

## Chapter 2

# Teachers' perceptions of creativity

Oscar Odena and Graham Welch

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter draws on a four-year qualitative investigation of creativity in music education with particular reference to the case study perceptions of six secondary school teachers in England. In addition to discussing the findings, the main contribution of the chapter is the consideration of a new generative model of how the teachers' thinking about creativity may develop over time.

The following section reviews the recent surge of 'creativity' in education research and policy. In sections three and four the research questions, theoretical framework and research methodology are outlined. The case study teachers' perceptions of creativity and the influence of their backgrounds on their perceptions are discussed in sections five and six. The final two sections present the generative model of the teachers' thinking and consider some educational implications.

### 2.2 'Creativity' in education research and policy

'Creativity' is a recurrent topic in education, as exemplified by the work of special interest groups (for instance the British Educational Research Association Special Interest Group Creativity in Education), government departments and advisory committees (Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2006; National Advisory Committee on Cultural and Creative Education, 1999; Scottish Executive, 2006). Researchers' interest in creativity produced a considerable number of investigations in the 1960s and 1970s. While there was a subsequent decrease following this initial surge, interest in creativity has remained consistent and has in fact peaked again in the last decade in many Western countries (Burnard, 2007; Craft & Jeffrey, 2008; Díaz & Riaño, 2007; Hickey, 2002; Kaufman & Sternberg, 2010; Webster, 2009).

As observed elsewhere (Odena, 2001b), there are at least two generic concepts of creativity co-existing: the 'traditional' and the 'new'. The traditional is ascribed to people who contribute significantly to a field and whose contributions are recognized by the community, such as successful adult composers, painters or sculptors. The significance of this traditional perspective in a school context tends to focus more on the output (such as interpretation within the 'canon') rather than the creative process. This implies that although the work of 'the masters'

is a source of inspiration and is often studied in educational institutions, such exceptional standards of quality are difficult to reproduce. Other authors have called it *historical creativity* (Boden, 1990) or *big C* creativity (Craft, 2001). In contrast, the 'new' concept (in the sense of being contrasted to the 'traditional') is related to a psychological notion of imaginative thinking and has broad applications in the school context (Savage & Fautley, 2007). Within this latter concept, creativity is defined as imagination successfully manifested in any valued pursuit. Confusion arises when accounts of the new concept are presented as if they were characterizations of the traditional one, as for example when we try to assess young people's musical products using historical creativity criteria.

Taking this situation into account, there are issues that need further consideration. For instance, the term 'creativity' and how creativity might be identified in music classrooms are rarely examined in the literature. A few studies indicate that teachers of arts subjects usually interpret creativity and its teaching in personal terms (Fryer, 1996), while the English National Curriculum devotes a fourth of its requirements for music to developing *creative skills* in the guise of composition and improvisation (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2006). In England, music is a compulsory classroom subject until age 14 and an optional subject subsequently between the ages of 14 and 18. Even though musical creativity practices have a long tradition, which go back to the 1970s experimental work of Paynter and his contemporaries (Mills & Paynter, 2008), having a statutory curriculum does not appear to guarantee a harmonized perception of these practices. For example, concerns have been raised about the standards of composition in generalist schools (Odam, 2000) and on the need for teachers to have more composition and improvisation knowledge if they are to engage fully with the students' composing processes (Berkley, 2001). Other research has suggested that the musical value of improvisation is context and genre sensitive in the lives of music teachers and musicians. For example, an Economic and Social Research Council study of postgraduate musicians undertaking a one-year specialist full-time course to become secondary music teachers in England found that they rated the ability to improvise much more highly than final year undergraduate music students (Hargreaves & Welch, 2003; Welch, 2006). In another example, a recent investigation into the nature of teaching and learning in higher education music studies (the Economic and Social Research Council *Investigating Musical Performance* Project) reported differences between classical and non-classical musicians in their attitudes to improvisation, with the latter (folk, jazz, rock musicians) rating the ability to improvise on their instrument significantly higher, not least because of differences in expected performance traditions (Crech et al., 2008; Welch et al., 2008).

In addition, the term 'creativity' is often used in music education statutory guidelines in two different ways: (a) describing composition/improvisation activities and (b) highlighting the value of creativity as a desirable thinking style. Examples of this duality are evident in the Curriculum for Northern Ireland (Department of Education Northern Ireland, 2006), the National Curriculum for

England (Department for Children Schools and Families & Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007) and the curriculum in Catalonia, Spain (Generalitat de Catalunya, 1992). In England, it is proposed in the secondary school curriculum that the teaching of music increases 'self-discipline' and 'creativity'; consequently pupils need to learn 'to create, develop and extend musical ideas' to make progress in composing skills (Department for Children Schools and Families & Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007: 178-187). Furthermore, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2009: 1) provides specific ways in which the teaching of music is believed to contribute to the development of 'Personal, Learning and Thinking Skills', observing that 'learners can develop as creative thinkers' through analysis and evaluation, selecting 'imaginative ways of working'. Hence, the term creativity is sometimes conveyed to mean a thinking style and at other times to imply activities in composition and/or improvisation.

### 2.3 Research questions and theoretical framework

This chapter draws on a four-year, case study-based investigation, which focused on creativity in music education with particular reference to the perceptions of six teachers in English secondary schools (Odena, 2004, 2005, 2007a). Two of the original research questions are considered:

1. What are these schoolteachers' perceptions of creativity?
2. In what ways do these teachers' musical and professional experiences influence their perceptions of creativity?

Initial analyses of the first question as well as a description of the influence of the teachers' backgrounds on their viewpoints at the time of data collection are reported elsewhere (Odena, Plummeridge & Welch, 2005; Odena & Welch, 2007). This chapter specifically explores, in the light of recent literature, how the answers to these questions interact in the formulation of a new generative model of the teachers' thinking on creativity in music education.

The initial investigation was divided into four stages and has been subsequently expanded to include other very recent research findings. The four stages were (a) examination of the meanings attached to the word 'creativity' and review of previous studies; (b) discussion of the methodological assumptions underpinning the research; (c) data collection and exploration using thematic analysis; and (d) the drawing of implications. The first stage literature review took a historical consideration of the variety of foci of previous research. Depending on the field of knowledge (aesthetics, musicology, psychology or education), several approaches to the study of creativity have been used, focusing on (i) the characteristics of the creative person, (ii) the description of an appropriate environment for developing creativity, (iii) the study of the creative process and (iv) the definition of the creative product (Odena, forthcoming). In a few studies and meta-analyses of

previous enquiries, up to three of these four approaches are evident (Fryer, 1996). In music education research a similar pattern of approaches appeared, with authors discussing the characteristics of creative students (Goncy & Waehler, 2006), the students' composing/improvising processes (Burnard & Younker, 2004; Fautley, 2005; Kennedy, 2002; Seddon & O'Neill, 2003), the environment most conducive to skills development (Berkley, 2004; Byrne & Sheridan, 2001; Glover, 2000) and the assessment of musical products (Green, 2000; Priest, 2006). Therefore, the subsequent fieldwork embraced an emergent fourfold framework that was used for researching case study teachers' perceptions of creativity in music education, focusing on Pupil-Environment-Process-Product.

## 2.4 Methodology

The participating teachers were deliberately selected following a maximum variation approach (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) on the basis of the combined characteristics of their personal backgrounds and their schools' socio-geographical situation. Their classrooms were videotaped for between three and five hours during lessons involving composition and improvisation activities with students aged 11-14 years. Teachers were interviewed at the beginning (prior to the videotaping) and at the end of the study. In the final interviews, they watched extracts of their lessons and discussed these with the researcher. This video elicitation interview technique had been developed in an earlier pilot study involving three teachers from different schools, which were not included in the final group (Odena, 2001a). All final interviews were understood as in-depth conversations with a purpose that were loosely structured around the videotaped extracts. Up to 30 minutes of short video extracts were selected for each teacher, summarizing their three to five hours of lessons. The aim of these extracts was to allow the teachers to reflect on what happened during the unit of work in terms of the different students in the class, the classroom environment and the students' processes, products and assessment. For reasons of confidentiality, the selection of extracts was not validated by external observers. Instead teachers were asked to comment on the selection at the end of the interviews and all participants agreed that the extracts contained a good summary of what happened during the unit of work. During the interview the interviewer stopped the video after each extract and gathered the teacher's views of what went on during the lesson, using open-ended questions such as 'Would you explain what happened there?' When appropriate, they were also asked to expand or clarify any comments they made relating to the four Pupil-Environment-Process-Product areas.

Interviews were fully transcribed and were analysed using thematic analysis with the assistance of the specialist software NVivo (Odena, 2007b, 2010). This involved a thorough process of reading, categorizing, testing and refining, which was repeated by the first author until all categories were compared against all the teachers' responses, and the overall analysis was discussed with

a colleague researcher. Over 87 per cent of the full transcripts – which included the interviewer's questions – were categorized, and two independent researchers read randomly selected parts of the interviews to confirm the reliability of the categorization. Participants were also invited to answer a Musical Career Path questionnaire, derived from Burnard (2000). Employing an undulating line drawn on a single sheet, teachers were asked to write down, in each bend of the line, specific instances that they considered crucial in the direction of their musical and educational lives (see example in Figure 2.1).

I was brought up in a musical environment in that there was an abundance of classical music played (recordings), along with folk music + Abba! Neither parent plays an instrument.

In Primary Education I took part in every event possible as singer. I took up recorder at the age of 5, clarinet at 9 and cello at 11. In Secondary Education I started to teach myself keyboard skills. I joined three orchestras – 2 youth and 1 adult, where I was asked to play Double Bass.

A major turning point was when I went to college at 16 on a Pre-Professional Music Course and studied Music for 28 hrs a week! I received piano lessons for the first time and played in many concerts (almost 1-2 a week). This experience cemented my commitment to music. I met some people who are still close friends and a source of inspiration. I decided on teaching as a career.

I studied for a BMus and continued to actively participate in as many concerts-ensembles as possible. [...]

Figure 2.1 Extract from Sarah's Musical Career Path response sheet

Participants were asked to complete the Musical Career Path response sheet answering the following question:

Thinking back over your life experience, please reflect on specific instances, or critical incidents, which you consider have influenced the direction of your musical life. Brief annotations may be included about any experience that precipitated a change of direction or any influential incident. Please reflect upon your experiences of music studying, making and teaching, at school, with friends and family as well as within the community, and elicit particular incidents and experiences which influenced your career path.

By completing this exercise instead of asking a predetermined list of questions, we intended to gather illustrative examples, maintaining a qualitative-naturalistic

research approach (Eisner, 1991). We guaranteed anonymity to participants by assuring them that the videotapes would not be disclosed in the future and that their names would be changed when reporting the study's results. Moreover, in the following sections, confidential information such as years, school and university names are omitted and the gender of one participant has been changed. The teachers' own words are incorporated in the main text in inverted commas.

Overall, the six teachers had fairly contrasting backgrounds. Patrick, the Head of Music in a well-resourced comprehensive school, studied classical performance (piano and viola) as well as a 'conventional' music degree, in which the only composition that he 'ever did' was 'a pastiche of nineteenth-century harmony and counterpoint' (his Musical Career Path is included in Figure 2.2 later in the chapter). Emma learned the piano and sang 'with parents from the age of 6', but stopped her formal music training at 13. At college, she wrote songs, joined a rock band and toured Europe. She had worked as a singer and studio engineer and was currently teaching part-time in a comprehensive inner-city school, and conducting vocal workshops as a freelancer. The third teacher, Laura, remembered arranging songs as a teenager at the piano. She went to a Performing Arts College at 16, studied for a Music and Drama degree at university, majoring in composition, and had experience playing and teaching abroad. She was the head of a small department in an inner-city multicultural comprehensive in an economically deprived area. James, the fourth participant, learned to play the recorder and the cornet at school. At university he specialized in flute as part of his Music and Drama degree and undertook a teacher education course in which he became acquainted with 'world music', but was not taught 'how to go about composing'. He was teaching at a comprehensive school in a rural area. The fifth participant, Elaine, had classical piano training from an early age and studied for a Music degree at university, which did not include 'original composition'. Elaine was the head of a well-resourced department at a comprehensive school in a rural area. The sixth teacher, Sarah, played the recorder, clarinet and cello as a teenager and then went on to study for a Music degree while being a clarinet instrumental teacher. Sarah was the Head of Music at a comprehensive school on the UK's south coast and was also playing regularly in an orchestra and with local jazz groups.

## 2.5 The teachers' perceptions of creativity

In the long conversations that followed the viewing of the videotaped lessons, teachers talked not only about the students' work, but also about the government's statutory music guidelines and the mixed feelings experienced when watching themselves on TV. For the purpose of this chapter, we focus here on the participants' talk on the creativity of their students. Twenty-two categories and subcategories that referred to the fourfold framework (see Table 2.1) emerged from the analysis of the interviews. The participants' perceptions exemplified, although in different ways, the idea of creativity as a capacity of all students. They viewed creativity



in terms of what Craft (2001) described as 'little c' creativity and earlier Elliott (1971) characterized as the 'new concept', where creativity is imagination as successfully displayed in any valued pursuit. Although participants did not agree on how creativity was to be defined, they expressed illuminating views about creative pupils, the environment for creativity, the creative process and creative musical products.

Table 2.1 List of categories (with subcategories in italics) of the teachers' perceptions of creativity emerging from the interviews

<b>Pupil</b>	<b>Environment</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Product</b>
1 Personal characteristics	6 Emotional environment <i>7 Motivation</i>	15 Different activities	20 Assessment 21 Originality
2 Individual learning <i>3 Adaptor students</i> <i>4 Innovator students</i>	8 <i>School culture</i> 9 <i>Teachers' role</i> 10 <i>Teaching methods</i> 11 <i>Time requirements</i>	16 Group processes 17 Improvisation-Composition 18 Structured process	22 Music style and conventions
5 Home background	12 Physical environment 13 <i>Complaints and proposals for improvement</i> 14 <i>Classroom settings</i>	19 Unstructured process	

The similarities and differences between the literature on creativity and these teachers' perceptions (in relation to the second research question) have been explored elsewhere (Odena et al., 2005). Major issues that emerged included the pupils' learning styles, the music school culture and the positive group dynamics. Four of the six teachers observed that pupils experienced music activities with different ways of learning. Borrowing Entwistle's terms (1991), some pupils preferred to work following small steps in a 'serialist' style of learning, while others learned in a 'holist' way, taking the activity as a whole. The former can be compared with 'adaptor' pupils and the latter with 'innovator' pupils (Brinkman, 1999). For the adaptor type of student, closed activities with a range of set instructions were perceived as more appropriate to develop their musical creativity. For instance, as Elaine noted:

For that [blues composition] unit, when they do their improvisation using the Blues scale...students...often get into a pattern, and they just repeat it over and over again. So, we have a checklist of things like 'have some short notes and

some long notes', 'use different pitches', 'repeat little patterns by sequence' and things like that.

In addition, Elaine observed that some of the students who felt more confident working with closed composition activities would do exactly what she 'asked them, and do it really well', and she commented they would be 'creative as well'. Emma, Laura, Elaine and Sarah observed, nevertheless, that the majority of their pupils were happily engaged with activities with different degrees of 'open' composition. Emma, commenting on video extracts of her pop song composition unit, noted that most of the pupils were 'involved in some way or other' and that only 'about ten per cent' did not fully engage with these activities. The issue for music teachers, then, is how to cope with the different learning styles in any given classroom. As Elaine observed, some pupils 'enjoy the freedom of improvising and others think it's too hard, because they don't know what to do'. She commented that the latter group of pupils just needs 'a few ideas feeding in'.

Teachers' views on the most appropriate environment to enhance creativity were coded under two broad categories: emotional environment and physical environment. Additional subcategories within these, such as *motivation* and *time requirements* illustrated practical issues in accordance with suggestions from previous studies. Three of the six teachers participating in the study observed that, in composition projects, added time pressures brought by examinations and a short time to finish the units affected the atmosphere for creativity. Therefore, the overall quality of the pupils' work suffered:

[Students] liked they were free to come up with their own ideas, but they wanted more time. (Laura)

We had such a short amount of time...there was that added pressure of having to learn the songs for the concert AND do the songwriting...I had to push, push, push, push the whole time...And now we've come back after half term, the concert is over...[and] they've stopped fighting me...it is just really relaxed and it wasn't relaxed before. (Emma)

James explained this happened particularly at the end of term:

Ideally if we had enough time we could then go through each group and give them an idea of what they could have done to improve it. So I try to do that, if I've got time... But the Year 7s seemed very rushed at the end of last term.

The strain suffered by pupils under time restrictions during music activities was perceived by these teachers as detrimental for their compositions. These time pressures could be brought by exams, preparation for school concerts, increasing workload at the end of term or poor weekly timetabling for music that would limit the time allocated to composition projects.



Other subcategories were not found to be examined in the literature to the same extent. For instance, *school culture* contained comments on the schools' music activities and the status of the music department within the school, which included a case where the relations between the department and the school senior management were not positive (Laura). This school had a lack of space and severe budget restrictions, but 'offered valuable insights on how to counterbalance this situation by making use of the pupils' instruments, getting bids from outside agencies and sharing resources with other schools' (Odena et al., 2005, p. 15). Regarding the creative process, these teachers presented different views depending on the activities and the students, particularly Laura and Emma, who were more circumspect and were disinclined to describe a 'universal process' for all students. It seems from the variety of views found in the study that having a compulsory curriculum does not necessarily unify the views of the practitioners regarding creative musical products. All teachers, nevertheless, had criteria that they applied to assess the pupils' work, which were largely negotiated. Indeed, they observed that discussing the assessment with the students was essential to make them aware of the qualities of good work, a view that resonates with the students' views gathered in recent music education investigations (Berkley, 2004; Fautley, 2004) and in an inquiry on the introduction of 'Assessment for Learning' approaches in secondary schools (Leitch et al., 2008).

## **2.6 The influence of teachers' musical and professional experiences on their perceptions of creativity**

A detailed examination of the Musical Career Paths and interview transcripts revealed that participants' experiences could be summarized as falling within three strands: *musical*, *teacher education* and *professional teaching* strands (Odena & Welch, 2007). Experiences in the *musical* strand included their own music education at school and at undergraduate level, as well as all their current and past musical activities out of school. The *teacher education* strand comprised the teachers' reflective explanations of their experiences during music education postgraduate courses. Finally, the *professional teaching* strand embodied all the anecdotes from their classrooms as well as the memories from previous schools. Participants' musical and professional experiences were summarized into strands for the purpose of making sense of the data; nevertheless the strands contain explanations of social activities that cannot be completely isolated. The significance of the strands on the teachers' perceptions of creativity seemed to relate proportionally to the level of variety in their experiences. These appear to have influenced their views of creative pupils, an environment that fosters creativity, the creative process and creative musical products. Both the *music* and *professional teaching* strands appear to have had a significant effect on the teachers' views of creative pupils. For example, the importance of the *professional teaching* strand is apparent in Patrick's and Laura's recollections from their current and previous

schools: working in particular socio-economic school areas brought opposite perceptions of the importance of the students' home backgrounds on their creative potential. Patrick concluded that, from his teaching experiences, a musical family background was not necessarily a condition for creative students: 'I can think of students who are very musically able...who don't have musical backgrounds and others who do.' In contrast, Laura observed that: '[the pupils' home] background does have a very large effect on what they bring, and what they come out with'.

Furthermore, the schools and the day-to-day teaching experiences of Laura and Patrick were different too. Their comments regarding their school music culture underlined the differences between the two schools. Laura was teaching pupils with a wide range of family incomes and backgrounds from different cultures. Patrick was teaching pupils with more similar backgrounds in a relatively affluent city area – that is, in a girl's school where the status of music was far removed from that in Laura's school. While Patrick managed a well-resourced music department ('the instruments we have cost quite a lot of money'), Laura was the head of a small department with a shortage of staff and resources: 'It's a battle to find space in this school... We [have] got a bid from an outside agency to promote the music from certain cultural groups [but] we have no money FROM the school' (her emphasis).

As demonstrated above, at the time of data collection Patrick did not have the same perceptions as Laura regarding the home background influence on pupils' creativity. In addition, he had not experienced a school like Laura's in his own education, as can be seen from his Musical Career Path (Figure 2.2).

In contrast, Laura taught in a large multicultural comprehensive inner-city school in what is classified as an economically deprived area. Uniformed and undercover police could often be seen near the school gates, and she had to keep instruments locked in two large metal cages to prevent thefts. Before starting to teach at this school, she also had experience of working with hearing impaired children in another comprehensive urban school and at a children's camp in an Eastern European country. Figure 2.3 includes an extract of her Musical Career Path.

The *musical* strand also had an effect on how teachers perceived the students. For instance, Emma felt that, thanks to her musical experiences as an adolescent – finding school music restrictive and giving it up at 13, even though she continued to compose songs at home – she could now recognize and help the pupils more inclined to open composition activities and with a dislike for rules.

When about 5-6 years old I used to play around on the piano at a neighbours' – eventually I persuaded my parents to buy a piano and I started lessons [...] I started the violin when I went to secondary school and after a year changed to the viola. I played in the orchestra and the wind band and performed in the regular concerts.

At 15 I joined the [County] Youth Orchestra - went on a tour to New England, USA - some of my happiest musical memories; the conductor's teaching style had a great influence on me. Studied A-level music at a specialist music course - lots of playing (especially piano accompanying) and concerts.

I studied for a music degree at [Oxbridge] - very academic course but I had an outstanding tutor who again influenced me as a teacher; lots of orchestral playing and opportunities to conduct which I really enjoyed.

After graduating I went to [university] to do a PGCE - I have always wanted to teach ever since I was about 6 years old! The course was excellent - introduced to many different styles of music - and I had two very contrasting but stimulating teaching practice schools. Both heads of department were very influential on my own teaching.

Started teaching in an inner-city boy's school - learnt a lot, mainly about how not to run a music department! After 18 months I went to be a head of department at another school. After 4 years I came to [this school] where I am now Head of Department. I really enjoy working here and am very proud of what we have achieved over the last four years. I find my teaching very creative and stimulating and my musical skills are continually being developed and stretched

Figure 2.2 Extract from Patrick's Musical Career Path response sheet

With a degree in Music and Drama, and composition being a strong interest, using music technology as an instrument was very exciting. Music making with youngsters at degree level led me to work with hearing impaired children in a [city] comprehensive school and at children's camp in [an Eastern country].

Living in [a North African country] was a strong link with teaching music at a school and playing Irish folk music at a regular venue.

Returning to get the PGCE at [an English university] and ending up running a secondary music department at a [city borough] comprehensive school (still there!!).

Travelling to South Africa on a music tour with youngsters has been an eye opener. Creativity in youngsters is alive and prospering [...]

Figure 2.3 Extract from Laura's Musical Career Path response sheet

Regarding the teachers' views of an environment that fosters creativity, the *musical* strand experiences emerged as the most influential. Laura, Emma and Sarah, who had experience with different musical activities, including composition, and different music styles, were more articulate at describing such an environment. Moreover, they were able to detect disturbing factors (anxiety, lack of time) and facilitating features (motivation) and so work to improve the classroom conditions to maximize the musical development of all students. Other teachers with less contrasting experiences on the *musical* strand were more inclined to give the class a predetermined activity and expect creativity to 'grow' (Patrick). The *teacher education* experiences generally introduced participants to different music styles but did not go further into teaching them how to compose.

As mentioned earlier, Emma and Laura were more circumspect than other participants when describing the creative process. These two teachers, who had composing experience, acknowledged that although the creative process required time and effort for everybody, students would get to different composing stages in their own time, and that no general rule or rigid staging could be applied to all pupils.

Regarding the assessment of creative musical products, participants with contrasting experiences in their *musical* strand (different music styles) would consider as 'creative products' some compositions that did not follow the structure and instructions of the classroom activity. For instance, Sarah and Emma observed that they would discuss and agree an individual's assessment criteria with some students. Elaine acquired a similar broader approach from her *professional teaching* experiences, and an example of her teaching is discussed in the following section. The participants' *teacher education* experiences did not appear to affect their perceptions of creative products.

## **2.7 Discussion: towards a generative model of the teachers' thinking on musical creativity**

The participating teachers acknowledged the effect of their musical expertise (e.g. when assessing the pupils' musical products) and the relative influence of their teacher education courses. In addition, their teaching experiences throughout their careers (*professional teaching* strand) appeared to shape their perceptions of musical creativity in the classroom in what might be described as a continuing feedback system (see Figure 2.4). These findings support Dogani's suggestion that teachers' choices regarding practice 'are constrained by their circumstances and their perceptions of those circumstances' and that 'in order to affect the quality of children's learning positively, teachers need to draw their teaching from a range of their previous experiences' as musicians and teachers (2004: 263). Figure 2.4 outlines the interactions between the Pupil-Environment-Process-Product framework 'at work' and the three strands, and how the interactions have the potential to modify the teachers' perceptions over time.




Figure 2.4 A generative model of the teachers' thinking on creativity in music education. Source: Odena & Welch (2009, p. 430)

Essentially, all the above elements are in constant interaction. When preparing the units of work and implementing them in the classroom, the teachers were drawing on their previous experiences (*musical, teacher education and professional teaching*), while simultaneously applying their preconceptions of creativity (*pupil, environment, process and product*). Depending on the teacher, their preconceptions had varying degrees of consciousness. For instance, Sarah and Elaine observed that they were not sure to what extent they were imposing their ideas of creativity when assessing the students' work:

[When marking] you are modifying pupils' work...taking away some of their creativity, because you are inherently working within norms. (Sarah)

By saying to them... 'if you come back to this note your piece will sound finished off and more complete'... you are teaching a tradition... intervening in a way that makes the tune sound better, but at the same time you want them to be able to

hear that it sounds better. So, in other words, I don't just accept their ideas, at face value...and I don't know if that's right or not. (Elaine)

In contrast, Patrick did not see a direct influence of his views on the students' creativity: 'I give [them] the instruments and space...and then creativity will grow.'

The left arrow in Figure 2.4, from bottom to top, shows how teachers develop *educational connoisseurship* (Eisner, 1991) through classroom teaching (e.g. observing the work of different pupils and their composing processes, and assessing musical outcomes). At the same time, their daily work slowly updates their preconceptions of creativity (right arrow), developing new Pupil-Environment-Process-Product perceptions. This includes, for instance, perceptions of the environment most appropriate to facilitate the development of musical creativity or, as discussed in the previous section, the influence of the students' home backgrounds on their potential.

It is apparent that the teachers with more experience of different music styles and composing activities were more aware of the different ways students can approach a composition assignment. They had learned from their own musical experiences, as well as from their teaching experiences. Some teachers were further in their learning journey than others: '[when teaching] my musical skills are continually being developed and stretched' (Patrick, Musical Career Path).

This learning journey carries with it plenty of opportunities for what has been defined by Schön (1983) as reflecting *in* and *on* practice. The first is the thinking and decision-making that goes on while teaching, in real time; whereas reflecting *on* practice is the type of thinking undertaken after the teaching has finished (something that was facilitated in the present study by the use of the video-eliciting technique). These reflecting processes, which have been represented as a cycle including planning, acting, observing and reflecting (Cain et al., 2007), require a fair amount of time and will from teachers, but ultimately, they are beneficial for practice. The generative model of the teachers' thinking presented here embodies the spirit of the reflective practice cycle and incorporates additional elements that interact and appear to generate changes in the teachers' thinking on musical creativity.

An illustrative example of how these interactions have the potential to modify perceptions and teaching practices over time concerns a student in Elaine's school who was initially described as 'conflictive', but towards the end of the school data collection was perceived more positively. This boy had had some behavioural problems in the past. During a unit on *blues* in which all students were asked to rehearse a blues melody at the keyboard and compose and record a solo part, he approached the activities in a different way. He adapted the original blues rhythm to a more contemporary *techno* style and quoted a melody from a dance song in his solo:



He would just do exactly what he wants in any lesson...and he loves playing the keyboard, so I'd rather have him in the class doing something, than out of the class – which he has been during some of the year. So I try not to get too cross if he is not doing exactly what I've asked them to do. And what he was doing I felt was quite valid. (Elaine)

Elaine then gradually renegotiated the tasks and the assessment criteria with the student, allowing him an increased level of freedom. Watching the videotaped lessons during the final interview, she changed her initial description of the student, observing that he was also 'very creative' in a way that was 'out of the ordinary'. Commenting on one of the taped extracts, Elaine stated: 'he is very creative in a kind of anarchic way in that he would do things like listen to the tunes on his mobile phone, and reproduce them on the keyboard...and that's quite a skill'.

In fact, all the teachers had to adapt their composition/improvisation tasks to the different types of students, taking into account the limitations of the physical environment available (all participants wished they had more resources) and their own preferences (choosing a music style and activities they felt comfortable with). Their role in assessing all these factors, specially the unpredictable ones, and their role in acting upon them in real time was perceived as crucial to the success of the units of work and highlights the importance of the pedagogical expertise of these teachers, or what Eisner (1991) calls educational connoisseurship. This connoisseurship is gained through years of classroom practice, which would explain the relatively minimal influence of the *teacher education* strand on the teachers' perceptions when compared with the other two strands.

## 2.8 Conclusion: educational implications and issues for further inquiry

As we have shown in this chapter and in previous discussions of these teachers' thinking, the perceptions within the Pupil-Environment-Process-Product areas should not be generalized: teachers develop their own slightly different versions depending on their past experiences, current working context and teaching, and, potentially, any other musical activities undertaken outside school.

This study highlights the importance for music teachers of having practical knowledge of different music styles in order for the knowledge to impact on their teaching. It also supports suggestions that practitioners need appropriate composing experience if they are to both assess work from a range of styles (Pilsbury & Alston, 1996) and engage with the students' composing processes (Berkley, 2001). These processes are not homogenous and the results from this inquiry corroborate observations from other studies regarding the influence of the music style and the students' individual differences on the composing processes (Burnard & Younker, 2004; Seddon & O'Neill, 2003; Soares de Deus, 2006). All these recent studies exemplify the complexity of creativity in music education, which is not always reflected in teaching manuals and statutory guidelines. The



generative model illustrates how this complexity is dealt with in the thinking of the participating teachers.

One educational implication that follows from this is the importance of newly qualified music teachers working alongside experienced practitioners to develop educational connoisseurship. Given that the generative model would work from the outset of each teacher's career and that participants presented different views that appear to be linked to different teaching and musical experiences, it would be advisable and beneficial for newly qualified teachers to undertake a mentoring scheme in order to have a sound start in the assessment and reflection of their teaching.

Implications for teacher education courses are, as mentioned earlier, the need for practical work using a variety of different music styles and activities. In a survey of teachers' perceptions and practices of musical improvisation in English primary classrooms, Koutsoupidou (2005) found that teachers were more likely to use improvisation if their higher education included this type of activity. Reflecting on the social worlds of children's musical creativity (see Burnard, 2006) could also be beneficial during development courses to allow teachers to go beyond collecting 'teaching recipes'. Both practical and reflective skills are needed to facilitate the engagement of pupils in composing/improvising experiences with a sense of musical flow (MacDonald et al., 2006). Finally, given the importance of the *musical strand* on the generation of these participants' thinking, further research is needed on the value for classroom teaching of providing opportunities for full-time music teachers to enjoy music-making activities with other musicians out of school.

The purpose of this study was to offer insights on the issues under inquiry. The video-eliciting interview technique and the Musical Career Paths helped to illustrate these teachers' cases with 'intense particularisations' rather than universal statements (Elliott, 2006). Further studies might include a longitudinal investigation, following a group of teachers from the beginning of their careers to a few years into their professional lives. A longitudinal design could reveal the progressive acquisition of the teachers' perceptions of creativity and their modification through interaction with their experiences, giving further support to the proposed generative model.

### Acknowledgements

We are most grateful to the participants for their willingness to share their experiences and to Emeritus Reader Charles Plummeridge (Institute of Education) for his advice throughout the research process. The study was supported by the Catalan Government (*Batista i Roca* grants BBR-01-23 and 2002BBR00017). This chapter is a revised version of the article 'A generative model of teachers' thinking on musical creativity' published in *Psychology of Music*, Vol. 37(4), October 2009, by Sage Publications Ltd, All rights reserved. © SEMPRES, 2009.

An extended discussion of research literature and methodology is provided in the article.

## References

- Berkley, R. (2001). Why is teaching composing so challenging? A survey of classroom observation and teachers' opinions. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(2), 119-138.
- Berkley, R. (2004). Teaching composing as creative problem solving: Conceptualising composing pedagogy. *British Journal of Music Education*, 21(3), 239-263.
- Boden, M. (1990). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Brinkman, D. J. (1999). Problem finding, creativity style and the musical compositions of high school students. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 33(1), 62-68.
- Burnard, P. (2000). How children ascribe meaning to improvisation and composition: Rethinking pedagogy in music education. *Music Education Research*, 2(1), 7-23.
- Burnard, P. (2006). The individual and social worlds of children's musical creativity. In G. McPherson (Ed.), *The child as musician* (pp. 353-374). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnard, P. (Ed.) (2007). Section 11 creativity. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 1173-1290). Dordrecht: Springer.
- 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.
- Byrne, Ch. & Sheridan, M. (2001). The SCARLATTI papers: Development of an action research project in music. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(2), 173-185.
- Cain, T., Holmes, M., Larrett, A. & Mattock, J. (2007). Literature-informed, one-turn action research: Three cases and a commentary. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 91-106.
- Craft, A. (2001). Little c creativity. In A. Craft, B. Jeffrey & M. Leibling (Eds.), *Creativity in education* (pp. 45-61). London: Continuum.
- Craft, A. & Jeffrey, B. (Eds.) (2008). Special issue: Creativity and performativity in teaching and learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(5).
- Creech, A., Papageorgi, I., Duffy, C., Morton, F., Haddon, E., Potter, J., de Bezenac, C., Whyton, T., Himonides, E. & Welch, G. F. (2008). Investigating musical performance: Commonality and diversity amongst classical and non-classical musicians. *Music Education Research*, 10(2), 215-234.

- Department for Children Schools and Families & Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2007). *The national curriculum. Statutory guidelines for Key Stages 3 and 4*. London: Department for Children Schools and Families & QCA.
- Department for Culture Media and Sport (2006). *Nurturing creativity in young people: A report to government to inform future policy*. London: Department for Culture Media and Sport & Department for Education and Skills.
- Department of Education Northern Ireland (2006). *Programmes of study and attainment targets* – see [www.deni.gov.uk](http://www.deni.gov.uk) (accessed 28 July 2010).
- Díaz, M. & Riaño, M. E. (Eds.) (2007). *Creatividad en educación musical [Creativity in music education]*. Santander: University of Cantabria.
- Dogani, K. (2004). Teachers' understanding of composing in the primary classroom. *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 263-279.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Elliott, J. (2006). Navigating the winds of change: The voyage of the good ship action research. Keynote speech at the Collaborative Action Research Network 30th anniversary conference, University of Nottingham.
- Elliott, R. K. (1971). Versions of creativity. *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*, 5(2), 139-152.
- Entwistle, N. (1991). How students learn and why they fail. In J. Radford (Ed.), *Talent, teaching and achievement* (pp. 77-96). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Fautley, M. (2004). Teacher intervention strategies in the composing processes of lower secondary school students. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 201-218.
- Fautley, M. (2005). A new model of the group composing process of lower secondary school students. *Music Education Research*, 7(1), 39-57.
- Fryer, M. (1996). *Creative teaching and learning*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Generalitat de Catalunya (1992). *Currículum. Educació primària [Primary school curriculum]*. Barcelona: Education Department of the Government of Catalonia.
- Glover, J. (2000). *Children composing 4-14*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Goncy, E. A. & Waehler, C. A. (2006). An empirical investigation of creativity and musical experience. *Psychology of Music*, 34(3), 307-321.
- Green, L. (2000). Music as a media art: Evaluation and assessment in the contemporary classroom. In J. Sefton-Green & R. Sinker (Eds.), *Evaluating creativity. Making and learning by young people* (pp. 89-106). London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, D. J. & Welch, G. F. (2003). *Effective teaching in secondary school music: Teacher and pupil identities*. End of award report, ESRC award R000223751.
- Hickey, M. (2002). Creativity research in music, visual art, theatre, and dance. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 398-415). Oxford: MENC and Oxford University Press.

- Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.) (2010). *The Cambridge handbook of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, M. A. (2002). Listening to the music: Compositional processes of high school composers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(2), 94-110.
- Koutsoupidou, T. (2005). Improvisation in the English primary music classroom: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Music Education Research*, 7(3), 363-381.
- Leitch, R., Gardner, J., Lundy, L., Clough, P., Odena, O., Mitchell, S. & Galanouli, D. (2008). *Consulting pupils on the assessment of their learning – Teaching and Learning Research Programme, Research briefing 36*. London: TLRP.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London: Sage.
- MacDonald, R., Byrne, Ch. & Carlton, L. (2006). Creativity and flow in musical composition: An empirical investigation. *Psychology of Music*, 34(3), 292-306.
- Mills, J. & Paynter, J. (Eds.) (2008). *Thinking and making: Selections from the writings of John Paynter on music education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (1999). *All our futures: Creativity, culture & education*. Sudbury, Suffolk: Department for Education and Employment.
- Odam, G. (2000). Teaching composing in secondary schools: The creative dream. *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(2), 109-127.
- Odena, O. (2001a). The construction of creativity: Using video to explore secondary school music teachers' views. *Educate*, 1(1), 104-122.
- Odena, O. (2001b). Developing a framework for the study of teachers' views of creativity in music education. *Goldsmiths Journal of Education*, 4(1), 59-67.
- Odena, O. (2004). Some considerations on research dissemination with particular reference to the audience and the authorship of papers. *Music Education Research*, 6(1), 101-110.
- Odena, O. (2005). Creatividad en la educación musical. Teoría y percepciones docentes [Creativity in music education. Literature and practitioners' views], *Eufonia. Didáctica de la Música*, 35(1), 82-94.
- Odena, O. (2007a). Experiencias de un estudio del pensamiento del profesorado sobre creatividad musical en escuelas de Inglaterra. Implicaciones educativas [Learning from a study of teachers' thinking of musical creativity in England. Educational implications]. In M. Díaz & M. E. Riaño (Eds.), *Creatividad en educación musical* (pp. 61-70). Santander: University of Cantabria.
- Odena, O. (2007b). Using specialist software for qualitative data analysis, *Education-line* – see [www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/165945.htm](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/165945.htm) (accessed 30 December 2010).
- Odena, O. (2010). Practitioners' views on cross-community music education projects in Northern Ireland: Alienation, socio-economic factors and educational potential. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(1), 83-105.
- Odena, O. (forthcoming). Creativity in the secondary music classroom. In G. McPherson & G. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Odena, O. & Welch, G. (2007). The influence of teachers' backgrounds on their perceptions of musical creativity: A qualitative study with secondary school music teachers. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 28(1), 71-81.
- Odena, O., Plummeridge, Ch. & Welch, G. (2005). Towards an understanding of creativity in music education: A qualitative exploration of data from English secondary schools. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 163, 9-18.
- Pilsbury, Ch. & Alston, P. (1996). Too fine a net to catch the fish? An investigation of the assessment of composition in GCSE music. *British Journal of Music Education*, 13(3), 243-258.
- Priest, T. (2006). Judges' assessments of creativity under three conditions. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 167, 3-14.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2006). *National curriculum online* – see <http://curriculum.qca.org.uk> (accessed 2 July 2010).
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2009). *How do we develop PLTS in music?* National curriculum online – see <http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/key-stages-3-and-4/subjects/music> (accessed 2 July 2010).
- Savage, J. & Fautley, M. (2007). *Creativity in secondary education*. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Basic Books.
- Scottish Executive (2006). *Promoting creativity in education: Overview of key national policy developments across the UK*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.
- Seddon, F. A. & O'Neill, S. A. (2003). Creative thinking processes in adolescent computer-based composition: An analysis of strategies adopted and the influence of instrumental music training. *Music Education Research*, 5(2), 125-137.
- Soares de Deus, J. (2006). Adolescent's engagement in computer-based composition in Brazil. Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Webster, P. R. (2009). Children as creative thinkers in music. Focus on composition. In S. Hallam, I. Cross & M. Thaut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music psychology* (pp. 421-428). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welch, G. F. (2006). What research into music teacher education tells us about the contexts and challenges for teacher education. In *Proceedings, Beijing international forum on music education 2006* (pp. 84-97) [Chinese version, pp. 98-113]. Beijing: NAMM/CSME/ISME/CNU.
- Welch, G., Papageorgi, I., Creech, A., Himonides, E., Potter, J., Haddon, E., Whyton, T., de Bezenac, C., Duffy, C. & Morton, F. (2008). *Investigating musical performance: Performance anxiety across musical genres – Teaching and Learning Research Programme, Research briefing 57*. London: TLRP.