Introduction

A creativity without gold stars

Sean Wiebe
University of Prince Edward Island

Peter Gouzouasis
University of British Columbia

Patrick Howard
Cape Breton University

Mitchell McLarnon
McGill University

Kathryn Ricketts
University of Regina

Layal Shuman
McGill University

In the social imaginary new concepts designate new realities, so with the 21st-century emergence of the concept of a creative economy, related concepts and terms have also emerged. Already terminology such as innovation, entrepreneurism, life hacks, pivots, platforms, coding, design thinking, and makerspaces has proliferated the educational landscape. Yet so much of what has been written that advocates for a complete rethinking of education lacks proximity to classrooms. Advancement of an idea includes the problematization of it. Thus, many of the contributions in this special issue question the underlying concepts by which creativity is understood. In thinking of Canada's creative economy writ large, as a social expression of human experience, Gouzouasis (2006) reminds us that "human imagination has resulted in creating extensions of self... the artist plies the science or system of any medium to achieve expression" (p. 3). It is this return to the making self, or even the self-maker, that characterizes the contributions to this special issue: From Gallagher's student makers to Leggo's advocation of living poetically, contributors are problematizing the discourse of the creative economy and education that regards students as economic unit-like subjects.

Howard (2015) notes that with the advent of the digital variable "divisions between technology and creativity have been erased" (p. 24). He points out that the very experience of creating is changing, and that this is disrupting the entire field of education. Reporting findings from a knowledge synthesis that looked at the impact of machine-learning algorithms and digital taylorism on the creative economy, Altass and Wiebe (2017) make the case that education should foreground "uniquely human skills" (p. 55). With the digital's profound effect on creative making, they write that innovation, collaboration, and social and emotional literacies are highly desirable.

> The good news is that these intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies are malleable, and can be learned and developed through education and life experience...Both in and outside of the classroom, students should be encouraged to ask questions, engage uncertainty, act creatively, take risks, think critically, and contribute to discussions that are important to the students' lives and communities (p. 56).

When discussing means to enhance creativity, there is value in being precise about the exact moment of discovery and how it enters the classroom. Biesta (2013) asks whether learning is "within our own construction" or whether it enters "our being from the outside" (p. 57). In the former, the creative teacher is chiefly a pedagogue, concerned with structuring the classroom. In the language of 21st-century teaching and learning, the teacher is a facilitator, guide, learning designer, co-learner, or mentor, etc., and what matters is shaping the classroom space for students' critical and imaginative discoveries. In the latter, the creative teacher has a discovery in mind, something the students would not likely come to on their own. It might be a technique, a concept, an experiment, and so forth, but what matters is the teacher's own practice as a creative that gives them the experience to share it. The distinction is not new and ideally in developing creativity in students, teachers would have subject matter expertise, pedagogical expertise, and the ability to model dispositions reflective of a creative mindset, such as persistence, critical thinking, problem solving, risk taking, experimentation and embracing failure as a vital pathway towards discovery. When it comes to teaching creativity, it means developing these dispositions by living in the world as a creative and taking up a creative practice of one's own. If "Artists are the natural lightning rods for prophecy and revelation" (Beitel, 2003, p. 41), then who better to lead the transformation of education in the 21st century than arts based, creative thinkers?

Teachers who are immersed in a creative pursuit, whether it be visual arts, multimedia design, craft, music, and dance, become powerful role models when they intentionally instill an ethos of classroom creativity. Not surprisingly, teachers are quite supportive of these kinds of artistic imaginings of their roles (Carter, 2014), which has been slow in emerging at the institutional level because the focus has been on information technologies and not the development of creative, artistically inclined individuals. McLuhan and McLuhan (1988) argue that a creative society depends on the artful teacher: "the only person in our culture whose whole business has been the retraining and updating of sensibility (p. 5). As we enter the third decade of the 21st century, the socio-cultural-ecological issues we will encounter require responses from people comfortable with ambiguity and complexity. Creativity is generative. Its processes can help us live well in communities facing challenges and uncertain futures.

Gallagher (this issue) points to the potential of social innovation, but also cautions that it is a term easily emptied of its significance, one too often used as a buzzword and too vaguely applied. She writes: "As with any movement that rapidly gains currency, though, it can be stretched beyond recognition or even emptied of meaning as definitions and uses proliferate or its trendiness outpaces its substance." In her article she argues that there should be a "more intimate and productive relationship between the broad, macro discourses of social innovation and the micro creative and art-making practices of young people in schools and communities." She provides us with the voices of young people "who have much to teach us about how 'creative pedagogies' are being enacted in classrooms."

Perry and Collier (this issue) propose a conceptual framework for creativity in action. Taking up recent work in literacy studies (e.g., Pennycook, 2010), poststructural theory (e.g., St. Pierre, 2015), and applied arts (e.g., Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013), they searched "unspoken ontological drivers of discourses of creativity" to seek a more precise description of what teachers value in creativity. A fuller understanding of creativity, they write, "cannot be addressed by compartmentalising or naming sweeping trends." Making the argument to decouple creativity from socially desirable outputs, Perry and Collier bring to mind the curriculum reconceptualist tradition, perhaps best exemplified in the work of Maxine Greene or Bill Pinar, noting that, "A "creative output" in education can be unshackled from the constraints of conventional uses of language, typical assessment and evaluation criteria." What they point us to instead is "the specificity and the contingency of the creative in every context."

In thoughtful juxtaposition, Leggo (this issue) situates his reflections on creativity in a life lived as a poet. Leggo says that he studies language "in order to ponder possibilities for making." Through a dialogue with his granddaughter Madeline, he recounts her incredulity regarding his lack of creative opportunities in school. Providing a close reading of Deresiewicz, Leggo shares that in educational institutions the two primary constraints on creativity are the pursuit of gold stars and the aversion to risk, and offers instead a pedagogy of love. Love, he says, quoting hooks, "will always challenge and change us. This is the heart of the matter" (p. 137). What is it, we wonder, about the co-implication of

love and creativity? Leggo says this about poetry "I never seek to domesticate poetry, to close it down, to explain it. I want to remain open to poetry, open to the possibilities."

Hatt (this issue) critiques the social construct of ideas, especially the ways ideas have become "a new currency... of this new revolutionary market." Instead, he invites us to turn our attention toward imagination, an "a priori factor that gives license to creativity as an a posteriori factor." He provides three phenomenological narratives to explore, "What is it to experience imagination in childhood?" In so doing, he illustrates how joy, play, wonder, and curiousity are abundantly available beyond educational discourses that tightly couple creativity to school and economic success.

Fisher and Golden (this issue) question the use of the word creativity in educational discourses arguing that it often lacks an explicit connection to teaching and learning processes and outcomes. They share their collaborative journey of creatively teaching and teaching creativity in English language learning classrooms in Montreal. The findings address the challenges and benefits of transforming our classrooms into creative spaces where young people co-create their experiences and define their learning goals. The questions they raise leave us wondering: "… as products of a performative educational system and as teachers within a performative educational system, were we creative enough to face the challenges that would come?"

Working with a child with autism, Evrard and Bolduc (this issue) detail their use of music and song to help improve their participant's verbal and non-verbal social interactions and abilities. Using mixed methods to generate a range of data, Evrard and Bolduc found that after 14 musical lessons, their participant demonstrated an increased capacity for creativity, imagination, empathy and humour. They conclude by recommending that music, song, and perhaps dance be used for integrating children with autism spectrum disorder into classrooms while noting that future research on similar themes might look to use music and song to develop linguistic competence.

In what ways might teachers open up curriculum spaces so that what students create extends beyond the matching skills to jobs Faustian bargain (Altass & Wiebe, 2017)? In an increasingly digital world opportunities to be creative have expanded. Digital tools

are creative tools for playmaking, and are opening up new spaces to play, but such spaces need to be historically, economically, and politically situated. The creative industries are "not immune to technological displacement and digital taylorism" (Altass & Wiebe, 2017, p. 54). The contributions to this special issue question the impulse to capture all human creative activity into the wide net of the creative industries. Consider, for example, Shalini Venturelli's (2000) threat that a nation cannot succeed unless its wealth creation is supported by continuous generation of intellectual property:

> In short, a nation without a vibrant creative labor force of artists, writers, designers, scriptwriters, playwrights, painters, musicians, film producers, directors, actors, dancers, choreographers, not to mention engineers, scientists, researchers and intellectuals, does not possess the knowledge base to succeed in the Information Economy (p. 15).

The enthusiasm for a creative economy focused on wealth creation needs to be tempered with an understanding of the possibilities for new social relationships. It would be a mistake, we believe, to confine creativity to an expression of intellectual property. John Willinsky (2009) has given a thorough examination of how schools might respond to pressures from industry for students to create. His focus has been not on content creation but student invitation. Because schools are public institutions, he argues, students have a legal right to enjoy the creative agencies, autonomies, and pursuits that are afforded anyone who works in a publicly funded institution. This is the beginning of an argument that creativity is worthwhile in schools because it is a public good—to play, to invent, to try out, to experience pleasure—these are the experiences by which a wider community flourishes through education.

References

Altass, P., & Wiebe, S. (2017). Re-imagining policy and practice in the digital era. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*, *15*(2), 48-63.

Beittel, K. R. (2003). Art for a new age. *Visual Arts Research*, *29*(1), 39–53.

Biesta, G. (2013). Receiving the gift of teaching: From 'learning from' to 'being taught by.' *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *32*, 449-461. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11217-012-9312-9

Carter, M. (2014). *The teacher monologues: Exploring the experiences and identities of artist-teachers*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publications.

Gouzouasis, P. (2006) Technology as arts-based education: Does the desktop reflect the arts? *Arts Education Policy Review*, *107*(5), 3-9.

Howard, P. (2015). Digital Citizenship in the Afterschool Space: Implications for Education for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*. *17*, (1).

McLuhan, M., & McLuhan, E. (1988). *Laws of media: The new science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Willinsky, J. (2009). The intellectual properties of literacy. *LEARNing Landscapes*, *3*(1), 17-25.

Venturelli, S. (2000). From the information economy to the creative economy: Moving culture to the center of international public policy. *GIA Reader*, *12*(3), 1-39.

.