*ibid*, p3).

Creative Economy Strategy (2008)

This document, published by the Government in February 2008, shortly after the response to the Select Committee on Creative Partnerships brought together a number of aspects of creativity in relation to the economy, initiated in 2005. It focused on creativity as a set of skills to be developed in relation to careers and progression into the creative and cultural industries. As Cochrane *et al.*, (2008) argue, two clear narratives were evident from it. The first focuses on 'nurturing talent' to enable young people to progress into careers and further education in the arts, cultural and creative industries. The second focuses on broader support for 'cultural learning' embedded in the Cultural Offer (Creative Partnerships, 2008).

Taken together, these three initiatives alone provide a powerful recognition of creativity and culture as embedded in education for children and young people of all ages. They emerged, too, in the context of a developing framework for ensuring that Every Child Matters, which has led to interprofessional practices to ensure that children and young people thrive. The DCSF's 2007 Children's Plan identified creativity as important (albeit in terms of the economy), and the DfES Manifesto to Learning Outside the Classroom (DfES, 2006) also urged the need to respond to children's curiosity and to nurture creativity. At the time of writing this third edition it is disappointing to note that the widely praised Creative Partnerships programme, launched in 2002, ceased existence in late 2011, due to funding cuts. However, in these times of austerity there still exists Government commitment to investment in creativity and culture.

The Henley Review (2012) and the Government's response (2012)

The Henley Review, an independent review into cultural education in England, was initiated by the Secretary of State for Education and the Minister for Culture,

Communications and Creative Industries in 2011. Darren Henley, the Managing Director of Classic FM, had previously been commissioned to carry out an independent review of Music Education, which was published in 2010. In common with the Robert's Review, the Henley Review (DCMS/DfE, 2012a) again emphasised the central role of cultural education in developing the nation's economy, stating 'It is vitally important that there is continued investment in giving the next generation of creative practitioners the tools and training necessary for the UK to continue its position of pre-eminence.' (*ibid*, p3). The review's recommendations – twenty-four in total – not surprisingly, were closely tied to those made in the earlier music education review. For example, there was attention placed on the value of partnership work, and professional development opportunities for teachers and artists.

The Government's response, published shortly after, was very positive. This positivity was supported by a financial commitment to cultural education of £15 million until 2015, to fund inspirational enrichment programmes, with the ultimate aim of supporting and expanding the cultural arts industries. Given that these industries are worth £8 million an hour to the UK economy (DCMS, 2014) this investment seems rather modest, but is nonetheless welcome. In summary, the response highlighted ten key areas that were deemed worthy of further attention on a national level:

- New joint Ministerial Board
 - A National Plan for Cultural Education together with the sponsored bodies
 - Work with Teaching Schools and sponsored bodies to improve the quality of cultural education in schools
 - A new National Youth Dance Company
 - National Art & Design Saturday Clubs
 - Heritage Schools – providing access to local history and cultural heritage
 - Cultural education passport – so that all children and young people can have a rich variety of cultural education
 - Museums education – to encourage and facilitate more school visits to museums and art galleries
 - Film education – to inspire and train the next generation of British filmmakers
 - The Bridge Network bringing heritage and film as well as arts, museums and libraries closer to every school.

(DCMS/DfE, 2012b, p2/3)

In sharp contrast to the wording of the Government's response to the Roberts Review in 2006, it is notable, that the word 'creativity' does not appear in any of these headline areas. Indeed, in the Henley Review itself 'creativity' only appears 15 times over 84 pages.

The shift toward cultural development seems significant; at the time of writing the third edition of this book, it seems that, in popular ideology, culture is the main priority, with creativity now regarded as an aspect of culture. For example, in 2011 the Cultural Learning Alliance published *Imagination Nation: The Case for Cultural Learning*, advocating for 'the transformative role played by the arts and heritage in the lives of children and young people' (CLA, 2011, p2). In 2013, following on from the Henley Review, a Cultural Education Plan was produced by the Government (DCMS/DfE). This sets out, in considerable detail, programmes and opportunities aimed at schools and teachers. However, in the appendix, only the draft National Curriculum programmes of study for art and design, and music are included; a somewhat slim choice, given the broad definition of culture evident elsewhere in the Plan.

While the most recent shifts in England have been toward cultural development, the European Union named 2009 as the European Year of Creativity and Innovation and the European Commission recently launched the €1.46 billion Creative Europe programme (2014–2020) to support Europe’s cultural and creative sectors, which brought back an emphasis on creativity. Additionally, in 2013 the United Nations published a Creative Economy Report exploring ‘local development pathways’ in developing countries. What seems undisputable is that this is a period in which creativity, culture and innovation are highly valued, particularly in relation to the ‘creative economy’.

Why the changing landscape?

The reasons for this resurrection of interest and the shift from a first to a second and then to a third wave of change to the landscape of creativity emerge from a mix of political, economic and social change.

The globalisation of economic activity has brought with it increased competitiveness for markets, driving the need for nation states to raise the levels of educational achievement of their potential labour forces (Jeffrey and Craft, 2001). Changes in our economy mean an increased proportion of small businesses or organisations, employing less than five people and with a turnover of less than £500,000 (Carter *et al.*, 2004). Employment in no organisation is for life. We have shifted our core business from manufacturing to a situation where ‘knowledge is the primary source of economic productivity’ (Seltzer and Bentley, 1999, p9).

Education has, of course, a dynamic relationship with this shifting world of employment and the wider economy. In response to changes in these domains, what is considered significant in terms of educational achievement is changing.

It is no longer merely sufficient to have excellence in depth and grasp of knowledge. Critical to surviving and thriving is, instead, creativity. For it is creativity which enables a person to identify appropriate problems and to solve them. It is creativity that identifies possibilities and opportunities that may not have been noticed by others. And it is argued that creativity forms the backbone of the economy based on knowledge (Robinson, 2001).

In the wider social environment, certitudes are in many ways on the decrease. Roles and relationships in family and community structures, unchanging for centuries, are shifting fast; a young person growing up in the twenty-first century has a much more active role than perhaps ever before in making sense of their experiences and making choices about their own life (Craft, 2001).

And alongside all this, information and communication technology plays an increasing role, both offering potential for creativity and demanding it.

All this change in the economic, political, social and technological context means that our conceptualisations of creativity, how to investigate and foster it, are changing. An aspect of the third wave in creativity is that the notion of creativity as ‘universalised’ is now common-place, i.e. the perspective that everybody is capable of being creative given the right environment (Jeffrey and Craft, 2001).

But the third wave also problematises creativity. It has brought with it exploration of the tensions and dilemmas encapsulated in fostering it.

Tensions and dilemmas

There are some fundamental tensions and dilemmas inherent in developing creativity. They are rather more than mere tensions between policy and practice although these too pose serious challenges in perspective, disconnected curricula and curriculum organisation to name a few.

There are at least four much more fundamental challenges, bearing in mind that in this third wave the education of children must nurture the creativity which will determine their ability to survive and flourish in a chaotic world.

Culture and creativity

There is growing evidence (for example, Ng, 2003; Nisbett, 2003; Saad *et al.*, 2013) that creativity is manifested and defined in different cultural contexts. To what extent can and should we take account of this in a multicultural learning environment? It has been argued that it is imperative that we do address these possible differences in the ways that we foster creativity in the classroom (Craft, 2005). And yet, in these times when teachers and creative partners are still celebrating the relative freedoms afforded by increased policy support for creativity, and therefore not perhaps critically scrutinising their practices in ways that they might later do, there is little sign of this occurring at present.

Creativity and the environment

How does creativity impact on the wider environment? For the creativity we are experiencing is anchored in a global marketplace that has a powerful influence on values. It is heavily marketised, so that wants are substituted for needs, convenience lifestyles and image are increasingly seen as significant and form part of a 'throw-away' culture where make-do-and-mend are oldspeak, and short shelf-life and built-in obsolescence are seen to be positive. In this marketised context, the drive to innovate ever further perhaps becomes an end in itself. And this occurs against a rising global population and an increasing imbalance between nations in the consumption of reducing world resources. How appropriate is this? What significance do we accord the evaluation of the impact of our ideas on others or on our wider environment? For to do so might mean seeing creativity in perhaps a more spiritual way in terms of fulfilment, individual or collective. And so it could also mean taking a different kind of existential slant on life (Craft, 2006).

Ethics

This is of course related to the environmental point. We want to encourage children's choices, but in a wider social and ethical context. What kind of world do we create where the market is seen as God? And how can we see creativity divorced from its ends? For the human imagination is capable of immense destruction as well as infinitely constructive possibilities. How do we balance these? An aspect of the teacher's role is to encourage children to examine the possible wider effects of their own ideas and those of others and to determine worth in the light of these. This, of course, means the balancing of conflicting perspectives and values – which may themselves be irreconcilable, particularly where they stem from fundamentalist beliefs (Craft, 2005).

Such fundamental challenges clearly leave us with pedagogical challenges. For example, if creativity is culturally specific how do we foster it in a multicultural classroom? And

how do we rise to the direct and indirect challenges posed by creativity linked to the market? How far does creativity in the classroom reflect or challenge the status quo?

Wise creativity

Stemming from all three of the previous challenges, is the question of how creativity is fostered with wisdom in schools, since the development of policy can be seen as underpinned by Western individualism, in relation to a globalised market economy which brings with 'blindness' to diversity in culture and values (Craft, 2008), a dissipation of trust and responsibility (Gardner, 2008) and a reluctance to consider what 'good' or 'wise' creativity might involve (Claxton, 2008). The time has perhaps come to explore how responsibility is equal to self-realisation, to recognise the intuitive and other resonances between our own actions and those of others; to recognise dispositions which may enable us to foster in the classroom creativity which dares to consider a moral role for creativity beyond current, economy-bound and habitual horizons (Craft *et al.*, 2008; Craft, 2010; Craft, 2013).

We have a challenging agenda ahead of us in education, but an exciting one.

REFLECTIVE TASK

- How familiar are the three creativity waves in your own experience of fostering creativity in education?
- How can you go about using the QCA framework to help you identify and promote creativity in learning?
- To what extent do partnership and apprenticeship form a part of your own pedagogy?
- How can you document children's perspectives about creative learning experiences?
- Which of the fundamental tensions and dilemmas could you begin to address in your own practice, and how?

A SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS

Changes in the landscape for creativity in education:

- No longer the preserve of the arts or arts education, creativity has moved from the fringes of educational concern to being seen as a core aspect of educating, which pertains to all aspects of human endeavour.
- Creative teaching focuses on the teacher. Studies suggest that teachers feel creative when they are in control and take ownership of their practice. Teaching for creativity focuses on the learner and includes giving the child many choices over what is explored and how.
- 'Creative learning' is a phrase which explores the middle ground between creative teaching and teaching for creativity. This involves learners using their imagination and experience to develop learning while strategically collaborating over tasks, critically evaluating their own teachers' practices. This mode of teaching often involves an 'apprenticeship' approach.
- In a world of rapid economic and social change it is no longer sufficient to have excellence in depth and grasp of knowledge. Wise creativity is critical for individuals to thrive and survive in the twenty-first century. This is because wise creativity enables a person to identify appropriate problems, possibilities and opportunities and to solve them in ways which others may not notice.

MOVING ON > > > > > > **MOVING ON** > > > > > > **MOVING ON**

In developing your own practice in fostering children's creativity, keep in mind three key questions.

What am I trying to nurture? Familiarise yourself with the NACCCE definition developed by QCA: creativity as imagination that is purposeful, leading to original and valuable outcomes. Try to be specific about how you can foster this in children you work with.

How can I do this? Consider resources, including people within and beyond school that you could work with to nurture children's creativity, enabling children in navigating choices and possibilities.

Why am I trying to develop children's creativity? How does your practice relate to the creative and cultural agenda? How far does it reflect the themes of creativity and innovation? How can you encourage children to develop 'wise' creativity in your classroom?

REFERENCES REFERENCES REFERENCES REFERENCES REFERENCES REFERENCES

- Amabile, TM (1983) *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Amabile, TM (1988) A model of creativity and innovation in organizations, in Staw, BM and Cunnings, LL (eds) *Research in organizational behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Amabile, TM (1996) *Creativity in context (update to The social psychology of creativity)*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amabile, TM (1997) Motivating creativity in organisations: on doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review*, 40:1.
- Balke, E (1997) Play and the arts: the importance of the 'unimportant'. *Childhood Education*, 73:6, 353–60.
- Beetlestone, F (1998) *Creative children, imaginative teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Boden, MA (2001) Creativity and knowledge, in Craft, A, Jeffrey, B., and Liebling, M. (eds) *Creativity in Education*. London: Continuum.
- Carter, S, Mason, C and Tagg, S (2004) *Lifting the barriers to growth in UK small businesses: the FSB biennial membership survey*. Report to the Federation of Small Businesses. London: Federation of Small Businesses.
- Central Advisory Council for Education in England (CACE) (1967) *Children and their primary schools, Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education in England (The Plowden Report)*. London: HMSO.
- Claxton, G (2008) Wisdom: Advanced Creativity?, in Craft, A, Gardner, H, Claxton, G, et al. *Creativity, wisdom and trusteeship: exploring the role of education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cochrane, P, Craft, A and Jeffery, G (2008) *Mixed messages or permissions and opportunities? Reflections on current policy perspectives on creativity in education*. Paper produced for Creative Partnerships Seminar 13 February 2008 (revised for publication April 2008).
- Craft, A (1997) Identity and creativity: education for post-modernism? *Teacher Development: International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, 1:1, 83–96.
- Craft, A (2000) *Creativity across the primary curriculum: framing and developing practice*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Craft, A (2001) Little c creativity, in Craft, A, Jeffrey, B and Leibling, M (eds), *Creativity in education*. London: Continuum.
- Craft, A (2002) *Creativity and Early Years education*. London: Continuum.
- Craft, A (2003a) Early Years education in England and little c creativity: the third wave? *Korean Journal of Thinking and Problem Solving*, 13:1, 49–57.
- Craft, A (2004) *Creative thinking in the Early Years of education*, in Fryer, M (ed.), *Creativity and cultural diversity*. Leeds: Creativity Centre Educational Trust.
- Craft, A (2005) *Creativity in schools: tensions and dilemmas*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Craft, AR (2006). Fostering creativity with wisdom. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(3), 337–350
- Craft, A (2008) Tensions in Creativity and Education: Enter Wisdom and Trusteeship?, in Craft, A, Gardner, H and Claxton, G (2008) *Creativity, wisdom and trusteeship: exploring the role of education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Craft, AR (2010). Possibility Thinking and Fostering Creativity with Wisdom: opportunities and constraints in an English context. In Bhegetto R ,Kaufman ,J (eds.) *Creativity in the Classroom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Craft, AR (2013). Childhood, Possibility Thinking and Wise, Humanising Educational Futures. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 126–134.
- Craft, AR, Cremin, T., Clack, J. and Hay, P. (2013). Creative Primary Schools: Developing and maintaining pedagogy for creativity. *Ethnography and Education*, 9(1), 16–34.
- Craft, A, Chappell, K and Best, P (2007) *Analysis of the Creativity Action Research Awards Two (CARA2) Programme*. Final Report, October 2007. Available at: <http://education.exeter.ac.uk/projects.php?id=100>
- Craft, A, Gardner, H and Claxton, G (2008) *Creativity, wisdom and trusteeship: exploring the role of education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Creative Partnerships (2005) Available at: www.creative-partnerships.com accessed 8/8/14.
- Cultural Learning Alliance (CLA) (2011) *Imagination nation: The case for cultural learning*. London: Cultural Learning Alliance.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2007) *The children's plan*. London: The Stationery Office. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-childrens-plan> accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2014) *Creative Industries worth £8million an hour to UK economy*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/creative-industries-worth-8million-an-hour-to-uk-economy> accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Department for Education (DfE) (2012a) *Cultural education in England: An independent review by Darren Henley for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Department for Education*. Available at: <http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/h/henley%20review%20of%20cultural%20education%20in%20england.pdf> accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Department for Education (DfE) (2012b) *Cultural education in England: The Government response to Darren Henley's Review of Cultural Education*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/260727/Cultural_Education_Govt_response.pdf accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006a) *Nurturing creativity and young people*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Culture, Media (DCMS) and Sport and Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006b) *Government response to nurturing creativity and young people*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2008) Joint DCMS/DCSF Press Release on the Cultural Offer, 13 February.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) and Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS) (2008) *Creative Britain: new talents for the creative economy*. London: DCMS.
- Department for Education (DfE) (2010) *The importance of teaching: The schools white paper 2010*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-importance-of-teaching-the-schools-white-paper-2010> accessed 8/8/14.
- DfE (2012a) Teachers' Standards available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-standards> accessed 7/9/14.
- Department for Education (DfE) (2012) *Statutory framework for the early years foundation stage: Setting the standards for learning, development and care for children from birth to five*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/271631/eyfs_statutory_framework_march_2012.pdf accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Education (DfE) (2013a) *Cultural education: A summary of programmes and opportunities*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226569/Cultural-Education.pdf accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Education (DfE) (2013b) *The national curriculum in England: Key stages 1 and 2 framework document*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/335133/PRIMARY_national_curriculum_220714.pdf accessed 8/8/14.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1999a) *All our futures: creativity, culture and education. The National Advisory Committee's Report on Creative and Cultural Education*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *Excellence and enjoyment*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004a) *A national conversation about personalised learning*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004b) *High quality PE and sport for young people: a guide to recognising and achieving high quality PE and sport in schools*. London: DfES.

- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004c) *Personalised learning for every child, personalised contact for every teacher*. London: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2005a) See website: www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2005b) See website: www.teachernet.gov.uk/professional-development/resourcesandresearch/bprs/search/
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006) *Learning outside the classroom manifesto*. London: DfES
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2007) *The Early Years Foundation Stage*. London: DfES.
- Department for Trade and Industry (DTI) (2005) *DTI economics paper no. 15. Creativity, design and business performance*. Available at: <http://www.ifacca.org/publications/2005/11/01/dti-economics-paper-no-15-creativity/>
- Edwards, CP and Springate, KW (1995) *Encouraging creativity in early childhood classrooms*. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearing House on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
- Feldman, DH (1999) The development of creativity, in Sternberg, RJ (ed.), *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischmann, W, Solomon, B, Greenspan, D and Gardner, H (2004) *Making good: how young people cope with moral dilemmas at work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fryer, M (1996) *Creative teaching and learning*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Gardner, H (2004) *Can there be societal trustees in America today?* Working paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Gardner, H (2008) Creativity, wisdom and trusteeship, in Craft, A, Gardner, H, Claxton, G, et al. (2008) *Creativity, wisdom and trusteeship: exploring the role of education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Griffiths, M and Woolf, W (2004) *Report on creative partnerships Nottingham action research*. Nottingham: Nottingham Trust University.
- Halliwell, S (1993) Teacher creativity and teacher education, in Bridges, D and Kerry, T, *Developing teachers professionally*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- House of Commons Education and Skills Committee (2007) *Creative partnerships and the curriculum. Eleventh Report of Session 2006–07. Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence*. London: The Stationery Office Limited.
- House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee (2008). *Creative partnerships and the curriculum: government response to the eleventh report from the Education and Skills Committee, Session 2006–07*. London: The Stationery Office Limited.
- Hubbard, RS (1996) *A workshop of the possible: nurturing children's creative development*. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Imison, T (2001) Creative leadership: innovative practices in a secondary school, in Craft, A, Jeffrey, B and Leibling, M (eds), *Creativity in education*. London: Continuum.
- Jeffrey, B (2001a) Challenging prescription in ideology and practice: the case of Sunny first school, in Collins, J, Insley, K and Soler, J (eds), *Developing pedagogy: researching practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Jeffrey, B (2001b) Primary pupils' perspectives and creative learning, *Encyclopaideia 9*, Spring (Italian journal).
- Jeffrey, B (2003a) Countering student instrumentalism: a creative response. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29:4, 489–503.
- Jeffrey, B (2003b) *Creative learning and student perspectives*. CLASP Report. Swindon: ESRC.
- Jeffrey, B (2004a) End of award report: creative learning and student perspectives (CLASP) Project, submitted to ESRC, November 2004.
- Jeffrey, B (2004b) Meaningful creative learning: learners' perspectives. Paper given at the ECER conference, Crete.
- Jeffrey, B and Craft, A (2001) The universalization of creativity in education, in Craft, A, Jeffrey, B and Leibling, M (eds), *Creativity in education*. London: Continuum.
- Jeffrey, B and Craft, A (2004) Teaching creatively and teaching for creativity: distinctions and relationships. *Educational Studies*, 30:1, 77–87.
- Jeffrey, B and Craft, A (2006) Creative learning and possibility thinking. In Jeffrey, B (ed) *Creative learning practices: European experiences*. London: Tuffnell Press.
- Jeffrey, B and Woods, P (2003) *The creative school: a framework for success, quality and effectiveness*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- John-Steiner, V (2000) *Creative collaboration*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kessler, R (2000) *The soul of education: helping students find connection, compassion and character at school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Leach, J (2001) A hundred possibilities: creativity, community and ICT, in Craft, A, Jeffrey, B and Leibling, M (eds), *Creativity in education*. London: Continuum.
- McMaster, Sir B (2008) *Supporting excellence in the arts: from measurement to judgement*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Miell, D and Littleton, K (2004) *Collaborative creativity*. London: Free Association Books.
- National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE) (1999) *All our futures: creativity, culture and education (The Roberts Report)*. London: DfEE.
- National College for School Leadership (NCSL) (2005) See website: www.ncsl.org.uk accessed 7/9/14.
- Ng, AK (2003) A cultural model of creative and conforming behaviour. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15:2 and 3, 223–33.
- Nisbett, RE (2003) *The geography of thought*. New York: Free Press.
- Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2003) *Improving city schools – How the arts can help*. Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/improving-city-schools-how-arts-can-help>
- Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2004) *Excellence in cities' primary extension: real stories*, document reference HM12394. See website: www.ofsted.gov.uk accessed 8/8/14.
- Purnell, P (2005) *Making Britain the world's creative hub*. Available at http://www.gov-news.org/gov/uk/news/quotmaking_britain_world39s_creative_hubquot/18221.html
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005a) *Creativity: Find It! Promote It! – promoting pupils' creative thinking and behaviour across the curriculum at Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 – practical materials for schools*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005b)
- Robinson, K (2003) *Out of our minds: learning to be creative*. Chichester: Capstone.
- Ryhammar, L and Brodin, C (1999) Creativity research: historical considerations and main lines of development. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 43:3, 259–73.
- Saad,CS, Damian, RI, Benet-Martinez, V, Moons, WG and Robins, RW (2013) Multiculturalism and creativity: Effects of cultural context, bicultural identity, and ideational fluency. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4:3, 369–75.
- Seltzer, K and Bentley, T (1999) *The creative age: knowledge and skills for the new economy*. London: Demos.
- Shallcross, DJ (1981) *Teaching creative behavior: how to teach creativity to children of all ages*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sonnenburg, S (2004) Creativity in communication: a theoretical framework for collaborative product creation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13:4, 254–62.
- Torrance, EP (1984) *Mentor relationships: how they aid creative achievement, endure, change and die*. Buffalo, NY: Bearly.
- United Nations (2013) Creative economy report – 2013 special edition: Widening local development pathways. Available at: www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/creativity/creative-economy-report-2013-special-edition accessed 8/8/14.
- Wegerif, R (2004) *Reason and creativity in classroom dialogues*. Unpublished paper based on seminar given at The Open Creativity Centre Seminar Series, Milton Keynes, UK, March 2003.
- Woods, F (1990) *Teacher skills and strategies*. Abingdon: Falmer Press.
- Woods, P (1993) *Critical events in teaching and learning*. Abingdon: Falmer Press.
- Woods, P (1995) *Creative teachers in primary schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Woods, F and Jeffrey, B (1996) *Teachable moments: the art of teaching in primary schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Woods, P (2002) Teaching and learning in the new millennium, in Sugrue, C and Day, D (eds), *Developing teachers and teaching practice: international research perspectives*. Abingdon and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.