



## Creativity as a transferable concept in arts education curriculum: Synergies and tensions in the Irish context

Kevin Gormley

To cite this article: Kevin Gormley (18 Jan 2025): Creativity as a transferable concept in arts education curriculum: Synergies and tensions in the Irish context, Arts Education Policy Review, DOI: [10.1080/10632913.2025.2451808](https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2025.2451808)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2025.2451808>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 18 Jan 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 112



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Creativity as a transferable concept in arts education curriculum: Synergies and tensions in the Irish context

Kevin Gormley 

School of Arts Education and Movement, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland

### ABSTRACT

In many countries, there is now an emphasis on creativity as a core capability and skill throughout arts education and wider education curriculum. Focusing on draft curriculum and broader policy documents from the Republic of Ireland, discourses of creativity are firstly identified in this paper. Here, within a “key competency” framing, creativity is established as a concept that moves across multiple subject contexts rather than one located in specific disciplines. This is linked to the identification of the needs of a future work force. Following this, versions of creativity that are “transferable” across multiple contexts and subject areas are explored. These include the facilitation of work within creative models and the prioritization of personal traits and characteristics related to creativity. This leads to a discussion on versions of creativity that are in tension with notions of transferability. These include emphasis on judgements and insights from biographies of creative individuals within specific fields. A focus is placed on music education to further illustrate the importance of specific discrete spaces for creativity. The discussion in the paper draws out how an assumed shared common or transferable creative process, against the backdrop of under-theorization in policy documents, means that some claims about creativity in curriculum are valued to a much higher degree than others. Implications and recommendations at the levels of policy making, teacher education and school curricular planning are identified.

### KEYWORDS

Creativity; arts education; education policy; music education; policy problematization

### Introduction

In recent years, curriculum has advanced constructs of creativity that suggest the concept is transferable and generalizable across disciplines (Australian Curriculum and Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA), 2013a, 2013b; Harris & De Bruin, 2018; National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA), 2020). In documents that frame curricular provision, creativity invariably appears in listings of competencies or core capabilities that stretch across multiple disciplinary areas. In addition to framings of core competencies, curriculum documents are replete with broad aims around the development of creativity, and around the facilitation of creative approaches to teaching and learning (National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA), 2020). Many of these messages about creativity are presented before one arrives at the core curriculum content for specific disciplinary areas like music, drama, or art education. Interested parties like teachers, looking to determine how the content

endorsed in the curriculum content for a subject like music education might present opportunities for creativity, will be met first by more generic content around the nature of creativity and about how it is facilitated. In an era of cross-curricular priorities where education systems promote key skills and such constructs as “common creative processes” (ACARA, 2013a, NCCA, 2020) across groups of subjects, the discourse of creativity becomes somewhat removed from specific disciplines and experiences. Within the context of the Republic of Ireland at a time of curricular change and redevelopment, the primary positioning of creativity within constructs of common processes and competencies as opposed to its prioritization within specific disciplines will be explored.

The intent in the paper is not to argue for or against various versions of creativity or to take a position that particular theories about creativity and its place in curriculum are more valid than others. A view is not taken that curriculum offerings are de facto “wrong” or “misguided” but that there is always

**CONTACT** Kevin Gormley  [kevin.gormley@dcu.ie](mailto:kevin.gormley@dcu.ie)  School of Arts Education and Movement, Dublin City University, Dublin, D09YT18, Ireland.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

a hidden curriculum (Gunio, 2021; Matorevhu & Madzamba, 2022) around the knowledge and skills promoted and valued. To argue that some versions of creativity are further inside “the truth” than others, multiple perspectives on creativity from within the research on the concept, each no more normatively true or false than another, are discussed.

This point about resisting normative truth can perhaps be reinforced with reference to the complex topic of curriculum integration and of the creative process within integrated arts education. In line with the position taken throughout the paper, there is no singular truth on integrated arts education experiences or on the place of creativity within such experiences. Nor is any normative stance taken here that discourses of integrated creative processes are normatively problematic or to be celebrated. The discussion in this paper should serve to reinforce that there are effects and outcomes to any arrangement of knowledge about creativity in curriculum and in the rationale throughout related policy documents for why creativity is valued. Strongly pursuing select ideas about creativity under any particular innovation such as curriculum integration, against the backdrop of a lack of definition or theorization around the topic in curriculum, means there might be a silence around versions of creativity which would otherwise be “within the true.”

While dispensing with a quest to achieve consensus however, attending to what is said about creativity is important. When certain ideas about creativity are taken up, and others are sidelined, this may inform what practices are pursued in schools. It may inform the activities in which teachers and children engage, and which activities do not feature in classrooms. Some children’s work and learning experiences that a teacher might otherwise facilitate might be sidelined or negated because of curricular requirements, even if such experiences were otherwise closely aligned with creativity in research traditions, and within excerpts from biographies of creative individuals from specific fields. A sociological research tradition that emphasizes the role of audience and expert judgment and accounts of creative thinking gleaned from biographies are later discussed in the paper. In an era of curriculum overload and multiple demands on schools’ time, any change in the discourse of creativity bring about real effects in student and teacher practices.

### **Problem statement, research questions and paper outline**

The problem which gave rise to this paper arises from current constructs of creativity knowledge in the Irish

draft arts education curriculum (National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA), 2024). From the myriad of conceptualizations of creativity which could feature in Irish arts education curriculum and related policy, a discourse of creativity as a generic capability and as a common process features most prominently. This problem generates a number of research questions, which are pursued throughout the paper: What social or political environment facilitates the prominence given to creativity as a generic capability? What wider discourses of creativity from the research literature align with current curricular framings of creativity? What wider discourses from the research exist in tension with curricular framings? What are the effects and implications of the prioritization of select versions of creativity? It is argued here that the dominance of a transferable creativity emerges from a worldview in which cross-applicable creative skills are more valuable than disciplinary appropriations of creativity. The work of Foucault (1972) and Bacchi (2012, 2015) informs this paper to query the current problems to which a generic version of creativity is put forward as a solution. Following this, particular constructs of creativity from the wider literature that are compatible with the cross-discipline version that appears in curriculum are identified. The fourth section of the paper highlights how it is inherently problematic to align a recognition of creativity within the judgements of others, or ideas of long immersive periods within disciplines, with a curriculum mandate for ways of being creative to transcend a range of subject or discipline areas. Specific sites or zones of creativity within music education are identified to reinforce how a discipline-bound view of the concept is largely outside of curriculum efforts to promote creativity as a generic capability or skill outside of research and practice traditions. The final section of the paper considers implications for policy makers and school personnel that arise from the discussion.

### **Creativity**

Any discussion of creativity in education should begin with acknowledging the eternally elusive nature of the concept. The ontological basis for creativity is markedly differently depending on the research base consulted. A useful system for categorizing creativity research is provided by Rhode’s fourfold schematic of person, place, product or process (Rhodes, 1961). In this system, the focus on person identifies creative traits and dispositions. A process-focus locates creativity in activities that creative people undergo. A product

focus considers outcomes and end-products while press (or place) is primarily associated with the environment conducive to creativity. Where curriculum writers advocate for creativity as a common competency, they place considerably more emphasis on person and process categorizations of creativity than they do on products and environment.

Due to diverse research traditions and disciplinary perspectives, from sociology to neurobiology, finding ultimate consensus on creativity is not possible. The disciplinary perspective that informs inquiry into creativity, or which is drawn upon in curriculum statements, should be queried. Emphasizing that creativity is largely connected to discrete traits such as inquisitiveness and tolerating ambiguity reinforces subject and psychological conceptualizations of the concept. Conversely, as will be discussed, there may be much less sense of a sociological conceptualization of creativity in curriculum (Amabile & Pillemer, 2012; Sawyer, 2012).

### **A defamiliarization of policy solutions**

Policy constructs are closely read in this paper to identify discourses around how and where creativity is developed in the curriculum. Foucauldian concepts of discourse and power (Foucault, 1972) are drawn upon to inform this reading. Furthermore, the broader social context which facilitates and supports discourses of creativity is explored through Bacci's concept of problematization. This concept draws attention to the framing of policy problems in any analysis of solutions that are put forward. What is identified as a solution is the end-product of a configuration of power relations. Drawing on wide-ranging literature and research perspectives on creativity, it is argued that current arrangements of creativity knowledge in policy could be otherwise. To emphasize the point that there is no universal recognition that creativity is a skill, capacity or aptitude that traverses across multiple contexts, some specificities from the site of music education are discussed.

In arguing for the contingency of policy problems and solutions, a focus is placed on practices in schools and classrooms to emphasize the point that arrangements of creativity knowledge support some practices while creating a silence around other ways of being creative or developing creativity. For example, work practices for students who might align creativity with working collaboratively and improvisationally with others are curtailed in curriculum and supporting policy discourses that prize the development of individualistic creativity skills to thrive in a competitive

job economy. Similarly, when creativity is cast as a series of processes applicable to multiple contexts, space for the development of creativity within periods of deep immersion and apprenticeship is sidelined.

Foucault's writings (Foucault, 1972, 1980) highlight the arbitrariness and contingency of curriculum text. He explored the effects, intended and otherwise, of what is presented in text. Curriculum exerts considerable influence; it informs the content and skills that are prioritized in schools, informs what is taught in teacher education courses, informs the production of textbooks and related materials, and informs judgments and media perception around what teachers and children ought to do in classrooms. Often forgotten however, is that the construction of that curriculum text and of the arrangements within, such as the arrangements for cross-curricular skills, are arbitrarily constructed configurations of discourse reflective of a singular time and place.

Discourse is a central concept in Foucault's work. It is a complex idea that is better thought of as practice rather than something that is simply said or written. The term "practice" highlights ideas of fashioning and constructing and implies ongoing effects. Discourse can be thought of as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). Rather than talk about "the economy" as a static entity over time, in the "Order of Things" (Foucault, 1970), history on economics was traced into renaissance, classical and modern times, to trace epistemic changes over these periods. Foucault's analyses of constructs such as psychopathology or systems such as the penal systems draws attention to networks of power relations that construct subjects and objects. Over time, various objects or what appeared on the surface as static truths or discourses were recast as a series of "relations ... established between institutions, economic and social processes, behavioral patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterization...(they) enable it (the object) to appear, to juxtapose itself with other objects, to situate itself in relation to them, to define its difference (Foucault, 1972, p. 45).

Foucault's work has been drawn upon in the past to look at questions of the prioritization of particular knowledge in the curriculum. For example, Foucauldian concepts such as genealogy, power and knowledge inform Hughes's (2021) exploration of the construction of boundaries around knowledge deemed valuable for the Australian mathematics curriculum, and of the silencing of Indigenous knowledge. In the US context, Cohen (2008) examined a central document

in the early childhood sector through Foucault's writings to outline how a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1980) is constructed and sustained in curriculum. As Foucault indicates, we should be "very mindful that everything one perceives is evident only against a familiar and little known horizon, that every certainty is sure only through the support of a ground that is always unexplored" (Foucault, 2002, p. 448). An important point here is that there are ways of being creative and of understanding and facilitating children's creativity in schools that are outside of certain discourses of deploying creativity for a competitive employment market and of deploying a generic creativity competency. Claxton's (2006) "soft creativity" and Thomas (2008, p. 8) argument for creativity as a "culturally situated apprenticeship in practical and social reasoning" are examples of creativity discourses that do not align with "key competency" frameworks.

Carol Bacchi's "What's the Problem Represented to Be?" (WPR) approach (Bacchi, 2012, 2015) develops Foucault's discourse focus and presents a type of framework to engage with contemporary problems. The WPR approach rejects simple policy solutions as fact or generic truth. Instead, it requires that we question the way in which the problem is defined and represented in policy discourse and examine how certain issues come to be constructed as problems, thus exploring the underlying assumptions and power dynamics at play in shaping policy agenda. There is a "basic premise" behind the approach, namely "that what we say we want to do about something indicates what we think needs to change and hence how we constitute the 'problem'" (Bacchi, 2012, p. 4). A key component of her approach is the reimagining of solutions and an orientation toward alternative solutions. Some dominant policy narratives in relation to common creative processes, to which the critical reflective approach offered by Bacchi can be brought to bear, include the idea of a workforce requiring transferable skills.

## The Irish Policy Context

Some recent developments in Irish education illustrate the tendency to promote creativity as a skill and competency across multiple learning areas. In 2020, the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2020) released the new draft framework for a new Irish primary curriculum. This release was followed by a range of draft curriculum specification consultations documents, one of which related to provisions for Arts Education (National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA), 2024).

One significant update from previous iterations of curricula is the inclusion of a range of key competencies across all subject areas. "Being creative" is one of these seven competencies and "involves, imagination, discipline, collaboration, persistence, and inquisitiveness" (NCCA, 2020, p. 8). Furthermore, "this competency recognises children's innate creativity, their creative energy, and their need for opportunities for creative behaviour" (NCCA, 2020, p. 8).

The concept of creativity is also presented as an aim in the new draft Primary School curriculum for arts education and is thus defined: "The ability to be imaginative, inquisitive, persistent, open-minded and flexible and to collaborate with others, persevere, embrace differences, and take creative risks" (NCCA, 2024, p. 6). It is suggested in the draft arts curriculum that subject disciplines like Art, Drama and Music have a "common creative process," which infers transference, but in the same paragraph, simultaneously said that disciplines have their own "knowledge, concepts, skills and intrinsic value" (NCCA, 2024, p. 11). Despite these permutations of knowledge on creativity, there is little offered in the draft Arts Education curriculum document or in the Primary Curriculum Framework document on associated definitions or theorizations of creativity as a "key competency."

The national cultural policy (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020) identifies "Creative Ireland" (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2017), an initiative of the Irish Government, as the main implementation vehicle for the development of culture and creativity. The cultural policy echoes the definition of creativity from "Creative Ireland" (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2017), namely "creativity as a set of innate abilities and learned skills: the capacity of individuals and organisations to transcend accepted ideas and norms and by drawing on imagination to create new ideas that bring additional value to human activity" (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2017, p. 11). It is problematic that such a brief construct that incorporates both "innate" and "learned," and both "individuals" and "organisations," acts as a foundation for multiple assertions throughout policy later about what creativity can and will achieve, for example how creativity will deliver expert growth and resilient employment.

In wider Irish educational and cultural policy, the arts are positioned as a "first encounter with the rich world of creativity" (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2017, p. 16). The inclusion of creativity as the first aim in the draft primary arts curriculum (NCCA, 2024) aligns with popular accounts of arts education that position the field as inherently creative. This has multiple effects. Firstly, it gives the arts a special

prerogative in the discourse space around creativity in education. In an era of intensification of creativity discourses however, research evidence has demonstrated how the relationship between creativity and arts education is repositioned and reconfigured to serve a language of innovation (Harris & Ammermann, 2016). Without a detailed or supported argument, it is implied in policy that by virtue of participating in creative subjects like music education, some policy goals such as achieving a more creative workforce, and the proliferation of more cultural industries will be met. Apparent here is the need for broader theorization of creativity in governmental documents like cultural policy and the “Creative Ireland” agenda, and for this theorization to inform new curriculum.

The Irish Government casts workplaces of the future as those in which transferable skills are necessary in education and cultural policy chains published around the same time as the new curriculum. There is an ultimate necessity that students will deploy creativity skills in diverse ever-evolving contexts since the worldview constructed is one of a workforce constantly in flux. A hierarchy between domain-specific knowledge and skills is established in the following way:

while knowledge and specialism expertise will continue to be important, what will be more important will be the ability to apply that knowledge and expertise in previously unimagined ways: to be creative and inventive, to identify problems and propose solutions, to work collaboratively and experimentally, to think conceptually and imaginatively. (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020, p. 20)

In the quotation above, a flexible and adaptable workforce where workers will implement their skills in diverse contexts is constructed. This adaptability is paramount in a world that is increasingly dynamic and competitive. Ireland cannot depend on past traditions or ways of working since “companies investing ... are now looking for workers who demonstrate both technical and creative skills and will invest in locations where young, well-educated and mobile workers want to live (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020, p. 10). Furthermore, “creative industries...focus on creativity as a means to deliver commercial success, export growth and resilient employment for Ireland” (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020, p. 7).

The appeals to ideas of flexibility inherent in policy constructs of “workers who demonstrate both technical and creative skills” mirror the premium placed on flexibility in post-Fordist economics (Beck, 1999). This policy prioritization of flexible workers echoes the “remixing and upgrading of skills on the part of labour’s privileged strata, especially in the most

advanced capitalist economies” observed by Roberts (2013, p. 184). The mention of creative skills in Irish government policy, closely aligned with discourses of creative industries and of the prerogatives of companies who may wish to invest in Ireland, subsumes creativity within global neoliberal discourses of flexibility.

There are assumptions to be deconstructed here and an imperative toward “critical scrutiny... pointing to the possible deleterious effect” (Bacchi, 2012, p. 7). The requirement to be creative is an element of a skillset that transcends knowledge bound in specific disciplinary contexts. Against the backdrop of this requirement however, there is no argument given on why creativity is not aligned with specialism expertise or how “important” is defined, or on what it means to “apply” knowledge and expertise, in the quotation given from policy above. The use of “while” at the start of the sentence, seems to quickly separate disciplinary knowledge and transferable skills into which creativity is co-opted rather than open a space for alternatives. One such alternative, or reimagined solution, might be the recognition of particular skills, competencies and dispositions articulated in fields of practice like music, before extending outwards to commonalities. Bacchi’s work allows for a critique of how the emphasis on transferring knowledge and (creative) expertise may overlook other important conceptualization of creativity, or indeed skills for a future workforce, in the leap toward a discourse of transferable skills. Her work cultivates an ethic of “permanent critique” (Bacchi, 2015, p. 9).

Nadine Kalin’s use of the term “horizontalism” refers to the promotion of flexible skills and knowledge across multiple contexts, rather than the recognition and celebration of deep knowledge gained in specific fields of study. Where cumulative knowledge gained over time in fields like art criticism was once deeply valued, Kalin identifies that this has become somewhat secondary to “flexibility in response to changing market conditions and on-the-spot problem solving” (Kalin, 2018, pp. 63–64). This highlights an undermining of nuanced and rich processes associated with creativity within discrete disciplines. There are however, versions of creativity from the research literature that are compatible with ideas of transferability across contexts.

### Transferable versions of creativity

Positioning creativity as an aim and a competency to be deployed throughout multiple areas of the curriculum and throughout multiple learning experiences promotes the idea of a transferable creativity. The

creative process model theorization is compatible with a transferable and cross-applicable version of creativity as a competency. Work by Graham Wallas in the 1970s (Steers, 2009; Wallas, 1973) presents a four-stage model involving preparation, generation, incubation and verification. In the “preparation” stage, the individual assesses a problem or scenario and clarifies how it can be addressed. The individual then enters a “generation” phase, like experimentation, where multiple solutions are formulated. Following this is “incubation” where a problem and different solutions exist in tension. Finally, in the “verification stage,” a solution from the pool of possibilities is selected. The adoption of this model, or variations on the model, can be observed in discourses of brainstorming or drafting multiple solutions alone or in collaboration with others before progressing with the chosen solution within education contexts. Regardless of the subject area or discipline, the model remains the same since creativity here is largely premised on fundamental cognitive processes like divergent thinking that underpin creative thinking across varied contexts.

The promotion of a model of creativity premised around personal characteristics also suggests a view of creativity as transferable. Sternberg and Lubart (1992)’s research identifies a number of “resources” that an individual brings to bear on creative work. Such resources include knowledge, thinking styles, and motivation. The resources also extend to a range of aspects of one’s personality such as tolerance of ambiguity, willingness to overcome obstacles, willingness to grow, willingness to take sensible risks, and belief in oneself. A listing of such traits and dispositions locates creativity with the individual and follows a logic that being creative is to utilize and exhibit these traits, across different contexts. Such work on individual traits is further developed for school contexts as in the example from the UK where Lucas et al. (2012) have developed their “Creative Habits of Mind” framework, a framework which has been widely adopted internationally<sup>1</sup>. The framework comprises five habits: (being) collaborative, inquisitive, persistent, imaginative, and disciplined. Within each “habit,” there are three “sub-habits.” For examples, the sub-habits of wondering and questioning, exploring, and investigating and challenging assumptions belong within the habit of (being) inquisitive.

It is noteworthy that the initial listing of attributes which “describe characteristic learning and development opportunities” from the draft primary curriculum (NCCA, 2020, p. 9) very closely align with the language of these habits and sub habits. Similarly, the influence of a “habits of mind” framework is evident

throughout the explanatory text for “creativity” as an aim in the draft text of the Arts Education curriculum (NCCA, 2024). Here, creativity is “the ability to be imaginative, inquisitive, persistent, open-minded and flexible and to collaborate with others, persevere, embrace differences, and take creative risks.” The language of such habits as descriptors throughout this policy is not surprising given that another document in the policy chain “Creative Youth Plan 2023–2027” (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2023), a constitutive element of the “Creative Ireland” agenda published at the time of the new draft curriculum, cites and prominently illustrates research by the developers of the “habits of mind” framework for creative skills and behaviors in the section on “defining creativity” (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2023, p. 11). The strong presence on research around “habits of mind” throughout policy and its manifestations in short curriculum statements could be considered as creating a regime of truth (Foucault, 1980) around creativity. There is an implied consensus that creativity can be “captured” with reference to these habits. Versions of creativity that are outside of particular habits and characteristics are outside the regime of truth, outside the “mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth” (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

Fundamentally, both the conceptualizations of personal resources and habits of mind direct creativity away from “end-products” or outcomes that arise from discrete fields of creative endeavor. They both advance the importance of being flexible and adaptable in one’s thinking and problem-solving, and overall versatility of creative thinking across domains. These conceptualizations align neatly with the dominant discourses of generalizability replete throughout much contemporary policy and are compatible with the policy problem of the need for a flexible workforce. As well as highlighting these patterns of compatibility however, a tension is now presented. The policy problems constructed, to which creativity as a transferable concept emerges as a solution, limits space for alternative discipline-specific and product-oriented accounts of creativity. This tension is now highlighted through the presentation of alternative accounts of creativity that do not suggest a seamless transfer across different contexts. A normative position of advocating for transferable or less transferable constructs of creativity is sidelined in this paper. Instead, the emphasis is placed on how current policy problems and solutions create a silence around certain versions of creativity.

A tension exists when discourses of developing personal resources or habits of mind to deploy in multiple settings meet ideas of creativity as deeply embedded within specific fields, or ideas of creativity associated with expert judgment and domain specific outcomes. Some portraits of such ideas and a focus on the specific field of music education is now offered.

### **Problematizing ideas of transferable creativity**

Accounts of creativity that emphasize expert or audience judgment or accounts from biographical narratives that highlight deeply context-bound experiences, beliefs and work practices in specific fields challenge the notion of a transferable creativity. It is argued that the accounts to follow, while occupying much space in creativity research, are outside of the grids of reference created by policy problems and solutions around creativity in Irish curriculum and policy.

The role of expert judgment primarily follows from a product-based conceptualization of creativity, rather than a person or process-centered conceptualization. For versions of creativity that emphasize products, there is a primacy to the role of judgment even if one individual is not identified as an expert judge or final arbitrator. As Runco and Acar (2019, pp. 241–242) say “humans are social animals and often use very subtle nonverbal cues, so even if team members in a brainstorming group do not say something judgmental about an idea, group members are likely to pick up on subtle cues and infer if there is any criticism, even if it goes unstated.” The role of judgment is a component of a sociocultural model of creativity (Sawyer, 2012) emphasizing complex interactions between the individual and other actors like gatekeepers and audience members, as well as values and beliefs developed over time in any given field. In the field of music education, judges might include composers or songwriters intimately connected to the field who draw on field-specific criteria, knowledge of innovations and developments within that field over time, and innate knowledge gained through their own past experiences. Emphasizing the interplay between judgment, novelty and appropriateness, where the latter two are two widely accepted definitional parameters for creativity, Sawyer notes how “after a person creates a product, it’s submitted to the field for consideration, and the field judges whether or not it’s novel, and whether or not it’s appropriate” (Sawyer, 2012, p. 216). In line with a sociological perspective on creativity, the judgment of others in recognizing work as creative or otherwise in a specific field like

art criticism or music education, would not be applicable or hold any currency in an alternative field. In and through the prioritization of the agentic subject pursuing certain processes in conceptualizations of creativity, there is little space for judgment. The draft Arts Education curriculum reinforces creativity as a series of abilities (NCCA, 2024, p. 6), correlative also with the definitions in cultural policy of abilities, learned skills and capacities (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2017, p. 10).

Another portrait that also resists transferability is creativity as a product of one’s biography. To seek out examples of creativity in biographical accounts is to reaffirm that creativity is situated within specific cultural, historical, and social contexts. Elements of individualized biographies provide a deeply context-bound account of how creativity “works” and move away from ideas of a generic competency to be brought into the service of policy writers or curriculum designers. The early experiences of creatives within a field and the extent to which their work followed from past encounters, their socialization into a field, their subjective and idiosyncratic work practices, and the influence of emotions are all potential components of creativity that can be revealed in biographies.

Vera John-Steiner’s “Notebooks of the Mind: Explorations of Thinking” (John-Steiner, 1997) offers rich accounts of creativity from several “creative thinkers” across many fields and domains including science and music. The text does not aim to define creativity or extract universal messages but instead seeks to understand the “dynamic and social aspects of creative cognition” (John-Steiner, 1997, p. xiv). It is important to note that the creativity of individuals explored in John-Steiner’s text is creativity at an eminent level, a creativity that is widely recognized and celebrated. In Kaufman and Beghetto (2009) gradation system, this type of creativity is called “big-c creativity,” as opposed to the “little-c” version that characterizes much work in schools. The discussion here does not suggest that the work of a small number of individuals is a singular source of wisdom and knowledge on creativity, or that these biographies convey normative truth on the concept. Elements of these biographies feature in this discussion of curriculum and policy discourses around creativity to draw attention to the ways in which the work of these individuals, widely celebrated as creative, emerged from periods of sustained immersion in distinct fields of practice. Since policy writers aspire to develop and foster creativity, consideration of the beliefs and work patterns of such individuals and of curriculum discourses that misalign with same is important.

Insights into creativity are possible through analysis of the biographies as well as through interviews which such figures as Aaron Copland and Anaïs Nin in John-Steiner's text. John-Steiner identifies the indeterminate nature of creative work. The term "indeterminate" firstly is used here in relation to a sense of habituality whereby creatives didn't expressly set out to be creative. John-Steiner's writings present creativity as unfolding, iterative and evolving. Nelson Algren shares below how writing was an organic activity and "just something you did":

I was always trying to write. Even in grammar school I think I was trying to write. It was something that I never thought of not doing.... It was just something you did, you know, just like a race horse runs. But I never thought really it came to anything. I thought you could write if you had a trade or if you were a teacher or newspaper man. Then you could write. (Algren in John-Steiner, 1997, p. 65)

In the later recognition and later lauding of his works as 'Big-C' or eminent creativity (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009), the sense of "everydayness" or just "something you did" as shared here should be borne in mind. Creativity emerges as a concept that is "within" and follows from an individual's biography within a specialized field of endeavor, not as an aim or competency attached later to a range of activities and disciplines.

The thinking and work patterns accessed in John-Steiner's text also suggest an indeterminacy through the evoking of "inner resources" (John-Steiner, 1997, p. 59). There is a difficulty around quantifying or formulating rules around such open-ended resources as memory and risk taking. In interviews throughout *Notebooks of the Mind*, the concepts of representational modes, inner speech, inner processes of thought, inner symbol systems, inner short hands, inner voices, and inner workings all emerge. The interiority here suggests that creative outcomes emerge from deeply personal systems of meaning-making that are a product of an individual's life experiences rather than a series of replicable processes.

Ones' memories and the influence of early experiences in later creative work is an inner resource. John-Steiner's text shares rich examples by which long-standing memories from childhood play a role in later creative thought and work. Paul Gauguin, for example, shares the significance of early memories:

I have a remarkable memory, and I recall this time in my life [his early childhood], our house and ever so many things that happened [Gauguin described the story of his running away from home.] ... It was a picture that had beguiled me, a picture representing a

traveler with a stick and bundle over his shoulder. (Gauguin in John-Steiner, 1997, p.71)

There is a high level of congruence between John-Steiner's accounts of creativity premised on early memories or other indeterminate factors like inner resources and Jane Piirto's concept of organic creativity. To call something "organic" is to highlight its "everydayness" and a natural, intrinsic quality. Through her description of organic creativity as "creativity that arises from within, with or without intention, as part of the whole" and as "unforced, spontaneous, free, pure, living and animate" (Piirto, 2021, p. 1), there is an emphasis on situational and idiosyncratic factors that suggest a disparity with aforementioned ideas of conceptualizing creativity within a model framework. Premised on her own work with creative individuals, she emphasized creativity as a "natural propensity of human being-ness" (Piirto, 2021, p. 1) and drew attention to the importance of sources like biographies and case studies to develop understanding of creative work.

The inclusion of words like "innate" in the definition from the "Creative Ireland" program for creativity (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020, p. 8), resonates with the ideas above of creativity as a natural human propensity. The word "innate" in policy definitions suggests an inherent tension with the idea that creativity is fashioned by curriculum writers to respond to policy problems or to manifest in similar ways across multiple subject disciplines. Therefore, it is not the case that Irish cultural and educational policy only takes a singular view on the place of creativity in students' lives. While it is argued in the paper that the policy problems constructed means that ideas of creativity as a skill and general capability are further entrenched in policy than ideas of creativity as an innate or organic propensity, Foucault's work reminds readers that power relations are always open and multi-directional. He draws attention to ways in which power relations "exist at different levels in different forms... (and are) not fixed once and for all" (Foucault, 1994, p. 292). Thinking with Foucault's work here along all versions of creativity in Irish policy, there is no singular exclusive version. It is important to explore the power relations at play where terms like "innate" are not supported to the same extent as other terms like "learned skill" (Government of Ireland (GoI), 2020, p.8). Additionally, it should be reaffirmed that if power relations were reoriented, for example through a reframing of policy problems, then the "innate" aspect of the definition could become further emphasized and theorized in policy. To make another argument for situated and context-bound accounts of

creativity in a specific field of practice, examples from music education are now shared.

### **Creativity within the specific field of music education**

There is widespread acceptance in the literature that arts education and therefore music education are de facto creative subjects. This is, of course, a positive situation for arts education advocates. At the same time, critical scholarship (e.g., Harris & Ammermann, 2016; Kalin, 2018) calls out a recent trend whereby the arts are harnessed and exploited for “creative potential” that aligns with discourses of productivity. It is therefore important to be alert to the rationale and power relations at play behind discourses of the inherent creativity in areas like music education to avoid a situation in which it may become “tragically ironic that the very capacities to contest or limit the reach of neoliberal economization such as critical thinking and creativity are the very skills that have been co-opted to accelerate economization through the vocalization of education” (Kalin, 2018, p. 93). Similarly, Aróstegui’s (2016) research highlights the negative impact of performativity and narrow accountability measures when applied to a creative field like music education, and attributes this to a decline in music education in national curricula. Cognizant of these external power relations however, but turning attention inwards to research in music education, associations between the subject and creativity are abundantly clear.

Burnard (2012) highlights the diversity of creative work within music education and finds “musical creativities” to be more representative of all the different forms. Proponents of a “pedagogical creativity” (Abramo & Reynolds, 2015) within music education advocate for various creative mindsets and habits that a teacher educator can bring to their work or can cultivate in students during music lessons. Within a “pedagogical creativity” model, music teacher education is reframed as “a process of becoming a creative pedagogue... (which) can serve as a complement to the cultivation of creativity in performance, composition, and improvisation” (Abramo & Reynolds, 2015, p. 48). Some elements of a pedagogical creativity include dealing with ambiguity (e.g., realizing the tension of viewing classical music history as both a continuous evolution as well as a series of regular ruptures) and the ability to “juxtapose seemingly incongruent and novel ideas in new and interesting ways” (Abramo & Reynolds, 2015, p. 38). Abramo

and Reynolds (2015) capture some of the nuance in their framework where they point out that “creative pedagogues... creatively approach the application and refinement of their educational practices” (Abramo & Reynolds, 2015, pp. 38–39). This implies that pedagogical creativity transcends discrete lessons and experiences, or dualistic thinking between “performer” or “teacher identity” and infuses student experiences with core dispositions and practices nestled within traits such as “responsiveness” or “embracing of multiple and intersecting identities of themselves and their students.” Responsiveness to student context and fluid teaching practices are at the core of pedagogical creativity, as opposed to practices espoused in static curricula.

At a time of global pandemic, when predictability gave way to uncertainty, research by Bylica and Bauman (2022, p. 21) found that “pedagogical creativity can be implemented as a socially situated, purposeful pedagogy, driven by a sense of responsiveness to whom and where one is teaching.” Participants in this research described how pedagogical opportunities were not centered around concert preparation and performances, creating space for teachers to pursue opportunities like improvisation and composition.

Creativity in the work of researchers like Burnard (2012), Abramo and Reynolds (2015), and also Kokotsaki (2012), is very closely linked to specific teacher and student practices within the music classroom. It can be further located in specific sites like songwriting and composition. Songwriting or songcrafting (Muhonen, 2014, 2016) involving the creation of melody and lyrics widely features in the literature as a creative activity. Muhonen (2014, p. 192) describes song crafting as follows:

A collaborative creative process and inquiry in which each participant’s intentions, experiences, knowledge, and social skills are present in collective negotiation (nonverbal, verbal, musical) where there is a possibility for tactful scaffolding during the creation process that aims toward a consensus of a shared goal, a new song, that its creators experience as meaningful.

This emphasizes process and product elements of creativity. Along with Muhonen, other writers like Marsh (2008) and Marsh and Young (2006) emphasize the collaborative nature of song singing and singing games, the democratization of creativity, and its embedment within children’s own musical world.

Composition enjoys a long legacy within creativity research, particularly the activity of group improvisation (Burnard & Younker, 2008; Veloso & Carvalho, 2016; Wiggins, 2007). Burnard and Younker (2008)

research involving sixty-nine elementary pupils consistently use the term “collaborative creative music making” in their application of Engeström’s “Activity Theory” to their analysis, and explored such factors as tool use, rules and division of labor. In a different paper, these authors also focused on individualized pathways through the composing process to illustrate nuanced problem solving processes which students brought to their work, suggesting that “creativity in composing operates at six levels—floater to linear, serial to recursive, staged to regulated—each level highlighting, to varying degrees, the interplay between problem-finding and problem-solving” (Burnard & Younker, 2004, p. 72). Research by Veloso and Carvalho (2016, p. 86) draws attention to the potential for emotional development inherent in compositional activities. They found that spontaneous music creation “seemed to provide a strong emotional and conceptual context that empowered the development of individual musical thinking.”

The above presentation of some research exemplars in music education is a brief selection of creativity research from within this specific field of enquiry. Since it does not include engagement with all possible sites, for examples the creative thinking accessed in listening to music (see Dunn, 1997), it cannot be representative of all research on musical creativity. The brief presentation emphasizes however, that the attribution of the term “creativity” or “creative thinking” follows from research traditions and from the judgments and recognition of researchers *within* fields of composition or song writing, themselves *within* the field of music education. One could also highlight ways in which creativity is positioned within research from other specific disciplines such as drama or visual arts education, thus highlighting discrete domain-specific spaces for inquiry and practice around the concept. This highlighting stands in contrast to many policy and curriculum constructs where creativity is largely positioned in discourses of common creative processes across multiple contexts and as a generic capability.

### Conclusions and possible ways forward

It has been identified that little theorization of creativity is offered throughout the new draft Irish arts education curriculum. At the same time, as is the case globally, multiple messages about creativity are offered. The above sections have embedded some constructions of creativity found in curriculum within a brief overview of wider theorizations of creativity in the literature. Attention is drawn to how creativity is understood in an always-partial way whereby some

versions are included and others sidelined. While more expansive theorization of creativity would further establish where curriculum writers situate their perspectives within wider research traditions into the concept, the eventual choice of text and construction of aims or competencies around creativity is always a contingent arrangement.

While the implications of a contingent arrangement, presently favoring creativity as a general capability and cross-curricular skill are relevant firstly to the Irish context, they have broader applicability. The premise guiding this paper is that there needs to be a critical orientation toward unquestioned acceptance of a creativity in the form of a common creative process, or creativity as a competency traversing all subject areas of the curriculum. In an era of curriculum revision, policy makers seek to address a perceived need for transferable skills and, as is the case in Ireland and globally, the discourse of creativity is subsumed within this imperative. An ethic of questioning and criticality is important as a response to these developments.

Conceptualizations of a transferable creativity serve some learners and promote the development of personal resources and models, but neglect other dimensions of creative work such as deep immersion in a field or the impact of expert judgment. A danger exists that the discourse of creativity at specific zones—such as at the zone of composing and song writing in music education—will be deemphasized in favor of a more flexible variety (Kalin, 2018). There are important points of consideration for schools, teachers and policy makers here.

Schools should approach the development of cross-curricular skills, including the development of skills like creative thinking in ways that recognize the opportunities and limits presented. A creative model wherein children move from generating multiple ideas to the ultimate selection of one idea across multiple art forms or the facilitation of tasks to promote inquisitiveness or collaboration, facilitate the development of some versions of creativity. At the same time, school personnel should bear in mind the limits to tasks that are premised on commonalities, where they are associated with creativity.

In recognition of the time component celebrated in the works of John-Steiner (1997) and Piirto (2021), teachers should be afforded the time to engage with accounts of creativity within specific disciplines. This infers reflection time in the classroom for how students’ creative works, and their experiences while undergoing the work, align or dialogue with accounts of other creatives such as peers or celebrated thinkers.

Opportunities to deeply engage in apprenticeship-style work are also important. This might be through initiatives like partnerships with community music or visual arts groups, or through immersion in theater. Such opportunities promote dialogue between student and field players and experts leading to recognition of what is involved in creative work. There are complex identity factors and approaches to arts practices that arise from such experiences that may be distinct to mainstream schooling experiences. For example, in their research around artists such as story-makers and dancers working in classrooms, Hall and Thomson (2017, p. 70) found that the artists “exposed students to the ways of thinking and being in the world that were intrinsic to their own arts practice and to the arts more generally.” Positive effects of partnerships with artists are also highlighted in more recent work from the US context (Bowen & Kisida, 2024) which found that partnerships infused teaching and learning with new modalities and promoted greater diversity among educators.

It is important to note here that the call for more apprenticeship-style experiences in education is not a call for a conservatory mode of teaching in the arts to somehow replace provision like music education in schools. Space in this paper precludes discussion on the question of the differences between music education in schools and a conservatory education. Those differences are likely to be recognized and inflected differently depending on the cultural context. For the purposes of this paper, the remit of music education in elementary schools, as well as the remit of the other areas of the arts education curriculum, is not understood to be analogous with the remit of a conservatory education. The argument in this paper is not for or against features of many conservatory-based teaching models, such as the transmission of specific repertoire (López-Peláez, 2022) or vertical student-“master” relationships (Almqvist & Werner, 2024), or that music education as part of a general elementary education should be radically remodeled to align with conservatory approaches. The call in this paper for more partnerships with field practitioners and apprenticeship-style experiences extends only so far as to call for more sustained opportunities for collaboration with professionals from the arts-world.

Teacher education programs should facilitate engagement with creativity, with the associated research traditions and with testimonies of creative work from individuals within the student-teachers’ chosen field of study. A critical orientation toward policy solutions, to the “problem” of creativity, for

example through applying elements of Bacchi’s (2015) WPR approach, would also promote questioning of the extent to which truths in policy about creativity mirror students’ own experiences or reflect insights and learning from the literature around creativity within their subject discipline.

The way in which policy actors move to present solutions to policy problems at the site of curriculum is a dimension of eternally evolving power relations in Ireland and in global educational contexts. The influential discourse of creativity as a core capability, as emergent within specific political and social climates could be recast in alternative ways. Wider theorizations and attention to multiple versions of creativity in this paper highlights the contingency of what is often taken to be singular and reinforces the potential for truths to be otherwise.

## Note

1. For example, this framework has informed the development of an instrument to measure creative habits of mind for prospective elementary school teachers in India (Maulidah et al., 2023) and the definition of creativity by the Arts Council of Wales (see <https://arts.wales/resources/synhwyror-iaith-sensing-language/creative-habits-mind>).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## ORCID

Kevin Gormley  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6974-6976>

## References

- Abramo, J. M., & Reynolds, A. (2015). “Pedagogical creativity” as a framework for music teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 25(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1057083714543744>
- Almqvist, C. F., & Werner, A. (2024). Maintaining and challenging conservative teaching and learning culture in conservatories: The need for holistic pedagogy in educational fields of tension. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 46(2), 257–270. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1321103X231187766>
- Amabile, T. M., & Pillemer, J. (2012). Perspectives on the social psychology of creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 46(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.001>
- Aróstegui, J. L. (2016). Exploring the global decline of music education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 117(2), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2015.1007406>
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2013a). *Australian curriculum: The arts foundation to year 10*. <http://www.acara.edu.au>

- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2013b). *Critical and creative thinking*. <http://www.acara.edu.au>
- Bacchi, C. (2012). Why study problematizations? Making politics visible. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 2(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2012.21001>
- Bacchi, C. (2015). The turn to problematization: Political implications of contrasting interpretive and poststructural adaptations. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2015.51001>
- Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society*. Polity Press.
- Bowen, D. H., & Kisida, B. (2024). Improving arts access through multisector collaborations. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 125(4), 279–289. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/10632913.2023.2212187>
- Burnard, P. (2012). Rethinking ‘musical creativity’ and the notion of multiple creativities in music. In O. Odena (Ed.), *Musical creativity: Insights from music education research* (pp. 5–27). Ashgate.
- Burnard, P., & Younker, B. A. (2004). Problem-solving and creativity: Insights from students’ individual composing pathways. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0255761404042375>
- Burnard, P., & Younker, B. A. (2008). Investigating children’s musical interactions within the activities systems of group composing and arranging: An application of Engeström’s Activity Theory. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47(1), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2007.11.001>
- Bylica, K., & Bauman, B. (2022). Teaching in a time of crisis: Pedagogical creativity in music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (231), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.5406/21627223.231.01>
- Claxton, G. (2006). Thinking at the edge: Developing soft creativity. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(3), 351–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640600865876>
- Cohen, L. E. (2008). Foucault and the early childhood classroom. *Educational Studies*, 44(1), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131940802224948>
- Dunn, R. E. (1997). Creative thinking and music listening. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 8(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1321103X9700800105>
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1994). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984* (Vol. 1). Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth. The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). For an ethic of discomfort. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984*. Power (Vol. 3). The New Press.
- Government of Ireland (GoI). (2017). *Creative Ireland programme 2017–2022*. <https://www.creativeireland.gov.ie/app/uploads/2019/12/Creative-Ireland-Programme.pdf>
- Government of Ireland (GoI). (2020). *Culture 25: A national cultural policy framework to 2025*. <https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/62616d-culture-2025/>
- Government of Ireland (GoI). (2023). *Creative Youth: Creative Youth Plan 2023–2027*. <https://www.creativeireland.gov.ie/app/uploads/2023/03/Creative-Youth-Plan-2023-2027.pdf>
- Gunio, M. J. (2021). Determining the influences of a hidden curriculum on students’ character development using the Illuminative Evaluation Model. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 3(2), 194–206. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2021.11>
- Hall, C., & Thomson, P. (2017). Creativity in teaching: What can teachers learn from artists? *Recherche & Formation*, (86), 55–77. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rechercheformation.2983>
- Harris, A., & Ammermann, M. (2016). The changing face of creativity in Australian education. *Teaching Education*, 27(1), 103–113. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/10476210.2015.1077379>
- Harris, A., & De Bruin, L. R. (2018). Secondary school creativity, teacher practice and STEAM education: An international study. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(2), 153–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-017-9311-2>
- Hughes, A. (2021). Positioning Indigenous knowledge systems within the Australian mathematics curriculum: Investigating transformative paradigms with Foucault. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 42(4), 487–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1715345>
- John-Steiner, V. (1997). *Notebooks of the mind: Explorations of thinking*. Oxford University Press.
- Kalin, N. (2018). *The neoliberalization of creativity education: Democratizing, destructing and decreating*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kaufman, J., & Beghetto, R. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four c model of creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688>
- Kokotsaki, D. (2012). Pre-service student-teachers’ conceptions of creativity in the primary music classroom. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 34(2), 129–156. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1321103X12466770>
- López-Peláez, M. P. (2022). The conservatory debated from a critical pedagogy perspective. *International Journal of Music Education*, 40(2), 217–227. <https://doi.org/dcu.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/025576142111034189>
- Lucas, B., Claxton, G., & Spencer, E. (2012). *Progression in creativity: Developing new forms of assessment*. Background Paper. <https://www.oecd.org/education/ceeri/50153675.pdf>
- Marsh, K. (2008). *The musical playground: Global tradition and change in children’s songs and games*. Oxford University Press.
- Marsh, K., & Young, S. (2006). Musical play. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The child as a musician. A handbook of musical development* (pp. 289–310). Oxford University Press.
- Matorevhu, A., & Madzamba, H. (2022). The hidden curriculum and its role in curriculum innovation implementation. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 2(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v2i2.96>
- Maulidah, N., Sapriya, S., & Supriatna, N. (2023). An instrument development to measure the creative habits of mind for prospective elementary school teachers. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran*, 9(3), 846–857. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v9i3.8389>
- Muhonen, S. (2014). Songcrafting: A teacher’s perspective of collaborative inquiry and creation of classroom practice. *International Journal of Music Education*, 32(2), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761413506657>
- Muhonen, S. (2016). Students’ experiences of collaborative creation through songcrafting in primary school:

- Supporting creative agency in 'school music' programmes. *British Journal of Music Education*, 33(3), 263–281. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051716000176>
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA). (2020). *Draft primary curriculum framework, for consultation*. NCCA. <https://ncca.ie/media/4456/ncca-primary-curriculum-framework-2020.pdf>
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA). (2024). *Draft Arts Education Curriculum Specification or all primary and special schools, for consultation*. NCCA. [https://ncca.ie/media/ihsmk40/draft\\_primary\\_artseducation\\_specification\\_2024.pdf](https://ncca.ie/media/ihsmk40/draft_primary_artseducation_specification_2024.pdf)
- Piirto, J. (2021). Organic creativity for 21st century skills. *Education Sciences*, 11(11), 680. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11110680>
- Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 42, 305–310.
- Roberts, B. (2013). Burnout: Liam Gillick's post-Fordist aesthetics. *Art History*, 36(1), 180–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8365.2012.00954.x>
- Runco, M. A., & Acar, S. (2019). Divergent thinking. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (pp. 224–254). Cambridge University Press.
- Sawyer, K. (2012). The sociology of creativity. In *Explaining creativity* (2nd ed., pp. 211–230). Oxford University Press.
- Steers, J. (2009). Creativity: Delusions, realities, opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 28(2), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2009.01600.x>
- Sternberg, R., & Lubart, T. (1992). Buy low and sell high: An investment approach to creativity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10767737>
- Thomas, K. (2008). Ambiguity as a hallmark of pedagogical exchanges between art teachers and students in the making of creative artworks. *Australian Art Education*, 31(2), 4–21.
- Veloso, A., & Carvalho, S. (2016). Music composition as a way of learning: Emotions and the situated self. In Odena, O. (Ed.), *Musical creativity: Insights from music education research*. Taylor & Francis.
- Wallas, G. (1973). The art of thought. In P. Vernon (Ed.), *Creativity, selected readings* (pp. 91–97). Penguin.
- Wiggins, J. (2007). Compositional processes in music. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 453–470). Springer.