Chapter 16
Creativity in Music Education? The Wild Card That Got Stuck in the Deck

Anna Houmann

Abstract Working within the field of creativity can be difficult within a context of the arts. Just mentioning the word could get you into trouble. One thought is that in arts education we don't talk about creativity in fear of loosing the "magic" about it. The arts are per se a creative context so why bother defining it, describing it, or even researching it? It just is. In this chapter, I discuss this tension and provide examples of work that gives creativity a voice in Music Teacher Education.

16.1 Introduction: Creativities Transcending Boundaries in Higher Music Education

If I could have a penny for each time some one made the following remark: "Oh, you work in higher arts education. That must be a creative place!" I would be an extremely rich person. Most people hold the idea that music by itself is a creative art form and by teaching it or performing it you are automatically a creative person. To this remark I always answer "of course" knowing that it all has to do with perspective and perception (and perhaps a limited assumption). In a mini-survey, conducted in 2010, scanning through all the curriculums at Lund University searching for the word creativity in a 10-year period, the word had completely dried out within the Faculty of Fine and Performing Arts and exploded like a tsunami wave at other faculties within the university. Does this mean that creativity does not exist within higher arts education? Of course not. Perhaps we use another word, perhaps it is intertwined in the context and doesn't sit "in the walls", as a colleague of mine put it, but rather carried out as a verb, an action, through the daily work. Or perhaps the truth is that higher arts education isn't a more creative place than any other higher education. Or worse, perhaps arts education, living under the creative spell, is in fact a less creative place since we don't talk about it because then it will lose all its magic?

A. Houmann (✉)
Lund University, Lund, Sweden
e-mail: anna.houmann@mhm.lu.se

Five years ago my colleague, Eva Sæther, and me had the opportunity to further understand the link between creativity and higher arts education pedagogy through the perceptions and opinions of students and teachers at Malmö Academy of Music (Houmann & Sæther, 2014). This research study aimed towards determining how experienced academic music teachers understand their role and the context of university in relation to fostering the creative capacity of their students and how the student perceived this. Going through literature on creativity inside and outside higher education, we searched for keywords that would help us with the visionary direction of our effort to include our students and colleagues in the process of enhancing creativities (that's right, plural) in higher music education. Eventually we focused on two fields of tension: the dual dichotomies of risk-comfort and joy-seriousness. We also wanted to include the collaborative and community aspects of creativity, leading to the pluralism of the concept, creativities.

Based on the condition that a project like this had to involve both students and teachers, we initiated a process that we hoped could impregnate the new teacher training in the coming years, and provide empirical material for research projects. This chapter tells the story about the project called "Creativities – Transcending Boundaries in Higher Music Education" and how it gave creativity a voice in Music Teacher Training.

The academic year 2011–2012 marked the start of a new music teacher education in Sweden – the third within a period of 10 years. The focal point at our academy was that "the music teachers whom we educate now will educate children and youngsters born around 2040, people who will retire in about 2105" (Houmann & Sæther, 2014, p. 174). What they will need during their professional careers is creativity. If students can use their creativity to combine their knowledge about pedagogical and psychological research with tried experience of music and learning to change their working methods and approaches then they can renew their teaching to create new creative learning environments for children and young people.

The nexus of creativity and higher education pedagogy has been brought to the fore by a growing interest in (a) understanding the precise nature of creativity, (b) asserting the link between creativity and economic productivity, (c) calling for a greater focus on creativity in higher education policy and (d) provocations about what precisely pedagogy for creativity capacity building might look like. In the "Creativities Transcending Boundaries" project we used a mix of quantitative methods and qualitative approaches, such as involving both students and teachers in workshops to discuss and reflect on the different approaches to creativity that were brought to the surface by e-mail surveys. The survey was a modified version of the "UK Higher Education Academy: Imaginative Curriculum" report 2 (The Creativity Centre, 2006) and an extended version made at the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education in Australia (McWilliam & Dawson, 2008). Although the aim of the study was not to compare Swedish teachers and students to the British and Australian results it is to some extent interesting to note differences and similarities when it comes to perceptions of creativity. In our study 53 students and 36 teachers answered the questionnaire and 100 students and 80 teachers took part in the following workshops where the results were discussed. The aim of the

Table 16.1 First and second generation creativity concepts

First generation creativity concepts	Second generation concepts
Serendipitous, non-economic	"Hard" and an economic driver
Singularisation	Pluralized/team-based
Spontaneous/arising from the inner self	Dispositional and environmental
Outside the box or any other metric	Requires rules and boundaries
Arts-based	Transdisciplinary
Something out of nothing	Something to something else
Natural or innate	Learnable
Not amenable to teaching	Teachable
Not assessable	Assessable

McWilliam and Dawson (2008)

workshop was to invite all involved to participate in future development of the project and to continue to reflect on their own attitudes to and skills in creativity in music education.

16.1.1 The Complexity of First and Second Perceptions of Creativity

One reason for the silence on creativity in higher music education could be the different perceptions of creativity. McWilliams and Dawson (2008) introduce the first and second generation concepts of creativity (Table 16.1).

"First generation" thinking about the nature of creativity can be characterized as focusing on "soft" creativity, i.e., creativity as giftedness so mysterious and serendipitous that it defies definition, or, as Claxton (2006) stated: "a rare exotic mental ability that stands apart from normal cognition" (p. 59). A corollary of this perception is that creativity also defies any attempt to foster is systematically through formal learning. According to McWilliams and Dawson (2008) such perception of creativity is relevant to a small percentage of graduates (overwhelmingly in the performing and visual arts) as future professional workers.

Recent research has challenged these propositions as myths, compiling evidence to support "second generation" thinking about creativity as a workplace capacity that is an observable and valuable component of social and economic enterprise (Cunningham, 2005, 2006; Haring-Smith, 2006). Put in Csikszentmihalyi's (2006) terms, creativity is no longer a "luxury for the few, but…a necessity for all" (p. xviii).

Key learning theorists have provided second generation scholarship with a platform for arguing that three components of creativity –domain relevant skills, creative processes, and intrinsic task motivation – can be identified and fostered through formal and informal learning (Folkestad, 2006; Robinson, 2000; Simonton, 2000;

Sternberg, 2007). There is some consensus around the view that creativity works as both a way of thinking "associated with intuition, inspiration, imagination, ingenuity and insight" and "a novel and appropriate response to an open-ended task" (Byron, 2007).

Second generation thinkers assert that sort of "hard" creativity that leads to innovative organizational practice is more likely to be an outcome of adaption – new recombinations of what currently exists (see Leadbeater, 1999; Lessig, 2005) – than of "flash-of-inspiration" moments or the radical invention of something out of nothing. Csikszentmihalyi (1999) makes an important addition to "second generation" definitional work, by insisting that it is the community, not the individual, that is the appropriate unit of analysis when seeking to inquire into creativity. This proposition challenges conceptions of creativity that are limited to personal psychological traits or the mystical "inner life" of individuals. This pluralisation of the unit of analysis of creativity raises substantial issues for higher education if graduate attributes continue to be understood and measured in predominantly individualized ways. It indicates that the student cohort or community of learners is the unit to which creative capacity may be more appropriately attributed, not the individual graduate.

This model of first and second generation perceptions of creativity also relates to discussions about talent and musicality. Is it a rare gift or can it be learned and developed? On a general level, our respondents held a mix of "first" and "second" generation ideas about creativity as a human capacity. On the one hand, respondents appear to endorse the first generation view that, in personal terms, creativity is an individual capacity that is best fostered by removal of any or all constraints. As one teacher put it: "I don't believe you can learn or teach how to be creative – it is something you already are. My job is to remove all constraints". On the other hand, there is recognition of the importance of group- or team-based approaches and of "direction", "processes" and "support" when fostering student creativity. Furthermore, they also reflect "first generation" thinking about creativity as best achieved through "arts-based" pedagogy, but also insist, in accordance with "second generation" thinking, that both science and the arts are fertile spaces for developing creative students capacity.

Koestler (1964) identified the decisive phase of creativity as the capacity to "perceive…a situation or event in two habitually associative contexts" (p. 95). Following Koestler, the capacity to select, reshuffle, combine, or synthesize already existing facts, ideas, faculties and skills in original ways can be taken as evidence of creativity at work. Perkins (1981) insist that skills like patterns recognition, creation of analogies and mental models, the ability to cross domains, exploration of alternatives, knowledge of schema for problem solving, fluency of thought and so on are all indicators of creativity as a set of learning dispositions or cognitive habits. These scholastics moves to unhook creativity from "artiness", individual genius and idiosyncrasy, and to render it economically valuable, team- or community-based, observable and learnable, shift the focus to creative ways of thinking and doing that are observable and replicable processes and practices within daily economic, social and educational life. Thus "second generation" thinking indicates that creativity can be engaged intentionally as an outcome of pedagogical work.

In our study the notion of creativity as "mysterious processes" was the lowest-ranked item for all sample populations: questionnaire and workshops. As mentioned above the participants perceptions reflected a mix of first and second generation thinking, with "hard" thinking and doing skills ranking highly, "seeing unusual connections", "innovation", "combining ideas" and "analytical thinking" being valued alongside "imagination", "invention" and "sudden inspiration". The majority of responses were related to the categories of thinking and doing. A notable exception in the study was the category "the arts". There were very few perceptions of creativity related to the arts. Although one respondent made reference to "the arts", the description provided was more aligned with the category "self-expression". It could be that the context of the study is higher music education so the connection between creativity stands to reason. Participants were requested to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements relating to creativity and education. Firstly, we observed the level of agreement regarding the perception of creativity as a rare gift. In this instance, over 85.5 % of the students and 85 % of the teachers disagreed with the notion that creativity is a rare gift that only a few people have. The vast majority of participants were in agreement that creativity could be developed.

16.1.2   The Fields of Tension Deepens

Initially teachers were rather irritated by the questions put in the questionnaire and some were quite put off by being asked questions about creativity in this manner:

> Creativity is a necessary condition that cannot always be controlled. It depends on numerous factors which all needs to interact. It is interrelated to the interaction with other people.// I don't agree with the bias in the ingress of this questionnaire – creativity is not a goal by itself that can be reached with the help of fine art and music! Creativity can never be disconnected from the activity it is "used" in. Fine arts and music cannot be reduced to a cleaning lady for creativity. That is why so many questions are impossible for me to answer in addition to the quantification of the answers. I am looking forward to the conversation that can take place at the Academy and that already are. (Teacher X)

This quote also relates to who puts the question about creativity. Through some of the teachers' descriptions it is clear that there is a field of tension between researchers and practitians. There seems to be an understanding that creativity can't truly be understood by anyone else but the persons involved in the daily work. Many things can explain this but perhaps the concepts of tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966), knowing in action (Schön, 1987) or implicit knowledge (Chomsky, 1965) can be of help. A significant part of professionalism lies within the repertoire of action patterns that have become automatized by frequently repetition in praxis. This ability to perceive and handle situations within the profession can from the perspective of the uninvited look rather magical. Actions are carried out on intuition, and the persons carrying them out cannot always explain what they are doing. Furthermore, if you perceive creativity from a perspective of first generation as giftedness, case is more or less closed. So who are you to ask? As Louis Armstrong said: "Man, if you

have to ask what it [jazz] is, you'll never know." In some way this has created a discourse where its own occupants are the only ones that can do research within its field. To introduce the questionnaire in our study we wrote: "Welcome in to our mutual investigating, mapping and developing of creativity. We do it together – teachers, researchers and students!" As researchers and teachers at our own academy we, naïve as it might be, thought we were insiders, "within its field". Turns out we were outsiders trying to get in. Conversations was already taking place, we were just not invited.

During the later years the importance of writing and reflecting has been more and more emphasized in teacher training and also, of course, in music teacher training. A focal point in students writings and reflections, at our academy, is knowledge as a form of awareness (Molander, 1996), knowledge as action, lived knowledge, embodied knowledge in constant motion; changing between insight and distance, reaction and reflection, part and whole, trust and risk taking. Due to current evaluation systems universities are assessed on the students capability to write an independent project (degree project) and the quality of the same (The Higher Education Ordinance, Swedish Code of Statues, No. 1993:100). This has of course been debated and discussed over the years. At our academy it has foremost amplified the field of tension between the parts of teacher training suggested to be more artistic/practical and the parts that are described as scientific/theoretical and to some extent also put creativity in the center of the battlefield. Who can claim that word/phenomena/activity? Researchers or practitians? Interestingly one teacher made a comment in the questionnaire that we were to late researching creativity, they had already moved on to other words.

> I don't want to sound snotty, but I don't use this word anymore. I suggest you use generate, the ability to generate, instead. (Teacher X)

In sum, our study showed that the essence of creativity in higher arts education was a hard nut to crack. Not only in the way we were doing it but the fact the WE, as researchers, were doing it. Students that write their degree projects enters a discourse that reminds of a catch 22; to write about their coming profession or artistry, mainly consisting on tacit knowledge, they have to break the unbreakable spell in transcending the field of tension between artistic/practical and scientific/theoretical using creativity to cross its boundaries and in the end of the process this degree project will, in the eyes of the assessment model, be valued more than all the other artistic/practical efforts, abilities, accomplishments they have done during their 5 years of teacher training. We, as researchers, teachers and supervisors of the students' degree projects became symbols of Dantes inferno. Are you still wondering why we were not invited? Alas one teacher respondent wrote in a comment: "You are researchers, shouldn't you know all this already?"

Interestingly every student does a degree project, as mentioned, leaving their second cycle at the university but when it comes to artistic research and funding of such projects it is not a requirement to have a PhD to be able to apply to the Swedish Agency of Research as it is within all other fields of science. This implies that the

field of tension, when it comes to tacit knowledge, goes beyond higher arts education, mum is the word.

This brings us to hybridity, a useful concept or a tool for playing with differences. Said (1999) explains hybridity with the help of a musical metaphor: a polyphonic work, where there is no leading melody and no following other parts, where all voices are of equal value. With the help of hybridity and the play with differences, it is possible to find new questions and to promote critical thinking. All very useful in educational settings, as a critical approach could be "the essence of all education" (Said, 1999, p. 266). Differences are important in this context too, since they offer possibilities for change. Change of attitudes, norms, curricula, teaching and research methods.

16.1.3 Creativity as a "Wildcard" in Academe

Most of the participants in the study perceived themselves to be creative. But we also got responses along the lines of: "I whish I were, it would be good for my work, my fellowmen and my life situation." When asked to justify why they perceived themselves to be creative, respondents related their understanding of creativity to thinking and problem-solving skills as well as to self-discipline and working together with students. In this context, the responses suggest that the concept of creativity is a skill or attribute that can be fostered and developed:

> I try of course, to be creative both in my musicianship and teaching by continuously analyzing my work. I do this in my musicianship by listening to my recordings of me playing, and as teacher by discussing the reflections of my teaching with friends and colleagues. A big help are the evaluations I do together with my students. Their fresh perspectives give a lot of ideas. (Teacher X)

While a minority indicated that they were not creative individuals, their responses suggested that a certain level of creativity had been learnt and developed through experience. For example: "Not particularly, but through working in a variety of places with a variety of people, I have learnt to be more creative". Related to Vygotsky (2004), a violation of the taken-for-granted, a fracture – dissociation – was necessary to promote imagination and create something new: "If life surrounding him does not present challenges to an individual, if his usual and inherent reactions are in complete equilibrium with the world around him, then there will be no basis for him to exercise creativity" (Vygotsky, 2004/1930, pp. 28–29). For some respondents, their creative capacity was perceived to be enhanced when in a state of flow (Csikzentmihalyi, 1990). For example: "Yes, I love writing music. Especially sinking into that creative space where ideas seem to emerge effortlessly and spontaneously. I sometimes think I live for those moments of inspiration".

The vast majority of Swedish, Australian and UK participants were in agreement with the statement "The capacity to be creative helps people to be successful". Seventy-two per cent of both Swedish students and teachers agreed with the

Table 16.2 The most academically successful students are also the most creative

Level of agreement	Students (%)	Teachers (%)	Australia (%)	UK (%)
Strongly agree	7.55	2.78	2.7	3.4
Agree	7.55	5.56	16.2	10.1
Not certain	18.9	5.56	16.2	25.8
Disagree	28.3	27.8	40.5	44.9
Strongly disagree	35.8	52.8	24.3	15.7
No answer	1.89	5.56	–	–

statement. Although a preponderance of the sample population agreed with this statement, the respondents' perceptions did not translate "successful" to an academic context. For example, 64.1 % of the students and 80.6 % of the teachers disagreed with the statement that "The most academically successful students are also the most creative" (Table 16.2).

It is interesting to note this anomaly in terms of what it might connote either about the extent to which creativity is perceived as a "wildcard" in academe, or that the academy is yet to value creativity and its formal credentialing processes appropriately, or both.

Creativity was perceived to enhance academic performance although respondents largely suggested that academic success was not an indicator of level of individual creativity. In the following workshops the participants agreed that creative people were more likely to be good in learning but there were mixed levels of agreement concerning the reverse of this statement (people who are good at learning are more likely to be creative). Interestingly it suggests that while creative people are likely to be good learners, the reverse of this statement is not automatically endorsed. This apparent contradiction may be accounted for as ambivalence around whether academic assessment practices really capture good learning. As one respondent in the UK study noted, the "curriculum encourages mediocrity and acceptance of… facts" (The Creativity Centre, 2006, p. 6). Interestingly one of the Swedish students mentioned how she, during her practice periods, tries to challenge her creativity by using the teaching methods of the Academy courses and playing around with them, in order to internalize and personalize them. This suggests that students, to develop their own creativity, are to make sure to be in places where other creative people are, to be inspired and find support: "I try to develop my ways of working with myself, with my teachers and my students, to find ways that give synergy effects between lesson planed and lesson lived." As the student above, teachers that strive to develop the students' creativity mention how their own creativity is necessary for the results of their teaching: "I challenge myself and I believe in their capacity to reach the goal. I give them positive feedback…I never repeat what has already been done, that reduces my own creativity".

The result from this study indicated that there is a widespread agreement among academic teaching staff and students with regard to the perceived value of developing student creativity – however, the teachers' efforts don't seem to be recognized by the students! Almost 85 % of the students and 94 % of the teachers indicated that

developing student creativity is important. The importance of developing student creativity is reflected in the percentage of respondents indicating that they aim to developing student creativity through their teaching practices. Over 94 % of the teacher respondents noted that they aim to develop student creativity. They do this by for example; creating situations with multiple choices, encourage creative solutions (musically as well as pedagogically), being a role model, challenging students experiences and believes, creating a learning environment that is supporting where students formulates their goals, realizing the process and assess the result.

Interestingly, 25 % of the students do not notice this 94 % effort to develop student creativity. One of the students explains:

> Some teachers obviously try. But I think that maybe many teachers are afraid of losing control, to let the students find their own way. They want the students to be creative but in the right way, creative within the frames. That is not creativity to me, creativity is to think and act beyond the frames. (Student X)

Regardless if students answered "yes" or "no" to the question "Do the teachers aim at developing your creativity?" the majority emphasizes the importance of time and possibility to understand and to curiously take on new challenges and different areas of knowledge. In the workshops the overall view was that higher education can develop students creative ability, but only during certain circumstances. Students must be given the possibility to work with assignments for a longer period of time and the assignments should focus on essential themes within the subject. Teachers need to emphasize both process and product and the students must have rich opportunities to explore, examine, experiment and revise. The assignments must also be created in a way that it gives students the opportunity to combine and integrate production with their observation and reflection. Further the students need to have several possibilities to assess their performance and to get formative feedback from their peers and teachers.

There seems to be broad consensus that creativity might be assessable but is unlikely to be so through the traditional assessment instruments used in the academy. Indeed, there was evidence of frustration with the extent to which the exercise of judgment, necessary for assessing creative capacity, was rendered impossible or at least improbable in standard academic assessment regimes. This same ambivalence about context extends to consideration of the "teachability" of creativity, although there was also some residual first generation thinking of creativity as "unteachable".

Aspects of higher music education perceived to promote creativity included: a closer link between teaching and research; slower paced learning for deep reflection; working with classmates on problem-based and project centered learning; and thoughtful and committed teachers. In describing perceived constraints inhibiting the development of student creativity in higher music education respondents indicated that assessment, large classes and poor teaching were primary factors inhibiting student creativity. Respondents also suggested that student demands such as limited time, and flexible learning were major constraints for developing student creativity.

16.1.4   In, About and Through Creativities – Useful Concepts in Music Education

The purpose of music teacher education is primarily to develop students' skills in teaching music and to facilitate the learning of their students. The students' learning is arranged in subject studies (musical studies), educational sciences (literature studies) as well as internship or practice in schools. However, my previous research as well as others (Eriksson, 2009) shows that there is a conflict between the so-called theoretical and practical sections in the teacher training. Perhaps more so in music teacher training since the practical section is equivalent with musical studies. Teacher students experience a conflict between encountering a traditional teacher role and an academic perspective on teaching as a profession. The role of the academic music teacher means that decisions and actions of the music teachers are based on scientific knowledge. However, it has proved difficult to integrate scientific knowledge with music as an agency. Rolf (2006) argues that it is only on an analytic, abstract level, that you can separate theory and practice. In all practical knowledge there are systematic theoretical units, patterns based on former knowledge. In the same way theory derives from practice when observations are systemized and patterns detected. Theory and practice are inseparable and naturally influence one another.

Students are at the center of this power struggle. As a student you meet both academics and practitioners who claim ownership of the truth. Nobody gains from maintaining this distinction; it imposes more limitations than possibilities for creativity. The possibility, for all parties, lays instead in seeing how you can use each other's knowledge, experiences and perspectives. Many teacher students also experience a big difference between the academy and the culture of the school environment they came from (Houmann, 2014a). Within the academy another set of norms exists, another language, other ways of thinking and solving problems and of course another way of being. To be able to oscillate from one approach to another is not easy. Bron (2000) introduces the theoretical concept "floating" as the basic state for the identity of the self, its place and belonging. The concept includes a sensation of being fragmented, of not having a past, and not being able to create, or plan for, the future. In academia you are confronted with different messages and new perspectives, but they don't seem valid. The old way of doing things is no longer enough. It's like being on a raft without being able to navigate. To be able to develop as a person and as a student you need to be challenged and at the same time given the opportunity to connect previous experiences with new. To bridge that gap we use biographicity (Alheit, 1995) and reflexivity (Ziehe, 1997) as theoretical standpoints in all educational sciences courses within music teacher education. I will give some examples of how this is done later on.

Another way of challenging students and to give them the opportunity to connect previous knowledge with new is , rather than defining studies at the academy according to the concepts of theory and practice, to talk about learning *in*, *about* and *through* (Houmann, 2010). "In" stands for action knowledge, knowing in action

(Schön, 1987), tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966), what we know but cannot explain, "about" is knowledge in general about teaching and "through" stands for knowledge that for example takes place in the teacher training internship. Music education research as an academic subject can be studied "in", "about" and "through" creativity, by letting these concepts be a link between theory and practice.

The findings from the "Creativities Transcending Boundaries" – project were useful in terms of determining whether and how the policy commitment of higher music education to develop creative capacity in staff and students alike could be enacted in higher music education teaching and learning. They show "second generation" thinking as emergent, while not yet being dominant, in the perceptions of these participants. The shift away from "first generation" thinking are important if any attempt is to be made to bridge the gap between policy rhetoric and teaching reality. The fact that these academics were a select group of teachers and students within higher music education does give some cause for concern about the speed of uptake of second generation thinking among those academics that were less acknowledged and rewarded for their teaching. This suggests there is still much work to be done to engage teachers and students with creativity as a hard-edged professional capacity that can and should be fostered through higher music education teaching and assessment.

Recommendations for disseminating "second generation" thinking about creativity capacity building through higher music education and teaching was made and implemented in to the new teacher training in 2011. With the use of the concepts dissociation and hybridity, biographicity and reflexivity we shaped the collaborative and including development project that was underpinned by our study on creativities in higher music education. On a practical level the experiences from this project was implemented in the curriculum of the courses in educational sciences. The courses in educational science have been developed alongside the workshops based on the results discussed so far in this chapter. We also created a webpage where all results are described and all research and literature about creativity is on display in a web-library (www.creativities.org). In the next paragraphs I will provide examples of the work that gave creativities a voice in Music Teacher Education.

16.2   Giving Creativity a Voice in Music Teacher Training

Creativity and invention have long been seen as a "black box" in higher music education (Houmann & Sæther, 2014). As mentioned before, higher music education don't typically, explicitly, try to understand this process. We fully expect that when musicians, as creative people, go into a room with a goal, they will come out with more or less creative discoveries and results. Although when we watch them at work we can observe some combination of playing, sketching, animated conversations, fine tuning instruments and bodies and messy floors. The fundamental nature of what happens in that room remains mostly a mystery. As a music teacher you just become, to some degree, creative.

Through several research projects (Houmann, 2010, 2014a, 2014b, 2015a, 2015b) we have been unveiling and describing the creative process that takes place when and how "it" happens in music teacher training and in music teaching. Consistently, in creating the setting for these projects inspired by Cirkus Cirkör (Björfors & Lind, 2009), we have chosen to put as much energy into the pedagogical part as the artistic part. With these two paths nurturing and inspiring each other, and an artistic approach to the professionalization of music teachers the development curve of the courses within educational science is nowhere near straight. Quite far from it! With all the success, all the failures, all the anxieties, new activities and leaps into the unknown, it pretty much resembles a rising ECG. The most important thing that we can share from our evolution is what the musical disciplines and our key words remind us of. At every crossroad, when decisions are to be made we ask our selves: What risks are we taking and are prepared to take? Who is risking what? Are we comfortable? Are we too comfortable? Do we need to get out of our comfort zone by taking a risk? What is the element of seriousness? Are we enjoying ourselves? So contradicting the current and political ideas stating that the arts should be more aligned with curriculums and assessment systems, the example of our life curve shows that it is in fact possible to let curricula and assessment be inspired by the arts.

Teaching for reflection in, about and through creativity (Houmann, 2014a) requires a pedagogic stance that is facilitative, enabling, responsive, open to possibilities and which values process as much as outcomes. As one example we use a specific method where music teacher students reflect on their teaching by visualizing the role of the multidimensional music teacher by creating a three-dimensional artifact. In this way the students acknowledge the concepts, personal qualities or skills that they believe are included in the "multidimensional music teacher". The purpose of the practical assignment is to get the students to describe the web of musical, pedagogical and social experiences that the music teacher creates in his or her work. By using self-reflection and autobiographies in this way music teachers reflect in, about and through creativity – and at the same time, through artifact making, creates a key to the life-world of the music teacher (Houmann, 2010, 2014b, 2015b). Hence you can see the artifact making process as a figuration of the life-world as an intentional world, lived world and a social world (Bengtsson, 1999; Merleau-Ponty, 1962/1999; Schütz, 1953/1999). Alheit (1995) writes about the hidden capacity to lead our own lives that can be set free through work with life-stories, where knowledge and learning is in focus. Knowledge about biographical learning helps us to understand the identity changes that our students go through. They shift their identity or move between multiple identities and roles depending on context and situation. Through the biographical reflection and interpretation in the construction of the three-dimensional artifact, that is reflection and interpretation of what has been, in the light of what is and in the light of what is planned, more alternatives become visible and can enable new and alternative routes in life. Often this means seeing an opportunity to make other choices that we earlier believed as possible or been aware of. Here the maxim of Søren Kierkegaard also applies: "Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards".

Drawing on biographicity and autobiography as a tool for working with creativity in higher music education, another example is the method "The soundtrack of my life" (Houmann, 2015b). In the first course in music teacher training students are asked to write an autobiography using music as a focal point in their stories. The students seek their identity through previous learning and experience and by doing so try to understand their current situation and context. They have to choose five pieces of music that they would describe as "crossroad music" or a "string of musical pearls" that together would form "The soundtrack of my life". Four of the five pieces should be music that they have listened to or played, or that others (parents, friends, teachers etc) have listened to or played that in some way inspired, motivated and changed or developed them. The fifth piece should be a piece or a song that they have been "ashamed" of. It could be either a piece of music that they have felt alone listening to and enjoyed or a piece that they felt they couldn't stand for in a musical context. From these five pieces of music they have to structure their autobiography in four themes; me and my music, me and my teacher, me and my school and me and my choice of profession. After individually writing their autobiography they get into groups of four. They then read each other's biographies and analyze each story. The students then move into the third stage of the process. The four autobiographies are then to be merged into one musical presentation. All the groups have a 15-min time limit for their presentation. During this process they can choose different means of collaboration, tools, themes and focal points. They can pick parts from each autobiography or just pick one autobiography to perform. By processing the biographies in this way the students become partners in an investigative process (Dominicé, 2000). The students then present, often very creatively, which categories that have submerged or how theory can be understood in or through practice. In turn, this presentation often leads to further reflection and implications for the teacher students and teachers.

16.2.1   When Music Puts the Questions

A third example of how creativity is given a voice in music teacher training is the project called "Creativities at Inter Arts Center". During the first year in teacher training students go in to internship. Besides supervised teaching they are also to investigate and identify music teachers' discretionary power and put their results in a report. Discretionary power is defined as "having the opportunity and knowledge to exercise one's own professional judgment in carrying out and making decisions in daily work" (Houmann, 2010, p. 1). It is identified by analyzing music teachers' possibilities and limitations through knowledge, actions and motivation. Students bring their results to a project week where researchers, teachers and students together examine, explore and experiment on possible ways to develop music teachers' discretionary power. During that week the students, based on their findings, come up with project ideas with the purpose to develop discretionary power in a school environment. They give a 5-min pitch of their ideas in front of an audience

and it is documented on video. After that the student analyze their pitch and audience feedback and develop their oral presentation into a 15-min pitch that is done with representatives from the internship in the audience. At the end of the period the project plans will be sent back to the schools where the student had their internship.

Inspired by Van Schalkwyk (2002) the students' observations are summarized into a report using the concerto form from the Westerns classical music as a metaphor for structuring and presenting their data. Many students often experience paper/report writing as a challenge when it comes to making sense of the mounds of literature surveys, data and analysis. Let alone writing the actual report. For many music teacher students it is like learning to play a new instrument. The main challenge is to find a framework for representing the end product that will convince the reader of the legitimacy of the scientific endeavor. In systems thinking metaphors are generally accepted for constructing realities about life (Indurkhya, 1992). This requires creativity to find "projective (similarity-creating) methapors…[where] the source concept network is interpreted in the target realm, as if the target realm is being encountered for the first time" (Indurkhya, 1992, p. 281). A musical composition reflects such structure and co-operation in the way the elements work together to form a coherent whole (Minai, 1995; van Schalkwyk, 1998). The intentional activity of the composer-music system evolves in much the same way as the process of conceptualizing a model for understanding and explaining a particular phenomenon, in this case discretionary power.

The report is like a composition and the student writing it, is the composer. The process or intentional activity is a co-creative dialogue (some kind of doing) between the student (a doer), the body of scholarship and the conceptualizing of theoretical propositions for a coherent model (something done) within a given context (Van Schalkwyk, 2002). In this process of "doing something" the student becomes aware that the timbre (tone or inflections), pitch (slant or bias), time (duration) and dynamics (plausibility and forcefulness) of many viewpoints may differ, although they merge together in the co-construction of new arguments and viewpoints on discretionary power. The rhythm is set in the alternation between supportive and new arguments, whereas the melody is found in the flow of clear and precise language. On the whole, through the intentional activity of conceptualizing the coherent representation of the study, propositions and suppositions are bounded together in harmony, and ideas alternate similarly to the different tonalities in a musical composition.

We found the musical form to be a suggestive metaphor where the concept network of the sonata form is used to provide an initial ontology for describing the different sections of the report. In this way the metaphor became a vehicle for organizing and systematizing the information in the different chapters so that the report could evolve as a coherent whole creating a continuity of ideas, and developing the theoretical propositions as themes in a dynamic unitary system; overture, exposition, development, recapitulation and cadenza/coda. We ask the students to keep in mind: What happens when music puts the questions and shapes both content and

structure of the report? By doing so the students identify music teachers' discretionary power – their possibilities and limitations.

Student reports evokes that today's complex and high-speed environment are calling music teachers to engage multiple styles of leading and learning. They need to know how to generate collective intelligence and how to call on everyone's participation and leadership. They need to generate shared clarity of purpose and create spaces for nonjudgmental learning. At the same time, music teacher students experience that they are asked from the policy makers to exercise hierarchical leadership. They are accountable to stakeholders and must take decisive action when needed. The goals for the subject music are stipulated in a chain of cause and effect but a creative process creates something different: not a chain but a framework for exploration, experimentation and trial and error. The path to the goal is not clear, and the goal may in fact change. Learning how to stand in this paradox and how to navigate the territory between too much chaos and too much control is the key for the upcoming project week of exploration. In this week student practice staying focused and centered in the midst of both chaos and control. They share stories from practice, education and previous experiences about teaching and learning creatively. It involves sharing learning and experiences of what happens when we engage in to co-learning and co-developing solutions to complex challenges. It also involves the practice of participatory leadership when leading creative processes in the project week, a week full of exploring and experiments through games.

16.2.2 The Game of Music Education

One part of Meads (1934) theoretical argument is perspective and perspective taking. The focal point for these thoughts is the self in terms of "I" and "me" and their respective relation to the "generalized other". By this Mead refers to society and/or the group that the individual perceive it belongs to. The mutual values and norms that exists in a society or a group Mead defines as the generalized others attitude, which can be understood as both the point of view and the approach that a society or a group takes in different regards. This concept is essential for example phenomenon's as socialization, learning and meaning making. When the part of the self called "me" develops it builds on what Mead calls "take the role of the other". You learn this through "play" but foremost "game". The distinction Mead is making between the processes play and game is that play is a form of imitation of others at the same time as it transcends imitation. Game means taking it a step further than what is done in play. If we consider a game of chess it is not only about planning your own moves but also thinking about you opponents next move. Preferably in as many moves and alternatives as possible to be able to do a good move yourself and thereby winning. Game, in other words, is about your actions being guided by interpretations of the others imaginable actions in the situation you are situated in. To be able to do this it requires a more advanced way of taking the role of the other than in play. I have to try to understand how the other person is thinking – how is he or

she understanding this situation right now? I have to be me and the other at the same time to be able to predict what the next move/step is in a certain context. The basis of these reflections are "me" and "the generalized other", hence the socialization that we have been apart of all our lives together with all we have learnt. Taking the role of the other is something we also practice as adults. We have good use of this, in the same way as predicting chess, in the social interaction that plays out between humans. Likewise understanding of the generalized others attitude is practiced and learnt continuously (Goffman, 1959).

During the project week students use different games to explore, examine and experiment, taking the role of the other (Mead, 1934) with musical formats as a focal point. The purpose of the week, besides investigating a theoretical phenomenon (discretionary power), is to examine what it takes to consciously design and host creative processes that deepens students' dialogue and leadership skills. Teachers introduce the elements of design, mental frameworks to understand how to work with emergence and complexity, and practical tools to support the students. Designing games the teacher and research team worked like a composer during the project week orchestrating the activities to achieve the right harmony between creativity, reflection, thinking, energy and decision making. Opening (divergent), exploring (emergent) and closing (convergent) are the core principles that helped to orchestrate the flow and get the best possible outcome from the creative processes during the project week. Each of these phases is different and it is important to know where you are in the process and what is needed in each phase. The first phase opens the world by setting the stage, introducing the players, and developing the themes, ideas and information that will populate your world. In the second phase you will explore and experiment with the themes you developed in phase one. In the third phase you will come to conclusions, make decisions, and plan for the actions that will serve as the inputs for the next thing that happens, whether it's another game or something else.

Invited with the question "how can we revitalize music education?" students initially embark the method Open Space Technology (Owen, 1997). To the first session of the week students bring their key findings or rather ideas for development of music teachers possibilities. Their ideas create the agenda for the day in a bulletin-board fashion. These items become potential breakout session, and participants have the freedom to "vote with their feet" by moving between breakouts. The goal of an Open Space Technology is to create time and space for people to engage deeply and creatively around issues of concern to them.

Dialogue sessions convene and each group captures the important points and post the reports on the news wall. All the reports end with a project idea that could be pursued during the project week. The students then chose which project they would like to develop by "dot voting".

Using the concept "Kubus" (Herlau & Tetzschner, 1995) the project idea is subject for exploring, examining and experimenting. The Kubus concept consists of the Kubus model that has been elaborated as a form of teaching-based research and has consisted in living out problems centering on entrepreneurship and innovation in a forward-looking perspective. The model focus on the phase prior to when the basic

idea and management has been determined, when project management theories come into play, the *preject*. Herlau and Tetzchner have done this because students' increasingly demanded to be instructed *in* how to lead the innovative process rather than *about* how it can be led. It is a great change from textbooks, power-point presentations and blackboard instruction to working in interdisciplinary self-managing groups, which are seeking a practical path toward very uncertain goals without a fixed leader, groups that can absorb the complexity, uncertainty and conflict on the path toward a well-defined goal. The Kubus model is a management model with shared management, which is designed for managing the work of interdisciplinary group in the early phases of the innovative process. The model has been developed in order to create a kind of operative framework so that relevant knowledge can be created as the point of departure for communication in the group. In the Kubus model, leadership is divided into two sharply distinguished functions: a process function and a result-oriented function. Leadership is exercised actively by all members of the group, who, on the basis of knowledge of the functions manifested by the leadership in the group work, support the leadership function through their actions of making themselves managerial. In practice, the team members are allocated leadership functions on the basis of a rotation principle, such that all members assume work tasks in order to highlight the leadership functions.

Results from the project week shows that music teacher students tend to employ simple strategies and practices to get where they want to go. It's not so much that they employ a consistent, repeatable process that leads to consistent creative results. It's more like a "workshop" with a set of tools and strategies for examining things deeply, for exploring ideas, and for reforming experiments and testing hypotheses, to generate new and surprising insights and results. Within teacher training in higher music education ideas and people cross-pollinates like bees in a single massive hive. The practices we live in are mostly an oral culture, passed along from person to person by word of mouth, or sound of play. In this week the students enters a space that is set to investigate and map this process and by that giving creativity a clear and firm voice in music teacher training.

16.3 Coda

Creativity in music education, like many other human activities, is built around goals. Goals are a way me move from A to B; from where we are to where we want to be. A goal sets up a tension between a current state A – an initial condition – and a targeted future state B – the goal. In between A and B is something we can call the challenge space: the ground we need to cover in order to get there. In music teaching we need to manage for creativity – in effect, we don't want predictability so much as breakthrough ideas, which are inherently unpredictable. In any creative endeavor, the goal is not to incrementally improve on the past but to generate something new. So, if a student wants to truly create, there is simply no way to precisely define the goal in advance, because there are too many unknowns. Embarking on this kind of adventure is akin to a voyage of discovery.

In a creative process goals are not precise and so the way we approach the challenge space cannot be designed in advance, nor can it be fully predicted. This is true at both a micro scale and a macro scale. Because the goal cannot be determined precisely in advance, some parts of music teaching must proceed on intuition, hypotheses and guesses. This may seem like a big challenge, but the world we create does not necessarily need to be complicated to be interesting and to help us move forward. Imagining a world can be as simple or as complex as you want to make it, depending on your goal, your situation, and the time you have available.

> Unlike a large and complex process, which must be planned in advance, a concept of operations is under constant revision and adjustment based on what you learn as you go. So, yes, you need to have a goal, but since you really know very little about the challenge space, it's very likely that your goal will change as you try out ideas and learn more about what work and what doesn't. (Student X)

Blackwell, Wilson, Street, Boulton, and Knell (2009) identifies fuzzy goals as a pole-star vision as an essential element of successful innovation. It is "a goal that motivates the general direction of their work, but without the need to get there blinding the team to opportunities along the journey" (p. 13). Important factors include the balance between focus and serendipity and coordinating team goals and the goals of individual collaborators, which easily can be transferred, to the actual situation of the music teacher in the classroom. Fuzzy goals in music education straddle the space between two contradictory criteria. At one end of the spectrum is the clear, specific, quantifiable goal and at the other end is the goal that is so vague as to be, in practice, impossible to achieve. In music teaching goals must give students a sense of direction and purpose while leaving them free to follow their intuition.

Music teachers need to navigate ambiguous, uncertain and often complex information spaces. In many ways it's a journey in the fog, where the case studies haven't been written yet, and there are few examples of where it's been done successfully before. "Voyages of discovery involve greater risks and more failures along the way than other endeavors. But the rewards are worth it" (Student X). Creativity can be your foghorn in higher music education if the cards are played well.

- There seems to be broad consensus that creativity might well be assessable but is unlikely to be so through the traditional assessment instruments used in the academy. Indeed, there is evidence of frustration with the extent to which the exercise of judgment, necessary for assessing creative capacity, is rendered impossible or at least improbable in standard academic assessment regimes.
- The findings from our research projects are useful in terms of determining whether and how policy commitment of universities to developing creative capacity in staff and students alike can be enacted in higher education teaching and learning. The findings also suggest that "second generation" thinking is emergent, while not yet being dominant, in the perceptions of awarded academic teachers. The shift away from "first generation" thinking are important if any attempt is to be made to bridge the gap between policy rhetoric and teaching reality.

- Creating an organization that takes inspiration from the art form could engage academic teachers with creativity as a hard-edged professional capacity that can and should be fostered through higher education teaching and assessment.
- Music is full of metaphors. To let music put the questions is to decipher what it really means to have practical specialist qualifications. We: students, teachers and researchers examine the dimensions of the music disciplines in relation to art and society. Until today, the disciplines have continually challenged us to question and think deeper and bigger.
- Contradicting the current and political ideas stating that the arts should be more aligned with curriculums and assessment systems and be more inspired by the business world, the example of our life curve shows that it is in fact possible to let curricula, assessment and business be inspired by the arts.

References

Alheit, P. (1995). Biographical learning. Theoretical outline, challenges and contradictions of a new approach in adult education. In P. Alheit et al. (Eds.), *The biographical approach in European adult education* (pp. 57–74). Wien, Austria: Verband Wiener Volksbildung/ESREA.

Bengtsson, J. (1999). En livsvärldsansats för pedagogisk forskning [A life-world approach for pedagogical research]. In: J. Bengtsson (Ed.). *Med livsvärlden som grund* [The life-world as foundation] (9–58). Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

Björfors, T., & Lind, K. (2009). *Inside a circus heart*. Norsborg, Sweden: Cirkus Cirkör.

Blackwell, A. F, Wilson, L, Street, A, Boulton, C, & Knell, J. (2009). *Radical innovation: Crossing knowledge boundaries with interdisciplinary teams*. Technical Report, 760, University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory. Retrieved 11 Sept 2015 from: https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/techreports/UCAM-CL-TR-760.pdf

Bron, A. (2000). Floating as an analytic category in the narratives of Polish immigrants to Sweden. In: *Allvarlig debatt och rolig lek. En festskrift tillägnad Andrzej Nils Uggla* (pp. 199–132). Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Byron, K. (2007, 8–10 January). *Defining boundaries for creativity*. Paper presented at the creativity or conformity? Building Cultures of creativity in Higher Education conference, Cardiff.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Claxton, G. (2006). Creative glide space. In C. Bannerman (Ed.), *Navigating the unknown: The creative process in contemporary performing arts*. Middlesex, UK: University Press.

Csikzentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2006). Foreword: Developing creativity. In M. O. N. Jackson, M. Shaw, & J. Wisdom (Eds.), *Developing creativity in higher education: An imaginative curriculum*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cunningham, S. (2005). Creative enterprises. In J. Hartley (Ed.), *Creative industries*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Cunningham, S. (2006). What price a creative economy? *Platform Papers: Quartely Essay on the Performing Arts, 9*, 1–50.

Dominicé, P. (2000). *Learning from our lives – using educational biographies with adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eriksson, A. (2009). *Om teori och praktik I lärarutbildning* [About theory and practice in teacher training]. Dissertation at Gothenburg University, Acta universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Folkestad, G. (2006). Formal and informal learning situations or practices *vs* formal and informal ways of learning. *British Journal of Music Education, 23*(2), 135–145.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Haring-Smith, T. (2006). Creativity research review: Some lessons for higher education. *Peer Review, 8*(2), 23–27.

Herlau, H., & Tetzschner, H. (1995). *Fra Jobtager til Jobmager* [From job-taker to job-maker]. Copenhagen, Denmark: Samfundslitteratur.

Houmann, A. (2010). *Music teachers' discretionary power – possibilities and limitations*. Dissertation at Lund University, Malmö Academy of Music.

Houmann, A. (2014a). Reflection in, about and through creativity: The key to the life world. In: T. De Baets & T. Buchborn (Eds.), *European perpsectives on music education. The reflective music teacher*. EAS Publications, Vol. 3. Innsbruck, Austria: Helbling.

Houmann, A. (2014b). Nyckeln till livsvärlden och musiklärares upplevelse av handlingsutrymme. [The Key to the Life world and music teachers experience of discretionary power]. In: A. Persson & R. Johansson (Eds.), *Vetenskapliga perspektiv på lärande, undervisning och utbildning I olika institutionella sammanhang – utbildningsvetenskaplig forskning vid Lunds universitet* [Scientific perspectives on learning, teaching and education in different institutional contexts – educational research at Lund University]. Lund, Sweden: Lunds universitet.

Houmann, A. (2015a). The soundtrack of my life: Autobiography as a tool for working with identity in musical practice and learning. In: S. Schonmann (Ed.), *The wisdom of the many – key issues in arts education*. International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education (vol. 3). New York, NY: Waxmann.

Houmann, A. (2015b). The key to the life-world – Unlocking research questions through expressive objects. In: L. Bresler (Ed.), *Beyond methods – lessons from the arts to qualitative research*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University.

Houmann, A., & Sæther, S. (2014). Using a survey on creativities as reflective practice and for reforming practice. In P. Burnard (Ed.), *Investigating creativities in higher music education*. London, UK: Ashgate.

Indurkhya, B. (1992). *Metaphor and cognition*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Leadbeater, C. (1999). *Living on thin air: The new economy*. New York, NY: Viking.

Lessig, L. (2005). *The vision for creative commons: What are we and where are we headed*? Paper presented at the Open Content Licensing (OCL), Cultivating the creative Commons.

McWilliam, E., & Dawson, S. (2008). Teaching for creativity: Towards sustainable and replicable pedagogical practice. *Higher Education, 56*, 633–643.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. London, UK: University of Chicago Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1999). *The phenomenology of perception*. London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 1962).

Minai, A. T. (1995). Emergence, a domain where the distinction between conception in arts and sciences is meaningless. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing, 3*(3), 25–39.

Molander, B. (1996). *Kunskap I handling* [Knowledge in action]. Göteborg, Sweden: Daidalos.

Owen, H. (1997). *Open space technology. A user's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Perkins, D. N. (1981). *The mind's best work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan.

Robinson, K. (2000). *Unlocking creativity: A strategy for development.* http://www.dcalni.gov.uk/index/arts_and_creativity/unlocking_creativity__a_strategy_for_developement.pdf. Accessed 10 Sept 2015.

Rolf, B. (2006). Tre kunskapsmodeller. [Three models of knowledge]. In A. Bronäs & S. Selander (Eds.), *Verklighet, verklighet. Teori och praktik i lärarutbildning* [Reality, reality. Theory and practice in teacher traning] (74–98). Stockholm, Sweden: Nordstedts Akademiska förlag.

Said, E. (1999). Efter orientalism [After orientalism]. In M. E. B. H. T. C. Eriksson (Ed.), *Globaliseringens kulturer. Den postkoloniala rasismen och det mångkulturella samhälle* [Cultures of globalization. The postcolonial Racism and the Multicultural Society]. Falun, Sweden: Nya Doxa.

Schütz, A. (1999). Den vardagliga och den vetenskapliga tolkningen av mänskliga handlingar [The everyday and the science of interpretation of human actions]. In A. Schütz (Ed.), *Den sociala världens fenomenologi* [The Phenomenology of the social world] (27–67). Göteborg, Sweden: Daidalos. (Original work published 1953).

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simonton, D. K. (2000). Creativity: Cognitive, persona, developmental and social aspects. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 151–158.

Sternberg, R. (2007). *Making creativity the centerpiece of higher education*. Paper presented at the creativity of conformity? Building CULTURES of creativity in Higher Education conference, Cardiff.

The Creativity Centre. (2006). *Facilitating creativity in higher education: The views of national teaching fellows*. York: Higher Education Academy. The Higher Education Ordinance, Swedish Code of Statues, No. 1993:100.

van Schalkwyk, G. J. (1998). *A systems paradigm for music psychology*. Unpublished D. Phil thesis, Univeristy of Pretoria.

Van Schalkwyk, G. J. (2002). Music as a metaphor for thesis writing. *The Qualitative Report*, *7*(2). http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-2/schalkwyk.html. Accessed 20 June 2016.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2004/1930). Imagination and creativity in childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *42*(1), 7–97.

Ziehe, T. (1997). Om prisen på selv-rationel viden – afmystificeringseffekter for pædagogik, skole og identitetsdannelse. [On the value of self-rational knowledge – effects of demystifying on pedagogy, school and identity]. In: J. C Jacobsen (Ed.), *Refleksive lærprocesser* [*Reflexive learning processes*]. Köpenhamn: Politisk Revy.