



The Open University

Open Creativity Centre

The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
United Kingdom
MK7 6AA

Tel: (01908) 274066

Email:

creativity-in-education@open.ac.uk

<http://opencreativity.open.ac.uk/>

Final Report January 2006

**Progression in Creative Learning
(PICL Pilot)**

A study funded by Creative Partnerships

Anna Craft
(The Open University)

Pamela Burnard
(University of Cambridge)

Teresa Grainger
(Canterbury Christ Church University)

Kerry Chappell
(The Open University)

with

Andrea Ball, Angela Bettridge, Paul Blake, Dawn Burns, Vivian Draper, Dominic James, Jean Keene



Faculty of Education



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team would like to thank the pupils and school staff who have given their time to contribute their perspectives to this pilot study, with generosity and openness. We would also like to express our appreciation for our co-researcher teachers in each site: Andrea Ball (North Walsham High School, Norfolk), Angela Bettridge (Cunningham Hill Infants School, Hertfordshire), Paul Blake (North Walsham High School, Norfolk), Dawn Burns (Hackleton Primary School, Northamptonshire), Vivian Draper (North Walsham Primary School, Norfolk), Dominic James (North Walsham High School, Norfolk) and Jean Keene (Cunningham Hill Infants School, Hertfordshire). The interpretation of the data has been vastly enriched by their participation as co-researchers. In addition we are grateful to our Steering Group: Dr Karen Littleton, Professor Dorothy Miell and Dr Peter Twining, at The Open University, and Dr Eva Vass at The University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, for their varied contributions and insights on the project. Each member of the core research team has contributed from their own expertise perspective and thus different styles and voices will be detected by the reader. Anna Craft and Kerry Chappell have led on the overall shaping of this report, and the drawing out of findings and conclusions; Pamela Burnard led on the music composition element and Teresa Grainger on the written composition element. Finally our thanks to Tricia Portsmouth for help with formatting the report. NOTE: Pupils' names have been changed; the names of the teachers and the schools however have not.

PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING

CONTENTS

PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
LIST OF TABLES.....	5
GLOSSARY	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	33
1.1 CONTEXT	33
1.2 RESEARCH PARTNERS AND SITES	34
1.3 A WIDER CONTEXT	35
1.4 CURRICULUM FOCUS AND PARTICIPANT PERSPECTIVES	35
1.5 EXISTING LITERATURE	35
1.5.1 <i>Creative Learning</i>	35
1.5.2 <i>Musical Composition</i>	38
1.5.3 <i>Composition in Writing</i>	42
1.6 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND DESIGN	45
2. METHODOLOGY	45
2.1 NATURE OF STUDY, AND REASONS FOR CHOOSING THIS APPROACH	45
2.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	47
2.3 ETHICS	48
2.4 ROLES UNDERTAKEN AND DATA COLLECTED	48
2.5. ANALYSIS UNDERTAKEN	48
3. EMERGENT FINDINGS BY SUBJECT AREA.....	53
3.1 CONTEXTS FOR COMPOSITION IN WRITING AND MUSIC.....	53
3.2 OVERVIEW OF PROGRESSION IN MUSICAL COMPOSITION	53
3.2.1 <i>Compositional Tasks</i>	53
3.2.2 <i>Teacher Stance</i>	54
3.2.3 <i>Compositional Knowledge</i>	55
3.2.4 <i>Compositional Skill</i>	55
3.2.5 <i>Compositional Process</i>	56
3.2.6 <i>Learner Stance</i>	56
3.2.7 <i>QCA Creativity Framework and Progression in Musical Composition</i>	57
3.1 OVERVIEW OF PROGRESSION IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION.....	59
3.3.1 <i>Compositional Tasks</i>	59
3.3.2 <i>Teacher Stance</i>	59
3.3.3 <i>Compositional Knowledge</i>	60
3.3.4 <i>Compositional Skill</i>	60
3.3.5 <i>Compositional Process</i>	60
3.3.6 <i>Learner Stance</i>	61
3.3.7 <i>QCA Creativity Framework and Progression in Writing in English</i>	61
4. A FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRESSION	63
4.1 THE ROLE OF INTERACTION IN MUSICAL AND WRITTEN COMPOSITION.....	65
4.2 LEARNER STANCE.....	68
4.3 QUESTIONING AND CHALLENGING.....	70
4.4 TEACHER STANCE.....	71
5. FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS	73
5.1 CREATIVE LEARNING AND HOW IT WAS CHARACTERISED	73
5.1.1 <i>Key Features of Creative Learning</i>	73
5.1.2 <i>Learning and Teaching Approaches</i>	75
5.1.3 <i>Emergent Definition of Creative Learning</i>	76
5.2 PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – MUSIC AND WRITING	77
5.2.1 <i>Contextual Factors</i>	77

5.2.2 <i>QCA Framework</i>	78
5.2.3 <i>Tasks</i>	80
5.2.4 <i>Learners</i>	80
5.3 PROGRESSION AND TRANSITION ACROSS THE KEY STAGES	82
6. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION	83
6.1 EXTENDING THE STUDY OF PROGRESSION IN MUSICAL AND WRITTEN COMPOSITION	83
6.1.1 <i>The Nature of Creative Learning</i>	83
6.1.2 <i>Development of the Progression Framework</i>	84
6.2 BROADENING THE SCOPE.....	84
7. REFERENCES	86
APPENDIX 1: PICL PILOT RESEARCH SITES AND PARTNERS	93
APPENDIX 2: OVERALL RESEARCH DESIGN	94
APPENDIX 3: INFORMATION SHEET GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS	97
APPENDIX 4: PARENTAL CONSENT FORM.....	98
APPENDIX 5: REFLECTIVE COMMENTARY SHEET: PICL PILOT	99
APPENDIX 6: UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER DRAW TASK PROMPTS	100
APPENDIX 7: EXTENT OF DATA SET FOR FINAL REPORT.....	101
APPENDIX 8: PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK AT INTERIM REPORT	105
APPENDIX 9: PICL PILOT ANALYSIS PROCEDURE 18 SEPTEMBER 2005	106
APPENDIX 10: PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK EIGHTH DRAFT, JANUARY 06	107
APPENDIX 11: DATA ANALYSIS REPRESENTATION TABLES	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Location and focus of each research site, PICL Pilot	<i>page 8</i>
Table 2:	Creative Learning elements (emergent from Cambridge Symposium 2005)	<i>page 37</i>
Table 3:	Developmental milestones in learners' musical creativity	<i>page 40</i>
Table 4:	Foci of tranches 1 to 3	<i>page 48</i>
Table 5:	Case study analyses used for Final Report	<i>page 51</i>
Table 6:	Overview of emergent progression framework	<i>page 51</i>
Table 7:	Emergent questions following Interim Report	<i>page 53</i>
Table 8:	Creative Learning elements (emergent from Cambridge Symposium 2005)	<i>page 65</i>
Table 9:	Emergent framework for Progression in Creative Learning	<i>page 68</i>
Table 10:	Analysis using the Cambridge Symposium Creative Learning elements	<i>page 75</i>

GLOSSARY

BERA	British Educational Research Association
CP	Creative Partnerships
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DFEE	Department for Education and Employment
DFES	Department for Education and Skills
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
FS	Foundation Stage
ICT	Information and Communications Technologies
KS	Key Stage
NC	National Curriculum
NCSL	National College for School Leadership
NESTA	National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts
NLS	National Literacy Strategy
PICL	Progression in Creative Learning
QCA	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
FINAL REPORT JANUARY 2006
PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING
(PICL PILOT)

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

From the late 1990s creativity, creative learning, teaching for creativity and creative teaching have been valued increasingly highly within the curriculum, to the point that the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) made recommendations to ministers for a curriculum which put creativity at its heart (QCA, 2005). Creative Learning is being conceptualised and developed (Craft, 2005, Spendlove and Wyse, 2005) by work in a range of educational settings, supported through organisations including Creative Partnerships (Creative Partnerships, 2004), National College for School Leadership (NCSL, 2005) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA 2005a, 2005b). A notable feature of the current initiatives is, arguably, the lack of co-ordination in order to draw out learning in relation to themes such as inclusion, the role of the arts and of partnerships in creative learning, as well as achievement. What is particularly striking is the understanding gap surrounding progression.

Drawing on this work, the focus of this study is characterising creative learning and exploring aspects of Progression in Creative Learning as evidenced in composition in English and Music¹. These domains were chosen to provide a mix of opportunities and demands for creativity, across core and foundation subjects.

It is hoped that ultimately this study will inform a larger and longer-term study to include the identification of a small number of learner cohorts in the designated curriculum areas, followed over a longer period, and including the transition from compulsory to post-compulsory education and the onward journey of learners.

1.2 Research partners and sites

This project was conceived of as involving close collaboration on data collection and analysis between teachers and university-based researchers. Sites and partners were chosen so as to build on previous relationships and to facilitate tracking the creative learning of small cohorts of pupils from Foundation Stage to Key Stage 4, in the two curriculum areas (see Table 1). The anchor teachers (one for FS, one for KS1 and one for KS2-4) were co-participants in the study and collected / facilitated collection of data for consideration in data surgeries. For them, there was also peer mentoring of an 'onward' teacher in collecting data,

¹ We initially aimed to include ICT in the study, as a cross-curricular domain to contrast with opportunities offered within English as a core subject, and Music as a foundation subject, however the study was narrowed early on so as to give adequate time and attention to these other areas.

who was teaching the children from September 2005.² Collection and analysis of data was conducted and triangulated by the research team.

Table 1: Location and focus of each research site, PICL Pilot

School	Location	CP school	FS focus	KS1 focus	KS2 focus	KS3 focus	KS4 focus
Cunningham Hill (in QCA creativity video)	Herts	NO	R	Y1			
Hackleton Primary School (in QCA creativity video)	Northants	NO		Y2	Y3		
North Walsham Junior School	Norfolk	YES			Y6	Y7	
North Walsham High School	Norfolk	YES				Y9	Y10

1.3 A Wider Context

It was important that this pilot study fed into the wider national and international research community. Therefore, it has been shared via papers and presentations at the Documenting Creative Learning International Symposium (Cambridge, April, 2005); at a Creative Learning symposium convened by the research partners at the British Educational Research Association's (BERA) conference (Cardiff, September, 2005); at the final ESRC Creativity Seminar (Strathclyde, October, 2005); at a public seminar at Hong Kong Institute of Education (Hong Kong, November, 2005); and a submission is pending to the BERA conference (Warwick, September 2006).

1.4 Curriculum Focus and Participant Perspectives

It quickly became clear that investigating ICT *per se* was beyond the scope of this pilot, since we were only able to look at ICT in other subjects; and even here it warranted greater time and resource than was available. The ICT dimension was therefore temporarily halted. Our original intention was also to involve Creative Partners, but this has not occurred, reflecting the non-partnership focus of the FS and KS1 sites, and timing in the KS2, KS3 and KS4 sites. It would be our hope to capture aspects of ICT and Creative Partner perspectives in a fuller study if this came about.

1.5 Existing Literature

1.5.1 Creative Learning

The 'Creative Learning' literature generally, is patchy and emergent, with a lack of shared discourse concerning its nature and significance. Some of the discussions which are more pertinent to this study include those raised at the International Symposium on 'Documenting creative learning' (details above). Despite questions raised in relation to the work of Feldman et al (1994), a selection of key features of creative learning were generated there. Drawing on evidence brought to the forum from empirical studies, these focused on conditions, pupil

² In practice, this worked better for some than for others. Staff changes, workload and the realities of timetabling and breadth of responsibility particularly in key stages 3 and 4, meant that in practice the anchor teacher model met with mixed success.

behaviours, pupil stance and processes in relation to creative learning, and provide part of the context and theoretical framework for this study.

Learning models and teaching strategies implied in creative learning have also been considered within the framework, including that implicit within the idea of creative learning, seems to be a constructivist model of learning as meaning-making in a social context (Craft, Burnard, Grainger, 2005, Craft, 2005, Jeffrey, 2001, Jeffrey and Woods, 2003). Much of this work stems from Woods' (1990) emphasis on relevance, innovation, control and ownership, in creative teaching and learning.

Also providing useful contributions to this study's theoretical framework are explorations of possibility thinking in creative learning (Craft, 2001, Craft and Jeffrey, 2004, Craft et al, 2005, Burnard, Craft & Grainger, in press); models highlighting pupil behaviours and pedagogical approaches (e. g. QCA 2005a, 2005b); apprenticeship models of pedagogy and learning (e. g. Griffiths & Woolf, 2004, Jeffery, 2005); and Creative Partnerships' perspective on creative learning which brings together creativity, culture and community (Creative Partnerships, 2005).

Finally definitions of creative learning are also in development (e. g. that developed following the international symposium by Spendlove, Wyse, Craft and Hallgarten et al, 2005): 'creative learning develops our capacity for imaginative activity, leading to outcomes which are judged by appropriate observers to be original and of value'. This also provided detail for developing a theoretical and contextual framework.

A selection of the questions arising from this literature have been honed into the fundamental question for this PICL Pilot: *how we might describe progression in creative learning, in musical composition and in written composition*. Although this rests on what we mean by 'creative learning', there does exist some work in this area detailed herein which offers a foundation for the PICL Pilot to engage with.

1.5.2 Musical composition

Over the last thirty years there have been studies on both sides of the Atlantic, probing learners' capabilities in musical composition (Gardner, 1982, Ross, 1984, Swanwick and Tillman, 1986, Hargreaves and Galton, 1992), all of which draw on an age-stage version of development close to Piaget's cognitive developmental psychology work. Each progression framework is tied closely to ages and all consider that the symbolic aspect of music depends on maturation and a well-developed stage of formal operational thought. In this view, creative development is normative, stage-based and age-dependent. Whilst there appears to be general (but disputed) agreement in terms of creativity as a universal (rather than unique) set of schematised levels across arts domains, conceptions of *how development proceeds* is, from this work on progression, not clear (Feldman, 1993, 1999). It should be noted that the focus of the body of this work is musical development, and not the progression of 'creativity' or 'creative learning', although it could be argued that creative learning and/or creativity are inherent in musical development.

A further feature which might be highlighted in this body of work is that creative development is characterised by the fact that it transpires in cultural contexts under certain conditions of dynamic change. Largely unexplored in the existing literature is whether this change arises as person-based individual differences or, as argued here, is *situated* within a *network of cultural systems*. Another set of themes arises from a focus on collaboration and intersubjective processes. (e. g. MacDonald & Miell, 2000a; Sawyer, 1997; Morgan, Hargreaves & Joiner, 2000; Wiggins, 2002).

We are left with questions about the extent to which these models can inform our understanding of progression in creative learning in musical composition, and the ways in which social and cultural context engage with such progression.

1.5.3 Composition in Writing

Within the complex domain of written composition there are a number of 'competing discourses' (Fairclough, 1989). Early *Cognitive models of composition* focused on cognitive processes and behaviour of individual writers (e.g. Flower and Hayes, 1981, Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987). More recently Sharples' (1996) inclusion of both cognitive and emotive elements in understanding writing represents a departure from the earlier studies, introducing the notion of writing as creative design. The *Australian genre theory movement* (Cope and Kalantzis, 1993) emerging from Halliday's (1985) linguistic work, and drawn into the UK largely through the work of Wray and Lewis (1997) recognises writing as social communication within particular cultural contexts. *Socio-cognitive models of composition* see the act of composing as essentially cognitive, but profile the relationship between meaning, form, social context and culture (Nystrand et al., 1993). Such models combine a sense of the previous two models and see literacy and writing as a social cognitive act.

With regard to the practice of teaching written composition, the influential creative writing movement of the 60s and 70s influenced by Maybury (1967) and Marshall (1963), popularised the notion that children need space for personal imaginative writing. This freedom was at the very least re-shaped in the 1980s by a focus on the role of teacher intervention influenced by Graves (1983) and Smith (1982) and the National Writing Project's profiling the influence of purpose/audience on composition.

With regard to *progression in writing* the NC assessment framework implies criteria for progression, but this tends to privilege quantifiable features of writing and the 'construction and correctedness' of the piece produced (D'Arcy, 1999; Bailey, 2002). Models of progression in writing exist, but are inevitably complex (e. g. Bearne, 2003). More recently it has been argued that more creative approaches need to be profiled (Grainger et al. 2005, 2003; Packwood and Messenheimer, 2003). 'Promoting creativity is a powerful way of engaging pupils with their learning' (DfES, 2003:34). As Vass (2004a, 2004b) documents, the potential of creative approaches, which enable children to see the world differently and make connections, needs to be recognised and purposefully developed in the teaching of written composition.

We are left with numerous questions ranging from the extent to which compositional progression can be theorised, and the roles played by policy (in framing practice) and practice (in shaping curriculum, pedagogy and learning). In particular, questions are raised about aspects of learner stance and pedagogy, for example the development of agency, the role of the social context

including collaboration, and multiple ways in which an environment of 'possibility' is developed in the classroom which, whilst leading to written composition may have their roots in other forms of activity including oral, kinaesthetic and visual.

1.6 The Research Questions and Design

Relating to these themes, we developed focused research questions, from the perspectives of teachers, pupils and, we initially hoped, creative partners:

1. How is creative learning BROADLY characterised in these early years settings and schools?
2. How can we describe progression in creative learning from Foundation Stage to KS4, as evidenced in Music and written composition?
3. What can we learn about transition across the Key Stages in terms of progression in these areas?
4. What are the questions for further exploration that arise from this scoping study?

In order to address these questions, we used a mixed methodology including desk studies of published work in this area (see literature reviews) and qualitative analysis in five sites, within the designated curriculum areas. Appendix 2 contains details of the overall design, giving the data instruments within a time and responsibility frame.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Nature of study, and reasons for choosing this approach

The aim of this scoping study was to record, analyse and document how creative learning is characterised in schools and to describe Progression in Creative Learning through exemplary cases of established teaching practices which make use of musical and written composition from FS to KS4 in Music and English. Collectively, our previous methodological work in the area of creativity provided evidence of the ways in which teachers and pupils engage in creative learning. The qualitative methods used for this study were:

- *Documentary analysis* of teachers' planning and school documentation.
- *Digital photographs* as focus for exploration with both pupils and teachers.
- *Informal interviews* with selected pupils and staff
- *Using drawings / concept mapping* with teachers, pupils
- *Video and audio recordings and other recordings already archived.*
- *Participant observation* with fieldnotes and audio/video recording.
- *Video-stimulated analysis* involving some pupils with university researcher.

Up to three individual student cases, comprising children from the high, middle and lower achievement levels per year group studied were identified. The study involved collecting data from each of these cases in the second part of the 2004/5 school year and the transition into the 2005/6 one. Data collection was done partially by the teachers and partly by the university research partners and the researcher.

2.2 Reliability and Validity

The research team strove to achieve validity and reliability by using a theoretical frame, also informed by policy, to inform the analytical synthesis; by defining creative learning to allow for integrated, domain-specific, across phase engagement in creative learning; by the use of multiple sources and forms of data; by investigating pupil perspectives, in order to provide triangulation with those of the co-researchers.

2.3 Ethics

Clear and detailed information was provided to schools (see Appendix 3). The written consent of parents, teachers and head teachers was sought (see Appendix 4). The project was explained to pupils by teachers, parents and also by researchers, and children remained free to withdraw at any time, in line with the BERA ethical code of conduct. Data have been stored on password protected computers and hard copy of materials has been stored securely by each researcher.

2.4 Roles undertaken and data collected

As indicated in the Research Design (Appendix 2), the teachers were to collect some data and reflect upon it (see Appendix 5) before sending it to the University researchers. The University researchers' visits included interviews with each pupil through a draw-prompt task (see Appendix 6). In practice, the roles originally established were not all successfully taken on, particularly in KS2/3, due to problems achieving the role of link researchers (see Appendix 7 for final data set).

2.5. Analysis undertaken

Co-participant teachers collected and reflected on a significant proportion of the data in the first two collection periods. Some of their analysis of this first tranche was supported in a full-day collaborative review, or data surgery. Prior to this, and after it, the University Researchers took a lead in analysis; this was further triangulated with the Researcher who joined the team in August 2005.

Preliminary analyses, pre-Interim Report culminated in a multimedia database incorporating material from each case, which facilitated triangulation through combined analysis (see Appendix 8 for Interim Report analytical framework). An analysis pro forma for analysing individual cases was then developed (see Appendix 9). This was ultimately used when focusing the analysis onto one pupil per Key Stage and producing the case analyses illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Case analyses used for Final Report

From across Tranche 1 + 2		From Tranche 3 Autumn 05	
FS Grace Music	FS Grace English		
KS1 Cherry Music	KS1 Cherry English	KS1 Grace Music	KS1 Grace English
KS2 John Music	KS2 John English	KS2 Cherry Music	KS2 Cherry English
KS3 Kevin Music	KS3 Louis English	KS3 John Music	KS3 John English
		KS4 Kevin Music	KS4 Louis English

While these case studies were being carried out the research team continued to work with developments on the analytic framework from the Interim Report (see Appendix 8), together with a range of emergent questions also from the Interim Report. Once all sixteen case studies were analytically completed overviews of the data were represented in a variety of tabular formats (see Appendices 10 and 11).

3. EMERGENT FINDINGS BY SUBJECT AREA

The study was a pilot, so whilst we tracked learners from Foundation Stage (Reception) through to Key Stage 4 (Y10), findings must be viewed as provisional. The themes are drawn out first with reference to context, then with reference to a range of distinct but related elements of progression.

3.1 Contexts for composition in English and Music

Teachers' ways of establishing context for composition varied by teacher and their stance on learners, learning, and the nature of achievement in creative learning in English and Music. These were also influenced by the key stage under focus, such that teachers of younger children, were more inclined to view writing as multi-modal, part of a wider experience and a process of generative connection-making. In both Music and English, teachers of older learners were more constrained by the curriculum and its assessment of individual performance, and the increasing importance of domain specificity. In music there was an increased emphasis on individual creativity rather than collaborative creativity. In writing in English, interaction during composition was significant in KS3 and KS4, whereas in FS, KS1 and KS2, interaction was situated prior to the act of composing in written form.

3.2 Overview of progression in musical composition

The analysis of progression in music is explored using a range of elements, followed by analysis in relation to the QCA framework (see Appendix 11 for analysis sources).

Compositional Tasks

The nature of compositional tasks was significant. In KS1 creative learning tended to occur through the *making of* and *playing with* music rather than *creating* music. In KS2, tasks tended to engage children more in the *creating* of music where children began to focus on the expressive (rather than the

representative) purposes of music and emphasised social interactions and working cooperatively. In KS3, challenges increased with evidence of more fixed choices, adult-as-standard models. The worth of learner's compositions as art became less visible, replaced by a focus on development in knowledge and skills.

Teacher Stance

Teachers encouraged and recognised the creative learning needs of their students differently. Teachers in KS1 and KS2 advocated exploratory and discovery approaches, and considered themselves *knowers rather than creators*. In KS2-3, teachers talked about learner agency but allowed less independence. In the upper key stages there was less focus on learner agency and more on learner persistence and learner ability. Composition teaching shifted through *making* and *doing* in FS-KS1, to *creating, perceiving, making* and *doing* in KS1-KS2, then to *perceiving, making* and *particularly performing music* in KS3-KS4, where the teacher's role changed serving as a mediator in purposive activity and in planning complex tasks.

Compositional Knowledge

As children progressed from FS to KS4, compositional knowledge shifted from use of structures and textures to prompt/stimulate compositional ideas to more specifically defined tasks; using derivative approaches to more distinctive musical languages and musical genres. From FS to KS2 we saw evidence of children engaged in playful exploration, and decision making about sound use and organisation. At KS3-4 the school setting became the cultural benchmark against which compositions were judged, with more sophisticated forms of musical knowledge featured. In collaborative compositions (FS-KS3) creative learning was evidenced in the act of producing knowledge. Where some learners participated more fully than others, the actions of the children - how they overcame organisational problems, solved problems, fed back to the teacher, moved the piece forward, and the communication of musical meaning - became a way of categorising or identifying a rich set of criteria.

Compositional Skill

From FS to KS4 children were expected to demonstrate an increasingly sophisticated array of skills related to appraising (listening, reflecting, reviewing etc), making (performing; motor coordination; control and mastery, memory, symbol use), and creating (generative, expressive, performative, communicating, using certain conventions, modelling). The relationship between personal and compositional actions appeared to be mediated by actual and perceived performative skills and confidence (i.e. background experience, expertise, control and mastery of a particular instrument and associated musical genres and mastery).

Compositional Process

As children progressed from FS through KS2, it appeared, the process of composing became a *meaning-making* enterprise – inviting musical narratives. FS and KS1 featured more exploration and capturing of activity. For KS2, the process of composing appeared to be exploratory, collaborative, characterised by the relationship between materials and their generation and manipulation, and featuring the introduction of 'guided reviewing', focusing and refocusing, and questioning activity. At KS3-4 the process of composing took a more prescribed path – grounded in individual creativity - where development of technical skills and a commitment to finalising and reviewing

projects emerged. At KS3-4, the musical starting points for tasks required learners to work to more specific genres/tools/devices 'briefs'. The process of composing became less visible because it occurred more often in the absence of others. The process also appeared to consist of a relationship between technique, structure, style, and manipulation in a performative sense, with more evidence of compositional action than personal action. A focus on structure was core across stages.

Learner Stance

The common features of stance across key stages were agency, self-determination, intentionality, being enactive, openness and persistence. At FS through KS1, children learned together, encouraged to invent their own systems for documenting their music making. At KS2 there was more talking and reflection on what they believed to be salient; they represented what was meaningful to them and how they got there. Group work revealed children's emerging social styles; some directed; others followed. Not all the children chose to use familiar sounds while composing. Some children demonstrated more of the featured stances of agency, self-determination, intentionality, etc, than others. What was important was that the children developed their own approach for selecting, organising and controlling sounds. The youngest learners were particularly characterised by their musical spontaneity and playfulness. At KS3-4 learners' roles as performers, listeners and composers changed, as tasks became more defined and accounts of what the student thought they did in what settings in what ways for what reason were less featured than in earlier years. Teacher input, learner perceptions of teacher input and learner stance were characteristics of creative learning progression.

QCA Creativity Framework and Progression in Musical Composition

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity. They interrelate with all the aspects of the framework for documenting progression and should be read alongside them.

Asking questions: There was little explicit evidence of the youngest children asking questions or challenging, although it is possible that questions were framed internally, or inaudibly, and to each other through playful social engagement. The less collaborative nature of work in KS3/4 did prompt a more questioning, challenged and challeng-*ing* stance. At KS3-KS4 more time was also spent engaged in posing musical questions whilst developing ideas than in visible exploration of ideas, a feature of FS-KS2. It is clear from this data that the older learners posed more questions with musical ideas by naturally using revision and extension techniques, which was also an artefact of working with technology.

Making connections: There was a wealth of evidence of children making connections; it seemed to be a core feature of creative learning. Younger learners made connections between sounds and sound sources, patterns and patterning, materials made and played in previous pieces, songs and recorded listening repertoire, and with musical experiences out of school. KS2 connections were made in collaborative group settings, where participants monitored and could regulate each others musical ideas and where knowledge was constructed together. At KS3/4 learners made connections between pieces played and listened to in and out of school and saw the relationships between ideas noticed and connections made

and framed within the lessons with classroom and specialist music teachers.

Imagining: There was much evidence across key stages of learners generating ideas and envisaging alternatives. Musical thinking was a kind of sonic imagining. The musical conversations and musical interactions that took place with the FS-KS2 learners in this study show some evidence of imagining musical ideas in terms of generating alternative possibilities (stopping, thinking, changing instrument, altering way of playing, thinking about what next to do).

Exploration: Inherent in FS-KS2 was engagement in exploration, suggesting that the process of creative learning involved an exploratory dimension. Learners in KS1 and the early stages of KS2 frequently evidenced engaging in intentional exploratory playing, inquiring, and testing. This, in effect, was evidenced in all cases but was sustained and developed much further in KS3/4 in a dialogue situated between school and home contexts.

Critical reflection: The learners from all key stages engaged in critical reflection as emerging out of their sustained engagement in the making of music. Even from the earliest years, learners were aware of the worth of their own and others' ideas. In FS-KS2, reflective activity was not always 'critical' but rather a reflective exchange and by KS 3-4 the critical reflection became more pronounced, distributed among peers, co-learners, teacher and system.

3.3 Overview of progression in written composition

The analysis of progression in written composition is explored using a range of elements, followed by analysis in relation to the QCA framework (see Appendix 11 for analysis sources).

Compositional Tasks

The diversity of the tasks set inevitably framed the degree of creative learning possible; some constrained self-determination through lack of choice, whilst others fostered creative collaboration and sought to encourage inventiveness. A few of the tasks offered limited challenges, highlighting the need for teachers' understanding of creative learning to be enhanced. In FS and KS1/2, writing tended to be undertaken at one sitting and built directly upon previous experiential learning activities with little time for revising. Freedom of expression and the children's ideas were seen to be central. By contrast, in KS3/4, tasks were more extended including the opportunity to revise, covering several sessions and framed solely within the Literacy/English curriculum. The tasks in KS2/3/4 were more specific, more tightly framed and more 'genre driven'.

Teacher Stance

The teachers expected and valued creative engagement although not all the activities fostered it fully. All the teachers held strong views on the role of interaction and collaboration in written composition and integrated such a stance into their pedagogical practice. At F-KS2 teachers viewed creativity as involving full child engagement, play and independent learning, and expected expressive and exploratory language. By KS3/4 the focus was more oriented towards the skills of written composition and accuracy of the

linguistic features of texts. Teachers were also more conscious of time constraints and the tension between encouraging agency and creativity and curriculum coverage. The teachers of the older learners voiced were critically of the NC, whereas the F/KS1 teachers viewed it as having a cross curricular, flexible and dynamic potential which they could creatively interpret.

Compositional Knowledge

As children progress from FS to KS4, it appears they show increasing understanding and use of compositional knowledge of both form and function, becoming increasingly aware of audience/purpose, and showing more control of a range of genres and their attendant linguistic and organisational features. Through KS2-4, learners' knowledge of the processes involved also develops as does their metacognitive and metalinguistic capacity to describe process and product. With increasing age learners became more aware of the value of their peers in composing and the benefit of using textual examples of genre. In KS2/3/4 they made increasing use of this knowledge, deconstructing published texts and reconstructing work in the same form and style.

Compositional Skill

The evidence suggests that from F to KS4 children also exert a greater degree of control of their compositional skills; their vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and use of paragraphs for example. With increasing age, orthographic conventions are adhered to with greater accuracy and a much wider range of sentence structures are employed. In addition, their ability to self correct appears to increase with age and in KS3/4 they consciously seek to edit and refine their writing, checking for accuracy, appropriateness and meaning, both during composing and after initial drafts have been committed to paper or screen.

Compositional Process

All the learners were extensively involved in generating ideas, suggesting, and proposing possibilities for their writing. This often occurred in group discussions of a text prior to writing and through collaboration in drama activities. Younger children were provided with more overtly playful periods of preparation for writing, within an integrated curriculum and did engage thoughtfully as they wrote, selecting words carefully and making occasional changes. The learners in KS2-4 spent considerably more time reflecting upon and changing their work as they wrote. They focused on emerging drafts and actively appraised, revised and shaped these, exercising an increasing independence of judgement and knowledge of language. Older learners also made more use of their peers' comments and were more involved in questioning and challenging others' ideas in order to develop their own compositions.

Learner Stance

The core feature of stance adopted by the children engaged in creative learning was a clear sense of their own or others' intentions. In F/KS1 the compositional goal gained both meaning and purpose by writing tasks being integrated into a seamless curriculum in which the children were imaginatively immersed. In KS2-4 the task was differently contextualised and was set within a tighter and more demarcated literacy or English frame. The positioning of the task appeared to be highly influential with regard to the learners' views of the act of writing and their self esteem as writers. The children's sense of identities as writers and learners also influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. The learners'

persistence developed in response to the nature of the task. It appeared that as the subject English became more differentiated, their attitude towards it became more explicitly shaped, alongside their awareness of themselves as writers.

QCA Creativity Framework and progression in writing in English

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity. They interrelate with all the aspects of the framework for documenting progression and should not be read separately from them.

Asking questions: There is little explicit evidence of the youngest children asking questions or challenging in the contexts' observed, although it is more than possible questions were framed internally and inaudibly, or that due to the task building upon previous exploratory play activities, the younger children did not engage in explicit questioning as they had already orally rehearsed/prepared. The work undertaken in KS3/4 was more collaborative in nature and although each eventually wrote individually, this form of interaction did appear to prompt a more questioning and challenging stance. At this stage, teachers fostered this kind of reflective questioning by supporting and requiring periods of review.

Making connections: There was a wealth of evidence of children making connections in diverse ways, and it seems immensely significant in encouraging children to see themselves as writers. The immersion experienced in the earlier years within an integrated curriculum enabled the learners to make both personal and cross curricular connections and draw upon their knowledge. During the end of KS2 and in KS3/4 the connections made however appeared to relate more closely to literacy issues, such as knowledge of the chosen genre, intertextual knowledge, their own and others' ideas and the drafting process. It is likely that in KS3/4 in particular, the literacy curriculum is less integrated and thus the relationships between ideas noticed and connections made are framed within the perceived boundaries of the lesson or of literacy as a domain.

Imagining: At the core of this is possibility thinking, of the child generating ideas and envisaging alternatives. This was evident throughout the age phases studied. Younger children actively engaged in group generative activities prior to writing, whilst older children in KS 3/4, more commonly engaged in 'imagination without the action' (Vygotsky, 1978). They were also expected to draw significantly from their own cognitive resources. In contrast, the possibilities for the content of writing generated in KS1, related very closely to previous activities.

Learners were all expected to imagine; but the pedagogic support differed in kind and degree and reduced somewhat as the children grew older.

Exploration: In most of the learning observed the children were involved in exploring: ideas, language, resources and fictional worlds. The teachers expected that this would enrich their compositions. The children in KS1 and the early stages of KS2 explored multiple ideas and aspects of a focus, in a 'hands on' manner which brought a wealth of experiences to their composition. In contrast, older learners' work involved drafting and revisiting previous writing. This necessitated keeping ideas and options open and selecting strategies to improve and enrich the work. From KS1 there was evidence of children exploring language options in and through sharing

written work with others, however this was sustained and developed much further and more explicitly in KS2-4.

Critical reflection: In the writing observed and documented, the children were all involved in reflecting upon their work and were able to comment upon the outcome evaluatively. Even in KS1, the learners were aware of which parts were better/stronger in their writing and why they had chosen particular words or phrases. In KS2-4 the majority engaged in reflecting thoughtfully on their work, during and at the close of the compositional process. This often led to making significant changes. In KS 3 /4 there was evidence of the children also considering the written work of their peers in a critically reflective manner.

4. A FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRESSION

The themes discussed in Section 3 can be represented within an evolving Progression Framework which encompasses a number of possible elements in the two domain areas investigated and detailed above, namely: task, product outcome, teacher stance, composition knowledge, composition skills, composition process, learner stance, policy on Creative Learning: the QCA framework. The emergent progression framework encompasses early work on Creative Learning in which conditions, behaviours, stance and processes were identified as elements of creative learning; pupil behaviours and processes have been combined together and subsumed within the composition process (see Appendix 10 for framework).

There were a number of questions which were identified for further exploration in and following the Interim Report, but which we found insufficient data to comment on. These were learner perspective on transition between the key stages, on what mediates their composition, on the role of knowledge and awareness of process. Through observation we were often able to document many aspects of these experiences, but not from the learners' perspective (e. g. within interviews). These questions would inevitably form an aspect of a future study on progression, and would most likely need to be documented in specially targeted ways.

However we can comment on the following additional questions which emerged and we decided to explore:

4.1 The role of interaction in musical and written composition

The research team takes the view that collaboration (sustained engagement with others in the service of a collective goal) is a sub-set of interaction (some involvement with others but not necessarily in the sustained service of a collective goal, in part because much less is articulated externally/verbally). The data shows a move over the key stages from interaction to close engagement (ie collaboration), but by Yr 10 in both written and musical composition, in this particular study, awareness seems to shift away from interaction and collaboration per se to more individualised creative engagement.

Awareness of Purposeful Collaboration

Across the KS's there was growing awareness of the different collaborative roles available and of learners' ability to be metacognisant of these. At all stages, students demonstrated awareness of leader/follower relationships

and of working to 'bounce ideas' off each other. The evidence suggested that, by Year 6, students were more aware that groups creating have the potential to mislead the outcome. There was also increasing awareness of cumulative collaboration. For younger learners, there was awareness of generating ideas in collaboration, with awareness of reviewing ideas collaboratively more apparent later. By Year 6, there was greater awareness of these contributing to accumulations of process over time, with a growing emphasis on group as well as personal responsibility. After Year 6, this was less apparent in writing but still evident in music.

Ongoing awareness of difference between own & collaborative process

The evidence demonstrated an ongoing awareness of the difference between one's own process and collaborative process. In music in particular, there was evidence by Year 7 of increasing awareness of this and by Year 10, learners demonstrated an increasing wish to work individually but with a tension between this and students' perceptions of how bands work collaboratively.

Awareness of Networks of Interaction

Throughout the key stages there was awareness of gleaning ideas from within the wider network of interaction, both from peers and others (teachers, parents, the latter less so later on). These interactions appeared to become more intensified for adolescents as peer pressure/judgement shaped interactions. There was also ongoing awareness of using peers and others as sounding board when working on individual creative ideas and when performing (or sharing) outcomes/products. In music, by Year 10 there seemed to be much less use of interaction as the source for ideas/examples brought into school from home or elsewhere, which does not appear to be so extreme for writing.

4.2 Learner Stance

Analysis highlighted the ways in which children appeared to internalise their teachers' attitudes toward composition tasks, and yet the ways in which children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin. By the same token, children's experiences of time and the styles of engagement developed and encouraged by their teachers varied widely. Previous experience in the domain – especially in music – also influenced learners' stance. Given these multiple influences on the development of pupil stance, the following comments are offered tentatively.

Intentionality, self-determination and agency

The core features of stance adopted by children in both writing and music composition related to their intentionality and self-determination. However, influencing this, the structure of the domain was given different emphasis; in music children were encouraged to invent their own systems for documenting music making, but whilst in English they were encouraged to adopt personal ways in to composition, they were nevertheless applying knowledge in a more structured way. From KS2, more emphasis was placed in both subjects on meaning, purpose, appropriateness, and reflection related to personal salience. By contrast to intentionality and self-determination, agency decreased over time so in KS3 and KS4 it reduced through lack of choice in task. Agency is of course affected by personal identity as a mediating factor, as is the nature of the task, and the teacher's stance as well as the demands of the specific domain.

Openness of attitude

The awareness of choice and an openness of attitude was evident from FS onward, although the latter was less evident in the middle primary years for writing (possibly reflecting an increased emphasis on curriculum and conventions of the domain). In writing in particular, children's sense of identities as writers and learners influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. The youngest learners appeared to show less differentiated and highly positive attitudes toward writing. As the subject became more differentiated, their attitude toward English became more explicitly shaped alongside their awareness of themselves as writers. In music, we see a gradual reduction in choice and exploration such that by KS3 and KS4, the process of composing involved less choice. Learners show a greater tendency to adapt to and adopt a prescriptive approach which appears to have less relationship to their personal identity and more to a teacher-framed curriculum and assessment programme.

Being enactive

Whilst being enactive is manifest in learner stance in both subjects from FS to KS1, by the top end of KS2 it is seen more in music than writing, although it does reappear in KS3, disappearing again in KS4; this aspect of learner stance may reflect the English curriculum and/or how teachers interpret it.

Reflectiveness

Whereas the younger learners are characterised more by their spontaneity and playfulness in both domains, there is nevertheless evidence of children reflecting on compositions right from FS onward. As learners move through KS2-4, they are expected to be increasingly reflective. This is explicitly mapped in the curriculum.

Persistence

The learners' persistence developed in response to the nature of the task. Those in KS3/4 were expected to persist over time, whereas persistence was less evident in the youngest learners and the expectations of their classroom. By Y3, however, we see persistence as a feature of learner stance in both subject areas – from Y1, an increased awareness in children that this is to be valued in composition.

4.3 Questioning and Challenging

In both subject areas, there is limited evidence in F and KS1 of learners questioning and challenging themselves and others. This may well be task-related and a product of the deep support and immersion, which may reduce the risks encountered. In addition, the pedagogy in these years worked within a praise culture. One of the KS1 children did show signs of pushing himself in writing, and the teacher reset the task as she perceived insufficient challenge. However, we were struck by the non-verbal nature of questioning and challenging in younger learners in particular. Depth of engagement often suggested a depth of questioning which was private and 'invisible' in a sense. For older learners, collaborative tasks prompted the asking of questions of one another, and reviewing of one another's work.

4.4 Teacher Stance

During and following the Interim Report it became apparent that teacher stance was an important influential factor. The areas which emerged within which the teachers had particularly pertinent stances were:

Stance towards knowledge and learning

The teachers' stance towards knowledge in general was dominantly towards multimodal (particularly including the 'hands on') and collaborative learning in Foundation Stage, KS 1 and 2, starting from a strongly child-centred and child-focused perspective in the Foundation Stage. In KS 3 and 4, the teachers' stance shifts more towards skills oriented activity and tasks in both written composition and music.

Stance towards creativity/creative learning

Particularly in FS, KS 1 and 2, and particularly for the music specialist, 'hands on', collaborative learning was highlighted as key to creativity/creative learning. Teachers of younger learners also appeared to expect and value creative learning as part of the formative role of children's development. Across the key stages, progression was viewed by the teachers as grounded in: having the time to understand each learner as an individual; increasing understanding and application of knowledge and (particularly thinking) skills, with the focus increasingly shifting off children's artistic voice; increasing ability to explore and review. By KS4 increased agency, self-determination and experimentation were much more important, with a marked shift in the teachers' balance between group and individual creativity towards the latter.

Stance towards learner

Across all key stages the teachers' stance is towards the learner as an individual (but within their own culture) of whom the teacher has high expectations. There seems to be more allowance for spaces outside of school as the root of individual's learning earlier in the KS's.

Stance towards teaching for creativity/creative learning

Across all KS's, teachers emphasised the balance between structure and freedom. Early on, exploratory and discovery approaches, with structures/ boundaries were set in order to encourage exploration of possibilities, and intervention was judged so as not to interrupt this exploratory flow. Increasingly structure was related to subject specific knowledge (styles/ conventions/ appropriateness) and skills, but always with teacher taking dominant control of structure/boundary. This was often achieved in the later stages through modelling (in written composition particularly, the teacher perceived teacher modelling and standard setting through feedback as a vital part of the process across KS3 and 4). Teachers appeared to take a tighter approach to structure at the beginning of KS3 which gave learners less independence, and then allowed more freedom for complexity as they shifted to the end of KS4 (with the freedom appearing to be greater in writing than in music). In writing in English particularly, creativity was modelled as an individual process by KS3. In music, the teacher stance to composition teaching shifted from creative teaching, from encouraging experiencing direct playful involvement with musical materials/elements through making and doing in FS-KS1, to creating, perceiving, making and doing in KS1-2, then to perceiving, making and particularly performing music in KS3-4.

Stance towards curriculum

Between Reception and the end of KS2, curriculum was viewed as cross curricular, and NC was viewed as positive, having potential and dynamic (teachers note that NC needs to be *interpreted* in this way). In writing, by KS3 and 4, the NC is viewed as 'problematic + restrictive' time and content wise,

particularly in relation to reading time. In music, by this KS, there is a strong curricular emphasis for the teacher in this study on exam preparation.

Particularly relevant to the study of progression in creative learning, were the teachers' stance towards creativity/ creative learning, the learner, and teaching for creativity/creative learning which were often to be seen mirrored in learner stance. However, as noted in learner stance above, children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin: interpretations could be wide or narrow and they could vary greatly within the same class. It should also be noted that this mirroring was seen to a lesser extent for teacher/learner relationships by KS4.

5. FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

This section draws together the emergent findings and highlights the main conclusions that can be offered in relation to the original research questions. These were:

1. How is creative learning BROADLY characterised in these early years settings and schools?
2. How can we describe progression in creative learning, from Foundation Stage to KS4, in music and writing in English?
3. What can we learn about transition across the Key Stages in terms of progression in these areas?
4. What are the questions for further exploration that arise from this scoping study?

5.1 *Creative learning and how it was characterised*

We took our focus here to be the ways that teachers characterised creative learning in opportunities offered to children in English and Music composition in classroom contexts.

5.1.1 Key Features of Creative Learning

The data revealed shifting perspectives among the teachers' perception of creative learning from relatively domain-free (multimodal in nature) across FS to KS2, to very strongly domain situated by KS3 and 4, when creative learning was also imbued by the teacher's own 'take' on the subject area (in this case including the fact that they were both artists in their domain). Teachers' values and practices concerning conditions for creative learning and expectations of pupil behaviours³ on the whole shifted over time, as children moved through the key stages. In relation to conditions for creative learning, all of the teachers valued experiencing the unknown to some degree. Whilst multi-modality was a feature in FS, KS1 and the lower end of KS2, the multi-modal condition became less evident in the upper end of KS2 and in KS3 and KS4. And, whilst learning leaps were valued and expected, the nature of the leaps varied in depth. In relation to pupil behaviours, immersion was valued in every classroom although not always achieved; where tasks were matched well to learners the immersion of learners in tasks occurred more readily. Playfulness was valued in every classroom

³ Both were identified as aspects of creative learning by researchers at the Cambridge Symposium on Creative Learning April 2006, as introduced in 1.5.1. Only conditions for creativity and expectations of pupil behaviours are discussed here, since pupil stance and pupil processes are discussed elsewhere).

although manifest more kinaesthetically at the younger end of the spectrum, with risk-taking becoming more personal as learners grew older. Tasks varied in the extent to which they demanded insightfulness of learners, with the demands implicit within tasks requiring on the whole increasing depth of insight into tasks within the subject. Finally, as documented, whilst learner agency was valued by teachers, it actually decreased in the upper key stages.

5.1.2 Learning and Teaching Approaches

Co-participation between children and between children and teacher, documented in the creative learning literature (Craft, Burnard, Grainger, 2005 and Craft, 2005, Jeffrey, 2001, Jeffrey, 2005) and the pedagogical strategies which Woods (1990) identified as supporting creative learning (relevance, innovation, control and ownership) were more evident in FS, KS1 and KS2 than KS2 to KS3. With older children co-participation shifted to become more like opportunities to work together and less of a process of co-owning ideas. This is in part a product of assessment emphasising the evaluation of individual work, as learners grow older.

Elements of possibility thinking (Burnard, Craft and Grainger, in press, Craft, 2001, Craft and Jeffrey, 2004, Craft et al, 2005), emphasising the role of the enabling context (Craft et al, 2005), were seen however in every classroom, although played out in increasingly domain-focused ways by KS3 and KS4. As discussed earlier in the report, there was evidence in all key stages of the QCA creativity framework (QCA, 2005a, 2005b). However, whilst the asking of questions was noted to be less visible and less externalised in the younger learners it was embodied within children's musical thinking, explorations and play.

Where learners were working with a professional musician or writer we saw apprenticeship models of pedagogy and learning (Griffiths & Woolf, 2004, Jeffrey, 2005). In KS3 and 4 learners were expected to interact with the practices and judgements of the field; although there were differences in the extent to which they were measured against the composition practices extant in the adult worlds. The scope and development of apprenticeship models of pedagogy and learning should be further investigated in an extension study. These contrast with standard classroom practices and bear further exploration in terms of achievement and progression. Our analysis yielded evidence of a powerful effect of adult attitudes on learners, who internalised teachers' intentional attitudes from their encounter with composition tasks and make them their own.

5.1.3 Emergent Definition of Creative Learning

Analysing our data against the creative learning definition in 1.5.1.3, as follows: 'creative learning develops our capacity for imaginative activity, leading to outcomes which are judged by appropriate observers to be original and of value' (Spendlove, Wyse, Craft, Hallgarten et al, 2005), we see that imaginative activity increases in depth but narrows in scope over the key stages. Composition outcomes in English and music shift from those arising from direct playful involvement with writing and musical elements through making and doing in FS-KS1, to creating, perceiving, making and doing in KS1–2, then to perceiving, making and in the case of music, performing it, in KS3-4. Outcomes are reviewed from FS to KS4, with increasing emphasis on this in KS3-4. Criteria are not focused overtly on originality until KS 3-4, when the opportunity and expectation to review is extended further, such that judgements of originality are made in a perhaps more participative way.

As far as value is concerned, children are offered tasks from KS1 to KS2 which on the whole enable them considerable scope. Tasks enable learners to ascribe value, within a framework offered by adults, who define the context for tasks. In KS3-4 ascribing value is undertaken much more overtly by teachers, grounded in a depth of knowledge and skills, with the focus shifting away from the learner's artistic voice.

It is clear that across the key stages, creative learning is increasingly focused on self-determination and experimentation and there is a marked shift in balance between group and individual creativity toward the latter, which may of course reflect the powerful emphasis on the individual in assessment in schools.

It is also clear that across the key stages teachers emphasise the balance between structure and freedom; for the younger learners structure relating to discovery and exploratory approaches; with provocations and interventions sensitively judged so as not to interrupt the exploratory flow. Increasingly, structure was related to subject-specific knowledge (styles, conventions, appropriateness) and skills, with the teacher holding dominant control (often through modelling), gradually allowing for greater complexity and freedom toward the end of KS4.

Perhaps most significantly however, creative learning was evidenced in this study, in the act of producing knowledge. As such, we propose a new definition as follows:

Creative learning can be viewed as significant imaginative achievement as evidenced in the creation of new knowledge as determined by the imaginative insight of the person or persons responsible and judged by appropriate observers to be both original and of value as situated in different domain contexts.

5.2 Progression in Creative Learning – Music and Writing

The research team tentatively propose the Progression Framework found in Appendix 10 and reproduced in this Executive Summary, as an analytical tool for understanding progression within musical composition and composition in writing. The elements are seen as building blocks which are both distinct and inter-related. However two of the issues which this approach does not encompass are the questions of: raised ceilings and increasing expectations as domains shift; and whether creative learning can be 'scaled', i.e. measured on a spectrum of attainment when the domain is changing and expanding rapidly, and where capabilities are enhanced by the moment. Both of these could be further explored in an extended study.

In what follows we draw out what seemed to the research team to be the most significant findings regarding progression in these subject areas, commenting first on some contextual factors, then the QCA framework and then on task, subjects and learners.

5.2.1 Contextual Factors

Dominant values and practices included approaches to pedagogy and curriculum, in particular the nature of curriculum elements and traditions in how they are regarded in relation to one another (FS to KS2), as distinct areas of knowledge (KS3 and KS4). Approaches to school organisation, culture, and the external frameworks, particularly for assessment (increasingly powerful in later years)

were also distinctive in different key stages. We documented a gradual separation to a subject-based, less integrated and personal approach – whilst still involving hands-on engagement. Also significant were teachers' own views of subjects, of appropriate tasks, of the nature of achievement in each subject, and of creative learning, in particular in relation to the domain, affecting the progression evidenced in the children and subjects studied, and becoming more dominant over time, particularly in KS3-4.

But perhaps most significant of all was the relationship between teacher and learner, and the role of authentic knowledge on the part of the teacher about the learner's capabilities in the subject. In this small sample we see a decrease in depth of relationship which would be worth exploring further in an extended study.

APPENDIX 10: PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK Eighth Draft, January 06

BACKGROUND:

Includes how task and product-outcome contextualised, wider climate of classroom / lesson, how time was used, modes of engagement (extent of multi-modality), extent to which learning leap involved/expected, role of enjoyment, staff communication / collaboration.

Task ⁴	Product Outcome ⁵	English / Music Composition Process	English/Music Composition Skills	English/ Music Composition Knowledge	Learner Stance (clustered characteristics)	Teacher Stance Toward	QCA Framework (2005a, 2005b ⁶)
		<p>BOTH SUBJECTS</p> <p>Learner engagement w. process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Immersion - Playfulness - Intention <p>The Composition process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generating ideas - Capturing ideas - Sharing ideas - Committing ideas - Reviewing / judging ideas 	<p>ENGLISH</p> <p>Using tools of composition such as:</p> <p>varied sentence structure, paragraphing, punctuation and orthographic conventions</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Memory (extent of repetition will effect ability to replicate, development, exploration)</p> <p>Performance skills</p> <p>Using musical materials to develop ideas</p> <p>Symbolisation</p> <p>Composition-listening</p> <p>Performance-listening</p>	<p>ENGLISH</p> <p>Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form)</p> <p>Role of memory, significance of repetition vs novelty/improvisation (knowledge first, composition next?)</p> <p>Knowledge of audience and purpose (function)</p> <p>Understanding of appropriateness by pupils</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form)</p> <p>Knowledge of audience and purpose(function)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - self-determination - agency - intentionality - persistence - toleration of ambiguity - enactive - reflectiveness - open attitude 	<p>knowledge and learning,</p> <p>creativity/ creative learning</p> <p>teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</p> <p>learner</p> <p>Stance towards professionals</p> <p>curriculum</p> <p>interaction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning and challenging • Making connections, seeing relnships of ideas, entities. • Envisaging what might be – possibility thinking, using imagination [imagining, also being imaginative] • Exploring ideas, keeping options open • Reflecting critically on ideas, actions, outcomes; both their own and those of others. <p>+ Risk taking</p>

⁴ Tasks were simply logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression was implied in tasks set.

⁵ Product outcomes were again logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression could be detected.

⁶ Creativity: Find it, promote it

5.2.2 QCA Framework

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity.

Asking questions: As already noted, there is little explicit evidence in either area of the youngest children asking questions or challenging in the contexts' observed, although the research team suggest that an area for future exploration would be the extent to which such questions were framed internally and inaudibly. In music the older learners engaged with their own questions as they revised; in part an artefact of working with technology and in part a reflection of the centrality of posing musical questions in composing. In writing in English, learners in KS3-4 worked collaboratively, interrogating one another's ideas with questioning and challenging inherent to this, such that their individual compositions were then informed by the views of others.

Making connections: Making connections seems to be a core feature of how children see themselves as composers and as writers. Younger learners made connections between home and school in both areas. Making connections beyond the domain of English was a feature of the experience of younger learners. In music, younger learners made connections more internally within the domain. In both subjects toward the end of KS2 and in KS3/4 the connections made appeared to relate more closely to subject boundaries; in turn perhaps defined by the separation of subjects.

Imagining: In both subjects children were encouraged to engage in possibility thinking, moving from an experiential space where their own ideas were generated, to one in KS3/4 where, particularly in writing, imagining was much less experiential. In KS3/4 if anything experiential engagement in music increased as pupils performed compositions as windows into their musical thinking. Pedagogic support for imagining differed in kind and degree and reduced as learners grew older, whilst the degree and depth of expectation in what learners might imagine in their compositions, increased.

Exploration: In both domains, learners from FS to KS2 were immersed in hands-on exploration. Learners were increasingly engaged in exploring a focus, exploring multiple ideas and aspects of it with intention. In English, composition might be completed in one sitting, reducing the possibility of keeping options open over time; in music there was a shift to encompass performing as a culmination. In the end of KS2 the emphasis in composing in both areas involved greater drafting, reviewing, selecting strategies to improve work more sustainably, which was developed much further in KS3-4.

Critical reflection: The learners from all key stages engaged in critical reflection. In writing, even in KS1 examples completed in one sitting, learners were able to critically analyse their work. This on the whole increased over time such that in KS3/4 learners increasingly changed their work as a result of critical reflection, and learners were able to explore the work of their peer in a critically reflective manner. In music, from FS-KS2, reflective activity was not always 'critical'. In KS3/4 the

critical reflection became more pronounced, distributed among peers, co-learners, teacher and system; a finding corroborated in the work of Dillon, (2005); Barrett, 2003; and Younker (2003).

5.2.3 Tasks

The nature of tasks used in relation to progression was significant. In music children were encouraged to shift through different kinds of tasks from: the *making of* and *playing with* music; to engaging children more in the *creating of* music with an emphasis on working as a team. Task designs in KS3 were more challenging, with more fixed choices, using adult-as-standard models and emphasis on knowledge and skills. In writing the tasks varied in time scale, complexity and degree of support offered. In FS and KS1/2, the writing tended to be undertaken at one sitting and built directly upon previous experiential learning activities, with no time provided for revising. By contrast, in KS3/4, the tasks were more extended, framed solely within the Literacy/English curriculum and required revising and reshaping over time. The tasks in KS2/3/4 were more specific and somewhat more tightly framed although diverse responses were encouraged.

The lack of any framework for assessing collaborative creativity at any of the key stages was noticeable. Work undertaken in higher education (Bryan, 2004) suggests that developing trust, a problem-solving learning ethos, and an assessment framework which looks at skills rather than propositional knowledge, may be useful for future work on progression in creative learning.

In addition to inherent variation in tasks offered, learners interpreted tasks differently; some quite narrowly, others with greater openness. Teacher input, learner perceptions of teacher input and learner stance (and previous experience) were vitally important in trying to explain the characteristics of creative learning progression in relation to task. These findings are corroborated in the work of Seddon, forthcoming; Barrett (2003) and Burnard (1995).

5.2.4 Learners

The core features of learner stance adopted by children in both areas, which increased over time, were *intentionality and self-determination*. In FS/KS1, the structure of the domain was given different emphasis; in music children were encouraged to invent systems for documenting music, but whilst in English they were encouraged to adopt personal ways in composition, they were still applying knowledge in a more structured way. At KS2, more emphasis was placed in both areas on appropriateness and reflection. From KS3-4 there was an increased emphasis on individual achievement in the wider learning environment, which may be reflected in increased self-determination and intentionality.

However, the possibility of *agency* within tasks lessened over time. By KS3 and KS4 lack of choice in task particularly reduced agency in both subjects. It is suggested earlier that agency is particularly affected by nature of task as highlighted here, as well as being influenced by the nature of personal identity, and the teacher's stance as well as the demands of the domain. The *awareness of choice and an openness of attitude* in terms of how compositions could be developed, is evident from FS onward. In writing, children's sense of identities as writers and learners influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. In music, there

is a reduction in choice and exploration such that by KS3 and KS4, there is a much greater tendency for children to adopt a prescriptive approach to composing with less relationship to personal identity.

Whilst *being enactive* is manifest in learner stance in both subjects from FS to KS1, by the top end of KS2 being enactive is seen more in music than written composition in English, although it does reappear in KS3, disappearing again in KS4; this aspect of learner stance may reflect the nature of the English curriculum and/or how teachers interpret it with respect to English composition. *Level of persistence* in their activities is less constantly seen. It developed in response to the task, for example those in KS3/4 were expected to sustain involvement and commitment to their writing, whereas persistence was both less evident in the youngest learners and in the expectations of the classroom.

It is also important in our discussions of progression in creative learning that we emphasise the mirroring or internalising of teachers' stance into learners' stance on such aspects as task, structure/ freedom and time. However, as noted previously, children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin: interpretations could be wide or narrow and they could vary greatly within the same class.

Following the Interim Report we also investigated awareness of the *role of interaction* in composition. What we see in the data is a move over the key stages from interaction to close engagement (ie collaboration), but by Yr 10 awareness seems to shift away from both interaction and collaboration per se to more individualised creative engagement. Alongside this was a growing awareness among learners of the different collaborative roles available to them, with an increasing awareness of cumulative collaboration, and the tensions between and pitfalls of working alone and with others. Yet there was also a consistent awareness throughout the key stages of gleaning ideas within wider networks of interactions, which seem to become intensified for adolescents.

5.3 Progression and Transition Across the Key Stages

It should be noted that despite setting up the study to include progression across year-ends and key stages, the data were inconclusive as far as transition was concerned. The study did however reveal that between FS and KS1, and KS2 and KS3, learners appeared to experience disempowerment in each subject. The research team are aware that this could be a product of teacher knowledge about learners' capabilities, but it might equally be a product of the research intervention. This issue has therefore been noted in preparation for any future developments of the study, particularly in relation to developing a deeper understanding of authentic transition.

6. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION

If teachers, creative practitioners and schools are to successfully develop creative learning across the curriculum, depth of attention will need to be paid to what it might mean to develop learning in a way which progresses, for all students, and in all subjects of the curriculum. This is of particular relevance in the context of possible changes in the curriculum which could bring creativity into a more central place.

6.1 *Extending the Study of Progression in Musical and Written Composition*

We would recommend that further work is undertaken. In terms of the two subjects selected for the pilot, music and English, we would prioritise the following questions. These should be undertaken in the context of vibrant creative partnerships.

6.1.1 The Nature of Creative Learning

PICL Pilot provided evidence that creative learning became increasingly situated within the domain itself and was involved in the production of knowledge. The emergent definition of Creative Learning as significant imaginative achievement as evidenced in the creation of new knowledge as determined by the imaginative insight of the person or persons responsible and judged by appropriate observers to be both original and of value as situated in different domain contexts, should be further investigated.

Teachers', learners' and creative practitioners' perspectives on creative learning could be probed further, with reference to those which surfaced here; a range of areas on which to focus are given in the full report, Section 6. These refer to task, use and sense of time, the nature of engagement in questioning and challenging, the nature and role of connection making, the role of risk, the nature and role of relationships, the nature and distinctions between individual and collaborative learning, the relationships between creativity and assessment within domains, learner perceptions of teacher expectations and the impact of pedagogical approaches on creative learning achievement.

6.1.2 Development of the Progression Framework

The progression framework which has emerged from PICL Pilot should be tested against a wider data set. This would mean exploring all parts of the framework, i.e. context, task, product outcome, subject process, subject skills, subject knowledge, learner stance, teacher stance and the QCA framework. The full report suggests that particular elements of this should be emphasised and also suggests further questions which could be explored.

6.2 *Broadening the Scope*

PICL Pilot uncovered the complexity of defining progression in creative learning in two areas of the curriculum; composition in writing and in music. There is much to be learned from the study, particularly in the current climate, as teachers seek to develop creative learning in a variety of curriculum contexts.

There is a powerful case for further work to document and characterise creative learning a situated within domains, through an extension study including but

going beyond the subject areas investigated in PICL Pilot. This should consider the possibility of including curriculum areas where the content is growing and changing rapidly (for example, ICT) as well as those where the content is perhaps growing less fast (for example, science and technology). Consideration should certainly be given to extending the work already undertaken in this initial study, in music and writing.

Any extension study of this sort should also include powerful and peer-recognised examples of partnership activity, in order to link together creativity, culture and community as is being done across the work of Creative Partnerships.

Future work should be closely linked to questions of the nature of assessment in creative learning, and should take account of the more detailed recommendations given in 6.1 of this report.

Work from PICL Pilot and from any extension study could inform thinking about the assessment and documentation of learning in skill areas within the curriculum. Given the current interest at policy level in placing greater emphasis on skills but within a framework of raising achievement, it is our strong recommendation that further work is commissioned in the area of progression in creative learning.

PICL Research Team:

**Anna Craft, The Open University
Pamela Burnard, University of Cambridge
Teresa Grainger, Canterbury Christ Church University
Kerry Chappell, The Open University**

**With grateful thanks to our school-based collaborators:
Andrea Ball, North Walsham High School, Norfolk
Angela Bettridge, Cunningham Hill Infants' School, Hertfordshire
Paul Blake, North Walsham High School, Norfolk
Dawn Burns, Hackleton Primary School, Northamptonshire
Vivian Draper, North Walsham Primary School, Norfolk
Dominic James, North Walsham High School, Norfolk
Jean Keene, Cunningham Hill Infants' School, Hertfordshire**

27th January 2006

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

From the late 1990s creativity, creative learning, teaching for creativity and creative teaching have been valued increasingly highly within the school curriculum, to the point that at the end of 2005, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) made recommendations to ministers for a curriculum which put creativity at its heart (QCA, 2006).

Creative Learning is being conceptualised and developed (Craft, 2005, Jeffrey and Craft, 2003, 2004, Spendlove and Wyse, 2005) by a variety of work in schools and other educational settings, supported through a range of organisations including Creative Partnerships (Creative Partnerships/DEMOS, 2003, Creative Partnerships, 2004), National College for School Leadership (NCSL, 2005) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA 2005a, 2005b). This work is being funded and the outcomes monitored by a variety of government departments. Some of this work builds on earlier conceptual accounts (Craft, 2000, 2002, Woods, 1990). Inclusion is a powerful theme in this work, also the role of the arts and of partnerships in general in supporting creative learning as well as achievement more widely. Through this burgeoning work, we have opportunities to learn more about each of these areas, as well as exploring others, such as progression, and yet a notable feature of the current initiatives is, arguably, the lack of co-ordination across them in order to draw out such learning. What is particularly striking is the gap in understanding and current research surrounding the notion of progression.

Drawing on existing work in the area of creativity and creative partnership from the Foundation Stage through to Key Stage 4, the focus of this study is around the following themes:

- characterising creative learning
- exploring aspects of Progression in Creative Learning as evidenced in composition in English and Music⁷.

The domains of music and writing within English were chosen to provide a mix of opportunities and demands for creativity, across core and foundation subjects. The participating staff and sites, the methodology used and findings are detailed below.

It is hoped that this study will inform a larger and longer-term study. This would build on the understanding of creative learning and the framework for progression in creative learning which have emerged here. It would include the identification of a small number of learner cohorts in each of the designated curriculum areas, to be followed over a longer period, and to include the transition from beyond compulsory to post-compulsory education and the onward journey of learners. The working title of the study is Progression in Creative Learning Pilot (PICL Pilot).

⁷ We initially aimed to include Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in the study, as a cross-curricular domain to contrast with opportunities offered within English as a core subject, and Music as a foundation subject, however the study was narrowed early on so as to give adequate time and attention to these other areas.

1.2 Research partners and sites

This project was conceived of as involving inter-perspectival collaboration (i.e. researchers and practitioners), with teachers and university-based researchers collaborating closely on data collection and analysis. To facilitate this way of working, we aimed to select sites so as to build on existing relationships between researchers and teachers in the area of creative learning.

In addition, the study sought to track the creative learning of small cohorts of pupils across the key stages from Foundation Stage to Key Stage 4, in at least two curriculum areas. Sites and partners were chosen so as to facilitate this. Three schools are involved in Creative Partnerships, and two are not, but who were featured in the QCA video released May 2005, entitled *Creativity: Find It! Promote It!*

Accordingly, the study has worked with a small number of pupils in each Key Stage, from Foundation Stage through to Key Stage 4, and with seven collaborating teachers, three of whom took leading roles as 'anchor teachers'. Table 1 shows the location and focus of each research site, and Appendix 1 gives a list of all research collaborators, and further details of each school. Note that although school names are used, and the names of the collaborating teachers, learners' names have been changed to protect anonymity.

Table 1: Location and focus of each research site, PICL Pilot

School	Location	CP school?	FS focus	KS1 focus	KS2 focus	KS3 focus	KS4 focus
Cunningham Hill	Herts	NO	✓ R	✓ Y1			
Hackleton Primary School	Northants	NO		✓ Y2	✓ Y3		
North Walsham Junior School	Norfolk	YES			✓ Y6	✓ Y7	
North Walsham High School	Norfolk	YES				✓ Y9	✓ Y10

The anchor teachers (one for FS, one for KS1 and one for KS2, 3 and 4), were co-participants in the study. They collected, or facilitated collection of data for consideration in data surgeries, and to which all of the eight participating teachers were invited. The collection and analysis of data has been conducted and triangulated by the three research partners, Anna Craft, Teresa Grainger and Pamela Burnard. This team was joined, from August 2005 onwards, by a researcher, Kerry Chappell.

For the anchor teachers, there was an element in this study of peer mentoring, since each of them was responsible for supporting a colleague or 'onward' teacher, who was to be teaching some or all of the children in their cohort from September 2005. Our intention was that anchor teachers collaborated with

'onward' teacher colleagues to collect data; in addition the 'onward' teachers collected some data independently.⁸

1.3 A Wider Context

It was important to us that the work undertaken during this pilot would form part of the wider national and international research community. Accordingly, initial experiences within the project were shared informally at the *Documenting Creative Learning International Symposium* held at Cambridge University in April, 2005 with Howard Gardner, David Feldman and other leading creativity specialists. The discussions within and outcomes of the symposium have been invaluable to us as this study has developed. Further details of symposium conclusions are provided in section 1.5.1 below (it also proved a useful addition to the framing discussion of findings in section 4).

A paper on initial findings was presented as part of a Creative Learning symposium that the research partners convened at the British Educational Research Association's annual conference in Cardiff in September, 2005. Findings were shared informally at the final ESRC Creativity Seminar at Strathclyde University in October 2005. A paper on findings has also been submitted to the British Education Research Association's annual conference in Warwick in September 2006.

1.4 Curriculum Focus and Participant Perspectives

As the collection and analysis of data got under way, it became clear that collecting data about the use of ICT *per se* was beyond the scope of this pilot, since we were only able to look at ICT as a tool for musical or written composition and not at creative learning within the area of ICT. In addition, ICT did not feature with sufficient regularity across the two subject areas and across all Key Stages for us to require this of teachers without altering their pedagogy. Although we did note in the data collected an increasing importance placed on ICT in composition, featuring as more of a finding across Key Stages 2 to 3, we parked the ICT dimension for the duration of the pilot, with the intention to return to it in our planning for a fuller study.

Our original intention was to involve Creative Partners in the study, but this has not occurred, reflecting the non-partnership focus of the Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1 sites, and timing in the Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3 sites. It would be our hope to capture Creative Partner perspectives in a fuller study if this came about.

1.5 Existing Literature

1.5.1 Creative Learning

The literature in the area of 'Creative Learning' generally, is patchy and emergent, in part because of the relative novelty of the term, 'creative learning' and lack of agreement on its definition or shared understanding and discourse concerning its nature and significance. An International Symposium on 'Documenting creative learning' was held at the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge in 2005. The aim of this symposium was to explore this term more

⁸ In practice, this worked better for some than for others. Staff changes, workload and the realities of timetabling and breadth of responsibility particularly in key stages 3 and 4, meant that in practice the anchor teacher model met with mixed success.

deeply. There were a number of conclusions arrived at regarding the slipperiness of the term.

- In relation to characterisations of ‘high creativity’ such as the model developed by Howard Gardner, David Henry Feldman and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, (Feldman et al, 1994) which emphasizes the individual, the domain and the field. The Symposium therefore recommended consideration by colleagues of the extent to which it is meaningful to talk of creativity unless it can be said to be High C.
- The extent to which creative learning can be viewed as domain-free; some would argue that creative learning could be viewed as age-related and that beyond the age of about ten, the domain-situated nature of creativity should be a significant component of our conceptualising of creative learning.
- How we best make sense of the dance between individual and collaborative creative learning.

A further question could also be asked, regarding the role played by ICT in creative learning.

1.5.1.1 Key features of creative learning

Despite the challenges and difficulties the Symposium generated an initial range of key features of creative learning with children aged 3 - 11, drawn from the evidence brought from empirical studies to this forum. These can be represented in Table 2 as a mix of conditions, pupil behaviours and processes; a set of distinctions that we return to in Section 4 of the report, but which are previewed here.

Table 2: Creative Learning elements (Emergent from Cambridge Symposium 2005)

Conditions	Experience of the unknown, multi-modality, a learning leap
Pupil behaviours	Immersion, playfulness, risk-taking, insightfulness, agency
Pupil stance	Self-determination, agency
Processes	Imagination Divergent thinking Generativity

There were continued questions about whether creative learning could be understood as being context free or domain specific.

1.5.1.2 Learning models and teaching strategies implied in creative learning

Implicit within the notion of creative learning, seems to be a constructivist model of learning as meaning-making in a social context. Co-participation appears to play a large and significant role, as does diversity in construction of creative learning groups (Craft, Burnard, Grainger, 2005 and Craft, 2005). Jeffrey and Woods explore many aspects of this in the context of the whole school (Jeffrey, 2001, Jeffrey and Woods, 2003) as well as the individual classroom (Jeffrey, 1997).

Related to formulations of creative learning, are formulations of pedagogical strategies. In his work, Woods (1990) emphasises the significance of

- relevance
- innovation
- control
- ownership,

in terms of both how teachers approach their work and also as organising principles for facilitating and developing children's creative learning.

Some researchers have explored the role of possibility thinking in creative learning (Craft, 2001, Craft and Jeffrey, 2004, Craft et al, 2005, Burnard, Craft & Grainger, in press), emphasising the role of the enabling context, in which pedagogy and learning interact to nurture the posing of questions, play, immersion, innovation, risk taking, being imaginative and self-determination (Craft et al, 2005).

In some models, such as that developed by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), it is pupil behaviours (such as asking questions, or making connections – see below) which are particularly emphasised, although these are tied in to pedagogical approaches. The QCA identifies five elements as present during creative learning experiences:

- asking questions
- making connections
- envisaging what might be
- exploring options
- evaluating

(QCA, 2005a, 2005b).

QCA has not as yet identified how this might work across key stages. Analysis and conclusions of this pilot study comment tentatively on these elements within sections 3, 5 and 6.

Versions of an apprenticeship model of pedagogy and learning is seen in a number of studies of creative learning both in England and abroad (for example, Griffiths & Woolf, 2004, Jeffery, 2005).

1.5.1.3 Definitions of creative learning

Definitions of creative learning are also in development, for example one proposed by Spendlove and Wyse (2005) was further developed following the symposium by Spendlove and Wyse, Craft and Hallgarten in discussion with Symposium participants, to arrive at the following one:

Creative learning develops our capacity for imaginative activity, leading to outcomes which are judged by appropriate observers to be original and of value. (Spendlove, Wyse, Craft, Hallgarten et al., 2005)

The Creative Partnerships perspective on creative learning aims to bring together creativity, culture and community (Creative Partnerships, 2005).

1.5.1.4 Questions remaining about creative learning

Questions arising include:

- What kinds of evidence can we capture which demonstrate the effects of nurturing learners' creative learning in schools and early years settings?
- How does creative learning change across key stages?
- What evidence is there of the changing nature of collaborative and individual creative learning
- Why are the arts over-associated with creativity? What might creativity look like in other domains, e.g. mathematics, from non-genius to genius levels?
- Can non-constructivist / non co-participative learning ever be creative?
- How significant is the nourishment of the teacher in the nurturing of learners' creative learning?
- What forms does medium c creativity take? Is this the dominant frame in school?
- How culturally specific is the notion of creative learning (and what are the implications of this for multicultural school communities)?
- What is the role of leadership in creative learning?

Perhaps most relevant to the PICL Pilot study, is the fundamental question of *how we might describe progression in creative learning, in musical composition and in written composition*. Although this rests on what we mean by 'creative learning', itself a contested and confused area as indicated already, there does exist some work in each area, which offers a foundation for PICL Pilot to engage with. We discuss the discourse in, first, musical composition in 1.5.2, and then composition in writing in English in 1.5.3.

1.5.2 Musical Composition

1.5.2.1 Developmental models of musical composition

Over the last thirty years or so there have been various studies on both sides of the Atlantic, probing learners' capabilities in musical composition (Gardner, 1982, Ross, 1984, Swanwick and Tillman, 1986, Hargreaves and Galton, 1992). All of these studies have been based on an age-stage version of development closely based on the work of developmental cognitive psychologist, Jean Piaget.

Some of the most influential of these theories are given in Table 3, which shows developmental milestones seen to be important by each researcher.

Table 3: Developmental milestones in learners' musical creativity
(Reproduced from Burnard, in press)

Gardner (1982)	Ross (1984)	Swanwick & Tillman (1986)	Hargreaves & Galton (1992)
0-1 sensorimotor presymbolic	0-2 sensuous engagement with sound materials	0-4 Materials (Mastery) Sensory and manipulative modes	0-2 Sensorimotor phase characterised by physical actions and sensory involvement
2-7 symbol use; attributes of creative person; 'codes' of the culture learned	3-7 musical doodling, conventional assimilation	4-9 Expression (Imitation) Personal and vernacular modes; emphasis on expressive character. Less exploratory	2-5 Figural phase in which global or outline representations feature
Age 8 significant increase in skill development and symbol use	8-13 concern with conventions of musical production	10-15 Form (Imaginative play) Speculative and Idiomatic modes; sudden changes/surprises	5-8 Schematic phase dominated by cultural rules and standards
	14+ personal style; personal taste, embodied meaning	15+ Value (Metacognition) Symbolic and Systematic modes; wider range of styles; personal style	8-15 Rule systems phase shows the increasing mastery of the cultural codes
			16+ Professional phase mature understanding of artistic conventions; divergence and originality valued.

As the first column illustrates, Gardner (1982) identifies a structural progression. In his framework children realise the universal properties of symbolisation from the presymbolic period (first year of life) and the period of symbol use (between ages two and seven) followed by further skill developments (from the age of eight onwards). He emphasises, as might be expected, the individual differences between children, saying, for example, "whereas all children come to explore the variety of symbolic forms made possible by a range of media, they do so in ways that are peculiarly their own" (Gardner, 1982, p. 122).

Ross (1984) also suggests an age- and stage- related developmental process. His progression framework identifies four periods of development in music, paralleling similar development in drama and art. His four "levels of operation" refer to sets of behavioural characteristics, showing how the significance of an individual's relationship with an artistic medium develops and interacts with the social and cultural context surrounding their learning.

A similar stage-based and age-dependent sequence of musical development is described by Swanwick and Tillman (1986), based in the UK. The source of their data is music compositional products by school-aged children of various ages. Swanwick and Tillman identify the musical aspects of materials, expression and form to elements of developmental change. According to these researchers, at specifiable points in development, musical schemes become organised in fundamentally new ways which profoundly alter the way in which the learner understands music. More domain-specific studies in music, are those of Kratus (1989) in the United States and Barrett (2003) in Australia, each of whom attempts to trace the different stages through which musical developmental sequences occurs by comparing compositional products of school age children of various ages. There is, however, little or no agreement regarding the ascending relationship between age and phases, and theoretical underpinnings vary considerably.

A similar developmental model, based on listening and generative skills (Hargreaves & Galton, 1992) shows five different stages of understanding: prefigural or sensori-motor, figural, schematic, rule systems, and metcognitive/professional. Notably, this model describes rather than explains the progression.

As acknowledged earlier, all of these models are based, to some extent, on Piaget's learning theory. Each progression framework is tied closely to ages and all consider that the symbolic aspect of music depends on maturation and a well developed stage of formal operational thought. In this view, creative development is normative, stage-based and age-dependent. Interestingly, none of these models relate to the development of extreme talent in individual prodigies (Feldman, 1993) which may in part be explained by the focus on musical development and not musical creativity.

The criteria for labelling age-related changes, as sets of sequential shifts, are similar in their focus on explaining rather than explaining differences between, and increases in, expertise from simple to mastery development in the domain. Whilst there appears to be general (but disputed) agreement in terms of creativity as a universal (rather than unique) set of schematised levels across arts domains, conceptions of *how development proceeds* is, from this work on progression, not clear (Feldman, 1993, 1999).

However, what the work underpinning these models highlight is evidence for the importance of:

- (a) the developmental interdependence of sensori-motor roots and action schemes;
- (b) the role of symbolic play in early childhood;
- (c) the individual cognitive and socio-culturally shared influences in the acquisition and development of creativity; and
- (d) learners' awareness and increasing mastery of the codes of the culture as symbolic and schematic representations of their worlds.

Another feature highlighted by Table 3 is that creative development is characterised first and foremost by the fact that it transpires in cultural contexts under certain conditions of dynamic change.

It should be noted that the focus of the body of work represented in Table 3 is musical development, and not the progression of 'creativity' or 'creative learning',

although it could be argued that creative learning and/or creativity are inherent in musical development. The PICL Pilot study sought to focus specifically on *Progression in Creative Learning* in musical composition, addressing the question of how creative learning is developed across the key stages.

1.5.2.2 Situating creative learning in musical composition within cultural systems

Largely unexplored in the existing literature is whether this change arises as person-based individual differences or, as argued here, is *situated* within a *network of cultural systems*. It was Feldman (1993), in studies of extreme cases of talent development (particularly prodigies), who coined the phrase “cultural organisms”. He argues that cultural organisms are “specialised social structures” which act as “humanly constructed systems for detecting, developing, protecting, promoting and rejoicing in potential within certain selected domains” (p. 246) whose purpose is “nurture and direct the expression of extreme talent” (p. 232). Significantly, however, from within the network of cultural systems in which children mature, how these contexts or specific environments affect development remains little understood (Burnard, in press Kluwer publication; Burnard, in press Oxford publication).

Learners are, however, not just reproducers of musical culture, ‘they engage in musical creativity as a processual and productive voyage at the interface of individual and community-based experience and culture’ (Burnard, in press, Bresler publication).

Another set of themes arise from a focus on collaboration and intersubjective processes. For example, the *social psychology* tradition of creativity research examines the nature of creative endeavour in relation to social factors such as peer group membership and peer influences, friendship, forms of communication, and shared goals can be supportive or inhibitory to musical creativity (MacDonald and Miell, 2000a, 2000b; Sawyer, 1997). Whether learners experience individual or group activities, both occur in social settings that involve responses to each other’s products (Morgan, Hargreaves and Joiner, 2000). There are similar findings in the work of Glover (2000) who describes a form of ‘parallel composing’ when individuals in the group are working alongside rather than with each other. Wiggins (2002) theorises this idea further and offers a model of the creative context and reports that often, learners’ independent work is shaped by musical and social roles, and that their roles are defined at intersections of social and musical perspectives.

More recently, Fautley (2005) offers a model of the group composing processes and phases from which to understand secondary school students’ ways of composing together. These studies provide music educators with frameworks in which to examine the relationship between collaborative learning and peer-evaluation as cultural practices employed by popular musicians (see for example, Leung and McPherson, 2003; Söderman and Folkestad, 2004; Dillon, 2004) and e-learning environments where computer-based collaborative composition between pupils, both within and between schools and potentially across a global community, occur (see for example, Dillon, 2003, forthcoming, Seddon, forthcoming, Savage and Challis, 2001).

1.5.2.3 A springboard for the PICL Pilot study

From the existing literature in musical composition we are left with questions about the extent to which any of these developmental models can inform our

understanding of Progression in Creative Learning in musical composition, and also the ways in which social and cultural context engage with such progression.

1.5.3 Composition in Writing

1.5.3.1 Three significant perspectives

Within the complex domain of written composition there are a number of 'competing discourses' (Fairclough, 1989). Three significant theoretical perspectives exist in the field of composition studies namely: cognitive theory, genre theory and socio-cognitive theory.

Cognitive models of composition were dominant within the 1980's and 1990's and focused on the cognitive processes and behaviour of individual writers (e.g. Flower and Hayes, 1981, Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987). Writing was seen as a problem solving activity or process and almost no attention was afforded to the social or cultural context in which the writing occurred. This perspective highlighted individual differences through the methodological use of 'think aloud protocols' (Flower and Hayes, 1981, Hayes and Flower, 1980) and clarified the organisational process of writing, for example planning, organising, reviewing and editing. The cognitive approach has shown that writing is a process of juggling constraints and that through the action of actually writing, learning about writing can take place. In addition, the concepts of knowledge telling and knowledge transforming have contributed to an understanding of composition (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987). It is argued that the former is devoted to creating and transcribing a chain of associations, whilst the latter is a form of reflective mental dialogue between the content and the rhetoric. This cognitive model is not the same as the pedagogical model of process writing as developed by Graves (1983) which is more commonly known in the UK, although the two models have developed in parallel. Graves emphasised the importance of choice in writing and the perhaps concomitant sense of ownership, autonomy and publication. The role of emotions in writing has been recognised more recently by Sharples (1996) who argues that writing involves the conscious re-creation of an emotional experience. Sharples' inclusion of both cognitive and emotive elements in the understanding of writing represents a departure from the earlier cognitive studies, introducing the notion of writing as creative design, thus acknowledging its complexity as a meandering process of problem-finding.

The Australian genre theory movement (see Cope and Kalantzis, 1993) has also made a significant impact on UK schools largely through the work of Wray and Lewis (1997). This movement emerged from the linguistic work of Halliday (1985), and emphasised the key features of each genre. It recognises writing as social communication within particular cultural contexts and highlights the importance of teaching certain text types as a way of empowering pupils. It has however been heavily criticised for being both prescriptive and static (Freedman and Medway, 1994). It has an accompanying pedagogy in which the teacher takes a specific instructional role, leading pupils through the stages of modelling the textual features of the genre at word, sentence and text level in shared, guided and then independent writing contexts. Both the teaching and the assessment of writing in England is closely related to these textual elements. However, in the National Literacy Strategy's model, (NLS) Halliday's (1978) ideational and interpersonal components are short changed, and it has been argued that as a result the role of the writer's ideas and intentions and their sense of the audience/reader have been downgraded(Bearne, 2003). Yet these

elements play a highly significant role in the process of finding a voice and becoming a writer (Grainger et al., 2005).

Socio-cognitive models of composition see the act of composing as essentially cognitive, but profile the relationship between meaning, form, social context and culture (Nystrand et al., 1993). Such models suggest that written composition and indeed becoming literate depend on both social conventions and individual problem solving. They thus combine a sense of the previous two models and see literacy and writing as a social cognitive act which creates opportunities for both strategic thinking and reflection. More recently, Sharples (1999) has argued that in working towards the composition of a piece of writing over time, writers operate as problem solvers, creative thinkers and designers.

1.5.3.2 Development in written composition

It is clear that the work in this area does not focus on creative learning in the context of composition or on progression in this area, although some work has been done on developmental models of writing. The question of the generalisability of compositional research to classroom contexts also needs to be considered, since the work in composition studies is distinct from that of academic literacy or literacy pedagogy. In addition, it must be noted that expert writers all voice particular and individual compositional styles and processes (Carter, 1999).

With regard to the practice of teaching written composition, the influential creative writing movement of the 60s and 70s influenced by Maybury (1967) and Marshall (1963), popularised the notion that children needed to be offered opportunities for personal imaginative writing. This was in part supported by Britton's (1979) categorisation of forms on a continuum, (from the transactional to the expressive and the poetic), and led to a period of time in which learners' development as writers was documented in natural ways and the emergent nature of their literacy was celebrated (e.g. Bissex, 1980; Hall, 1987; Harste et al., 1984). This stemmed from the belief that the active motivated young learner experiments with a range of forms of writing in the context of real literacy acts. As Wyse and Jones (2001) note, the freedom of developmental writing as an attendant pedagogy was nonetheless supplanted or at the very least re-shaped in the 1980s by a focus on the role of teacher intervention in the process approach to writing influenced by the work of Graves (1983). The work of Smith (1982) focused on separating composition (with an authorial focus on ideas, choices and grammar), from transcription (with a secretarial focus on paragraphs, punctuation, spelling and legibility) and in the mid to late eighties the National Writing Project profiled the influence of purpose and audience on composition. However, the influence of the process approach and notions of children as authors, whose choices should be honoured, has had very limited influence on the NLS Framework for teaching (DfEE, 1998), which was shaped largely in response to genre theory.

With regard to *progression in writing* the National Curriculum itself implies criteria for progression in its assessment framework, but this is not based on research evidence and tends to privilege quantifiable features of writing and the 'construction and correctedness' of the piece produced (D'Arcy, 1999; Bailey, 2002). Models of progression in writing exist, but are inevitably complex, responding to the differences in different forms of text and also including progress descriptors across the NC levels. QCA work in this field has examined progression in narrative and persuasive texts, using the key Standard assessment Test criteria for content analysis, namely: composition and effect,

text structure and organisation, sentence structure and punctuation Bearné's (2003) progression is perhaps the most realistic, describing as it does the process of development in considerable detail in relation to NLS objectives within each year of primary schooling. In more simplistic terms however, Bearné suggests evidence of progress is 'shown by increasing confidence in:

- Having something to write about
- Showing understanding of the needs of the reader
- Knowing how to organise texts
- Dealing with technical aspects and conventions
- Reading writing critically
- The ability to tackle a variety of writing activities
- Using information drawn from other sources
- Making decisions about how, when and what to write'.

(Bearné, 2003:78)

More recently it has been argued that in response to the accountability culture, the drive for standards, (as measured by the assessment of textual features and writing skills in England) and a growing indication that young children are becoming increasingly disaffected with writing, (Grainger et al., 2003; Packwood and Messenheimer, 2003) more flexible and creative approaches need to be profiled. The key issues in creative learning namely: relevance, ownership, control of learning, and innovation (Woods and Jeffrey, 1996; Jeffrey and Woods, 2003) need to be applied by teachers of writing in order to encourage self directed learning and the foster individual agency and involvement (Grainger et al., 2005). If the classroom is predominantly teacher controlled, then as Dyson (2001) observes, the learners will develop little sense of what they are doing or why. In contrast, more imaginative approaches involving individuals and groups in initiating questions and lines of enquiry can support their development as writers. Such collaboration and interaction can enhance their sense of autonomy in the literacy events which unfold (Vass, 2004a, 2004b). Arguably, current advice on writing (DfEE, 1998; DfEE, 1999) does not give sufficient weight to composition, to harnessing the energy and experience of the writer and to the generation and sharing of ideas. Arguments have been made regarding an expanded model of composition by both Bearné (2002) and Grainger et al. (2005), who recognise the importance of oral, kinaesthetic and visual activities of various kinds which may be combined with written ones in imaginative and creative learning contexts. Such creative contexts imply an environment of possibility which offers choice and encourages children to experiment with ideas, take intellectual risks and find innovative ways forward in speech and writing.

'Promoting creativity is a powerful way of engaging pupils with their learning' (DfES, 2003:34) and can make a marked difference to learners' commitment to and interest in writing, as well as influence their ability to write with voice and verve, with authenticity and vigour. The potential of creative approaches, which enable children to see the world differently and make connections, need to be recognised and purposefully developed in the teaching of written composition. This is documented in the work of Vass (2004a, 2004b).

1.5.3.3 A springboard for the PICL Pilot study

We are left with numerous questions ranging from the extent to which compositional progression can be generalised in terms of its theoretical frame, and the roles played by policy and practice in the way that curriculum and pedagogy are influenced, at a macro level through to classroom focused questions which we are able to explore in this study. These include aspects of learner stance and pedagogy, for example the

development of agency, the role of the social context including collaboration, and multiple ways in which an environment of ‘possibility’ is developed in the classroom which, whilst leading to written composition may have their roots in other forms of activity including oral, kinaesthetic and visual.

1.6 The Research Questions and Design

Relating to these themes, we developed focused research questions. From the perspectives of teachers, pupils and, we initially hoped, creative partners⁹:

5. How is creative learning BROADLY characterised in these early years settings and schools?
6. How can we describe progression in creative learning from Foundation Stage to KS4, as evidenced in Music and written composition¹⁰?
7. What can we learn about transition across the Key Stages in terms of progression in these areas?
8. What are the questions for further exploration that arise from this scoping study?

In order to address these questions, we used a mixed methodology¹¹:

- **Desk studies** of published work in this area; this included conceptual and empirical studies in each of the two major focus curriculum areas (composition in writing and music), as well as any relevant policy frameworks.
- **Qualitative analysis** in five sites, within the designated curriculum areas, music and writing in English.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Nature of Study, and Reasons for choosing this Approach

The aim of this scoping study was to record, analyse and document how creative learning is characterised in schools and to describe Progression in Creative Learning through exemplary cases of established teaching practices which make use of musical and written composition from Foundation Stage to KS4 in Music and English.

Collectively, our previous methodological work in the area of creativity provided evidence of the ways in which teachers and pupils engage in creative learning. Qualitative methods used have included:

- *Analysis of video, photographic and other data already archived in the schools.*
- *Documentary analysis* of teachers’ planning and where available, school documentation.

⁹ In practice, it turned out that creative partners were not involved in the study, mainly a factor of timing, although in two of the sites, the music teacher was also a professional musician and in one site the English teacher was a professional writer.

¹⁰ We adopted the view that composing, as a time-based process, referred to ‘the act of making a revised piece of writing or music created over time (Burnard and Younker, 2004: 62)

¹¹ The overall design, giving the data instruments within a time and responsibility frame, can be found in Appendix 2.

- *Use of digital photographs* as focus for discussion / exploration with both pupils and teachers.
- *Informal interviews with selected pupils and staff* focusing on their perceptions and experiences of progression in creativity in these curriculum areas.
- *Using drawings / concept mapping with teachers, pupils and creative partners*, to elicit perceptions of implicit or explicit progression models.
- *Video and audio recordings of some learning sessions*.
- *Participant observation in a small number of sessions*. Field notes made along with audio or video recording.
- *Video-stimulated analysis* involving some pupils with university researcher. These sessions were audio recorded.

In the original plans for the study, questionnaires were also considered, however given the numbers in the pilot it was decided not to use questionnaires at this point to capture perspectives and expectations since these were now being collected in greater depth using other methodologies.

In each of the three sites, we identified, with the 'anchor' co-participating teachers, a small number of individual student cases (usually three in each class). These comprise, according to teachers' judgements, children from the high, middle and lower achievement levels within each subject area being studied. In practice, it should be noted that at least one teacher selected high, middle and lower achievement based also on 'personal-social' or 'literacy-numeracy' criteria rather than specifically musical or written composition skills.

Using a diverse range of pupils and teachers addressed the need to compare pedagogical practice across different Key Stages and examine how variation related to progression.

The study involved collecting data from each of these cases in the second part of the 2004/5 school year and the transition into the 2005/6 one. In all, three sets of data have been collected, one set in the spring, one in the summer and one in the autumn. The collection of data was done partially by the teachers themselves and partly by the university research partners and the researcher. In adopting this mix of perspectives and data, and the co-participative approach, the study aimed to overcome the limitations of previous studies which rely on teacher accounts, or observations of classrooms for informing what constitutes creative learning, but which do not necessarily include the processes and outcomes of pupils' work, or in depth discussion between teachers and researchers.

In each class, we aimed to collect data from musical and written compositional activities by three cases. Whilst Table 1 indicated the planned spread of sites and foci, Table 4 indicates the details of data collected and analysed in tranches 1 to 3.

Table 4: Foci of tranches 1 to 3

Tranche 1 Spring 05 Collected by Teachers and by University Researchers	Tranche 2 Summer 05 Collected by Teachers	Tranche 3 Autumn 05 Collected by Researcher
FS Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Jean Keane @ Cunningham Hill)	FS Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Jean Keane @ Cunningham Hill)	
KS1 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)	KS1 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)	KS1 Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Angela Bettridge @ Cunningham Hill)
KS2 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teacher: Vivian Draper @ North Walsham Junior)	KS2 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teacher: Vivian Draper @ North Walsham Junior)	KS2 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)
KS3 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS3 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball)	KS3 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS3 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball)	KS3 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teachers: Paul Blake + Andrea Ball @ North Walsham High)
		KS4 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS4 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball @ North Walsham High)

It should be noted that two students were case studies in music Key Stage 4, as one selected student did not ultimately opt for music in Key Stage 4.

2.2 Reliability and Validity

The research team strove to achieve validity and reliability through the following strategies.

- use of a theoretical frame to inform the analytical synthesis of written and musical composition;
- defining creative learning in ways that identify and distinguish allow for integrated and domain-specific engagement in creative learning across phases;
- the adaptation of the QCA framework, providing a potentially fruitful structure for understanding how teachers and pupils perceive creative learning and the relationship to theoretical and policy frames;

- use of multiple sources and forms of data;
- investigating pupil perspectives and goals as regards creative learning in musical and written composition, in order to provide triangulation with those of the teacher and of the researcher; and
- inter-perspectival collaboration between university researchers and teachers

2.3 Ethics

Clear and detailed information was provided to schools (see Appendix 3). The written consent of parents, teachers and head teachers was sought (see Appendix 4). The project was explained to pupils by teachers, parents and also by researchers, and children remained free to withdraw at any time, in line with the BERA ethical code of conduct. In practice all were keen to participate with one learner even coming specially to school for a researcher visit despite being unwell.

Data have been stored on password protected computers and hard copy of materials has been stored securely by each researcher.

It should be noted that, in practice, our access to the research sites and data has been differentiated, in that some sites have been far easier to access than others. This may be due to the wide-ranging and different demands of primary and secondary education, and perhaps also the mix of schools chosen, meaning that the information sheets were interpreted differently in different sites.

2.4 Roles undertaken and data collected

As indicated in the Research Design (Appendix 2), the teachers were to collect some data and reflect upon it (see Appendix 5) before returning the data set to the University researchers. The University researchers' observation visits included interviews with each pupil through a draw-prompt task (see Appendix 6). The process for analysing data with teachers and for university researchers' work on this is described under 2.5.

In practice, the roles originally established were not all successfully taken on, particularly in Key Stages 2 and 3, due to problems achieving the proposed role of link researchers particularly with respect to the anchor teacher role. Thus, although teachers agreed to participate, in practice each took on different levels of ownership and involvement as co-researchers, reflecting a diversity of identities, specialisms, contextual understandings and agendas. This meant wide diversity in teachers' perceptions of the tasks in relation to the study.

The data set ultimately collected is given in Appendix 7.

2.5. Analysis undertaken

Effectively there were three periods of data collection within this project: the spring, summer and autumn (all in 2005). Co-participant teachers collected and reflected on a significant proportion of the data in the first two collection periods. Some of their analysis of this first tranche was supported in a full-day collaborative review, or data surgery, held in June and attended by almost all of the team. Prior to this, and after it, the University Researchers took a lead in analysing the material collected; this was further triangulated with the Researcher who joined the team in August 2005.

It should be noted that the realities for some of the participating schools were such that some co-researchers found it challenging to meet deadlines agreed within the project, meaning that the first and second data sets were not as complete as intended and the third tranche of data was lacking separate teacher reflection (it should be noted that informal teacher reflection was however encouraged in the interview with the researcher).

The analysis reported in the Interim Report was based on as much first and second tranche data as was available in July 2005. The main aim of that analysis was to characterize creative learning in different settings involving musical and written composition. Significant, qualitative shifts in pupils' creative learning were not expected to occur over relatively short units of work but were expected across year levels, and setting up comparison data sets with the same case studies (3 children per key stage) meant that we could rely on pupil accounts and process-product outcomes to help chart any shifts.

These preliminary analyses culminated in a multimedia database incorporating material from each case. This offered triangulation through combined video records of lessons augmented by observation notes, digital still images where appropriate, teacher and pupil interview transcripts, written work, lesson aims, plans and materials, teacher commentary / diary material, and an overarching descriptive account outlines of prominent pedagogical themes and charting development of pupil activity and thinking over time. The analytical framework, as it appeared in the Interim Report can be found within Appendix 8.

Following the first of the researcher's site visits during the autumn term 2005 (see Appendix 7), and the receipt of some outstanding data from tranches 1 and 2, an analysis pro forma for analysing individual cases was developed and tested on a small number of cases by the research team. This can be found in Appendix 9. Having found the pro forma to be a useful way of analysing and integrating different kinds of data in relation to the main research questions, and because of the depth of the data and the time available, the decision was taken by the research team to focus the analysis on one pupil per Key Stage. This produced the case analyses (each constructed according to the analytic pro forma in Appendix 9) illustrated in Table 5 (see next page).

While these case studies were being carried out the research team continued to work with developments on the analytic framework from the Interim Report (see Appendix 8). Once all sixteen case studies were analytically completed overviews of the data were represented using the format shown in Table 6 (see next page). Two versions of this table were created, one for writing in English analyses and one for Music analyses. As can be seen the contextual column from Appendix 8 table has been dissipated across the other columns, and the additional columns of 'Task', 'Content Analysis' and 'Teacher Stance' have been added as categorisation of data developed. A fuller version of this table can be found in Appendix 10.

Table 5: Case analyses used for Final Report

From across Tranche 1 + 2		From Tranche 3 Autumn 05	
FS Grace Music	FS Grace English		
KS1 Cherry Music	KS1 Cherry English	KS1 Grace Music	KS1 Grace English
KS2 John Music	KS2 John English	KS2 Cherry Music	KS2 Cherry English
KS3 Kevin Music	KS3 Louis English	KS3 John Music	KS3 John English
		KS4 Kevin Music	KS4 Louis English

Table 6: Overview of emergent progression framework

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance	Teacher Stance	QCA
Grace in Rec								
Grace in Yr 1								
Cherry in Yr 2								
ETC								

In addition, in the Interim Report, a number of further questions were identified for analysis, namely:

- Learners' awareness of transitional experience between key stages
- Their sense of the role of interaction during the compositional process
- Their views on what mediates (enables/constrains) their composition
- Their perspective on the role that knowledge of music / writing in English plays in their composition
- Their awareness of processes of music and writing and the differences and similarities between these
- Their awareness of the need to persist and to sustain the face of challenge
- The extent to which questioning and challenging are significant parts of creative learning particularly in Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1

Data for each of the key learners were analysed against each of these emergent questions as shown in Table 7.

Our findings are discussed first in each subject area and then in terms of findings which may be generalisable across both, so as to shed light on the situated nature of creative learning as well as common features. In this way we hope the situated findings may be useful to those teaching English and music, as well as addressing progression issues more generally.

Table 7: Emergent question analysis following Interim Report

Learner	Learners' awareness of transitional experience between key stages	Their sense of the role of interaction during compositional process	Their views on what mediates (enables/constrains) their composition	Their perspective on the role that knowledge of music/eng plays in their composition	Their awareness of processes of music + writing + the differences + similarities	Their awareness of need to persist + sustain in face of challenge	Extent to which q + ch are significant parts of creative learning partic in F + 1
Grace in Recep							
Grace in Yr 1							
Cherry in Yr 2							
ETC							

3. EMERGENT FINDINGS BY SUBJECT AREA

The study was a pilot, so whilst we tracked learners from Foundation Stage (Reception) through to Key Stage 4 (Y10), findings must be viewed as provisional. Having said this, a number of preliminary themes can be detected in each subject area.

The themes are drawn out first with reference to context, then with reference to a range of distinct but related elements of progression. The findings are shown with reference to the in depth case study analysis of middle-achieving learners, in each of the subject areas, music and writing in English, and in general.

3.1 Contexts for Composition in Writing and Music

The ways in which teachers established the context for composition in writing in writing varied with the individual teacher and their own stance on learners, learning, and the nature of achievement in creative learning in English and Music. These aspects of teachers' stance appeared also to be influenced by the key stage under focus, such that teachers of children in F, KS1 and to a lesser degree KS2, were more inclined to view writing as multi-modal, part of a wider experience and a process of generative connection-making, over time, which fed directly into the written composition. On the other hand, teachers in KS3 and 4 were more inclined to conceptualise written composition more narrowly. In both Music and English, teachers of older learners were more constrained by the curriculum and by its assessment of individual performance, increasing importance placed on domain specific skills and knowledge, as well as by separation of curriculum areas through timetabling and staffing arrangements, which appeared to frame their approaches to teaching and learning. In music in particular there was an increased emphasis on individual production of pieces, sometimes separate from other elements of the curriculum, and with less emphasis on ways in which interaction with others might play a role in composition (that is, featuring individual creativity rather than collaborative creativity). In writing in English, interaction during composition was significant in KS3 and KS4, whereas in F, KS1 and KS2, interaction was situated prior to the act of composing in written form.

3.2 Overview of Progression in Musical Composition

The analysis of progression in music is explored first using the elements of Task, Product Outcome, Teacher Stance, Knowledge, Skill, Process and Learner Stance. The analysis on which this commentary draws can be found represented in Table A in Appendix 11. In addition to the analysis across these features, data for each of these cases was analysed in relation to the QCA framework. This analysis can be found in Table B in Appendix 11. The analysis of case by case data in Tables A and B is discussed as follows.

3.2.1 Compositional Tasks

The nature of compositional tasks was significant. Children engaged in individual and social encounters with music with a diverse range of tasks designed to allow (or impose) varied levels of freedom, structure, boundaries, expectations, and agency.

In KS1 creative learning tended to occur through the *making of and playing with* music rather than *creating* music. In KS2, tasks tended to engage

children more in the *creating* of music where children began to focus on the expressive (rather than the representative) purposes of music. In KS2, tasks often required children to invent their own systems for documenting their music making. They were asked to reflect on what they believed was salient about their musical experience. Tasks emphasised working as a team. Social interactions and working cooperatively were highlighted, with an emphasis on 'fitting' together and listening to each other and supporting improvement. There was a focus on the usefulness of the children's invented systems for notating what they were saying

Task designs changed dramatically in KS3. Challenges increased. There was evidence of more forced/fixed choices. Adult-as-standard models appeared to apply. Achievement was measured according to a set of benchmarks. The worth of children's compositions as art – however it was valued (and undervalued) - became less visible, replaced by a focus on essential development in knowledge and skills. Forms of musical knowledge and compositional devices became particularly technical, skills- and theory-based.

3.2.2 Teacher Stance

Teachers encouraged and recognised the creative learning needs of their students differently. They held strong views about 'creativity' and 'creative learning' e.g. structure leads to freedom; freedom exists within constraints; creative boundaries; and learners' individual differences in terms of types of learners. For teachers, learner 'independence' appeared to be perceived more often to be equivalent to learner 'agency'.

At KS1-KS2, independent learning, discovery learning, play and non-interventionist strategies characterised teachers' pedagogical practice.

KS2-3 featured noticeable changes. Teachers talked about learner agency but allowed less independence. They tended to use adult practice as standard models of achievement and the worth of children's compositions changed; judging goodness occurred in relation to an adult, or expert, a specialist standard. A shift of focus from an expression of children's artistic voice (what they want to say and the ways they say it musically) to the role of knowledge and skills occurred. As we moved into the upper key stages we saw less focus on learner agency and more on learner persistence and learner ability, learner differences in using symbols to convey a specific form of musical knowledge.

Composition teaching shifted from creative teaching, from encouraging experiencing direct playful involvement with musical materials/elements through *making* and *doing* in FS-KS1, to *creating*, *perceiving*, *making* and *doing* in KS1-KS2, then to *perceiving*, *making* and *particularly performing music* in KS3-KS4.

Encouraging creative learning as a *creator*, rather than a *maker*, *knower* or *producer*, was seen to heighten knowledge and skill more than *creating*.

Class teachers in FS, KS1 and KS2 advocated exploratory and discovery approaches, and considered themselves *knowers rather than creators*. The exception to this was the music teacher in FS and KS1 who is also a professional musician. In their enthusiasm to provide learners with a meaningful and interesting creative/learning experience, teachers of earlier

key stages appeared to expect creative learning and value creative learning as part of the formative role of children's development.

At KS3-4 the teacher's role changed serving as a mediator in purposive activity and in planning complex tasks. Intervention strategies changed drawing more upon adult apprenticeship models. The thorny issue of music theory, harmony and counterpoint, became the focus of aspects taught and learned. Teaching became more instructive in the use of facilitative tools and for understanding harmony and counterpoint in order to more fully realise the learners' compositional ideas.

3.2.3 Compositional Knowledge

As children progressed from FS to KS4, compositional knowledge shifted from use of structures and textures to prompt/stimulate compositional ideas to more specifically defined tasks; using derivative approaches to more distinctive musical languages and musical genres.

From FS to KS2 we saw evidence of composing which occurred in the context of a community (or class culture) where children engaged in playful exploration, making decisions about what sounds to use and how to organise them. The exploration of instruments, materials and elements, involved a variety of pitched and unpitched instruments, body percussion and singing. Children were sometimes directed to use a particular material, element, or instrument and other times given opportunities to make their own choices.

At KS3-4 the school setting became the cultural benchmark against which compositions were judged – and were often found deficient.

At KS3-4 more sophisticated forms of musical knowledge – compositional devices, particularly the technical and theory-based and technical aspects of performance and performance-orientation, were featured. Use of established models within which music was made became the terms of reference.

There was a palpable sense in which knowledge *is* power at KS3-4. BUT composing was also about the production/creation of knowledge, something which was featured more in FS- KS1-2.

The collaborative compositions (FS-KS3) - as expressions of the learner's knowledge – enabled us to look closely at group leadership, peer teaching and participation. Here, creative learning was evidenced in the act of producing knowledge (i.e. creating a piece of music whose task defined what did and did not happen).

3.2.4 Compositional Skill

From FS to KS4 children were expected to demonstrate an increasingly sophisticated array of skills related to appraising (listening, reflecting, reviewing etc), making (performing; motor coordination; control and mastery, memory, symbol use), and creating (generative, expressive, performative, communicating, using certain conventions, modelling).

From FS to KS4, skills played an increasingly important role in composing. The relationship between personal and compositional actions appeared to be mediated by actual and perceived performative skills and confidence (i.e.

background experience, expertise, control and mastery of a particular instrument and associated musical genres and mastery).

3.2.5 Compositional Process

As children progressed from FS through KS2, it appeared, the process of composing became essentially a *meaning-making* enterprise – inviting musical narratives - where children engaged in personalised and collaborative yet highly intentional encounters with music (i.e. selecting one instrument in favour of another, generating ideas, exploring possibilities, and being allowed to work in structured and open contexts where compositional processes occurred in collaboration/cooperatively with others, often in play contexts, where controlling materials and playing from ‘the known’, listening with enormous concentration and self-correcting occurred).

FS and KS1 featured more exploratory (finding) and capturing (fixing) of activity. KS2 saw the introduction of ‘guided reviewing’, focusing and refocusing, questioning activity.

At KS3-4 the process of composing took a more prescribed path – grounded in individual creativity - where development of technical skills and practical considerations take. A commitment to finalising and reviewing projects emerged.

In KS2 social collaborative forms of creative activity featured more. The creative process was scaffolded through activity embedded in social interaction. There was some evidence of ‘parallel composing’ with particular positioning of self and others in relation to something. Some students were active, others passive.

At KS3-4, the musical starting points for tasks changed. Learners were required to work to specific ‘briefs’ with specific genres/tools and compositional devices. The process of composing became less visible because it occurred more often in the absence of others (i.e. at home).

A focus on structure was core across stages.

Breakthroughs, focus episodes and blockages - as significant events - to the process of composing differed for *individual composing* in KS3-4 school contexts to *collaborative composing* in KS1-2 and FS contexts. It was such events that made creative learning visible.

3.2.6 Learner Stance

The common features of stance across key stages were agency, self-determination, intentionality, being enactive, openness and persistence.

At FS through KS1, children learned together. They were encouraged to invent their own systems for documenting their music making.

At KS2 there was more reflection on what they believed to be salient about their compositions. They represented what was meaningful to them and how they got there.

These encounters involved making decisions about what sounds to use and how to organise them. Some children directed the activity; others followed

their lead. Not all the children chose to use familiar sounds while composing. Some children demonstrated more of the featured stances of agency, self-determination, intentionality, etc, than others. What was important was that the children developed their own approach for using and controlling sounds and selecting sound sources and organising them to form musical compositions/narratives or personal statements. The youngest learners were particularly characterised by their musical spontaneity and playfulness.

The group work revealed children's emerging social styles.

At KS3-4 learners' roles as performers, listeners and composers changed. The tasks became more defining as starting points for their compositions. Accounts of what the student thought they did in what settings in what ways for what reason was less featured than in earlier years. In KS1-2, in the midst of social interactions, learners were allowed to frame their compositions on the basis of their personal experiences and stories (i.e. musical narratives) they imagined. At KS1-KS2, children appeared to welcome the chance to talk about what and how they created.

From KS3-4, the symbolic world of composing changed. The process of composing featured less choice and more devised strategies for compositions-made-easy.

Children interpreted tasks differently; some quite narrowly, others with greater openness. Teacher input, learner perceptions of teacher input and learner stance were characteristics of creative learning progression.

3.2.7 QCA Creativity Framework and Progression in Musical Composition

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity. They interrelate with all the aspects of the framework for documenting progression and should be read alongside them.

Asking questions

There was little explicit evidence of the youngest children asking questions or challenging in the contexts observed, although it is more than possible that questions were framed internally and inaudibly. It is also possible that due to the clear nature of the music compositional tasks set – and the nature of the tasks - which built upon open-endedness, agency and ownership, the younger children did not feel the need to engage in the explicit questioning to teachers but posed musical questions to themselves and each other, as evidenced in musical exchanges.

The context of the work undertaken in KS3/4 was less collaborative in nature (in terms of small group work) with learners more often required to work individually, in part a reflection of the increasingly individualised assessment context at this stage of schooling. This did prompt a more questioning and challenged and *challeng-ing* stance (e.g. Lawrence). This was evidenced for example through discussion of resistance expressed and frustration felt and present in the periods of exploration and reflection on the tasks set. At KS3-KS4 more time was spent engaged in posing musical questions whilst developing ideas than in visible exploration of ideas, a feature of FS-KS2.

It is clear from this data that the older learners posed more questions with musical ideas by naturally using revision and extension techniques. This was also an artefact of working with technology. It was clear that the older learners spent a lot of time working through musical materials and ideas without being explicitly asked to do so. The posing of musical questions was central to learning how to compose.

Making connections

There was a wealth of evidence of children making connections in a range of qualitatively different ways; making connections seemed to be a core feature of creative learning, both within and beyond the domain.

Younger learners made connections between sounds and sound sources, patterns and patterning, materials made and played in previous pieces, songs and recorded listening repertoire. Connections were made with musical experiences out of school.

KS2 connections were made in collaborative group settings, where participants monitored, adjusted, oversaw, balanced, managed and could regulate each others musical ideas and where knowledge was shaped and constructed together.

At KS3/4 learners made connections between pieces played and listened to in and out of school and saw the relationships between ideas noticed and connections made and framed within the lessons with the classroom music teacher and their instrumental specialist teacher.

Imagining

There was much evidence across key stages of learners generating ideas and envisaging alternatives. Musical thinking was a kind of sonic imagining.

The younger children generated and presented ideas in motion (evidenced by the use of motivic material and musical gestures) in response to tasks that put them into a context that gave rise to a musical composition – a series of interrelated musical ideas that makes a statement of its creator's intent.

The musical conversations and musical interactions that took place with the FS-KS2 learners in this study show some evidence of imagining musical ideas in terms of generating alternative possibilities (stopping, thinking, changing instrument, altering way of playing, thinking about what next to do).

Not all musical decisions were externalised – i.e. played out loud. The process of preserving a compositions sometimes involved memorising or remembering musical forms.

Exploration

Inherent in FS-KS2 was engagement in exploration. Evidence suggests that the process of creative learning involved an exploratory dimension. Learners in KS1 and the early stages of KS2 engaged in exploratory playing, exploratory inquiring, exploratory testing as intentional acts of mind. This was evidenced frequently as players purposefully intended to

build upon and extend ideas spending time searching *and* performing. This, in effect, was evidenced in all cases but was sustained and developed much further in KS3/4 in a dialogue situated between school and home contexts.

Critical reflection

The learners from all key stages engaged in critical reflection as emerging out of their sustained engagement in the making of music. Even from the earliest years, learners were aware of the worth of their own and others' ideas. In FS-KS2, reflective activity was not always 'critical' but rather a reflective exchange between player and instrument but also between the players themselves. In KS 3-4 the critical reflection became more pronounced, distributed among peers, co-learners, teacher and system.

3.1 Overview of progression in written composition

The analysis of progression in written composition is explored first using the elements of Task, Product Outcome, Teacher Stance, Knowledge, Skill, Process and Learner Stance, as represented in Table C in Appendix 11. In addition to the analysis across these features, data for each of these cases was analysed in relation to the QCA framework, as shown in Table D in Appendix 11. The analysis of case by case data in Tables C and D is discussed as follows.

3.3.1 Compositional Tasks

The diversity of the tasks set inevitably framed the degree of creative learning possible; some constrained self-determination through lack of choice, whilst others fostered creative collaboration and sought to encourage inventiveness. The tasks varied in terms of time scale and complexity and differed in terms of the degree of support offered for composing. A few of the tasks offered limited challenges, highlighting the need for teachers' understanding of the nature of creative learning to be enhanced, in order to plan for progression more explicitly.

In Foundation and KS1/2, the writing tended to be undertaken at one sitting and built directly upon previous multimodal learning activities; the compositions were always contextualised and emerged from a cross curricular enquiry, time in a role play area, and so forth. Little or no time was provided for revisiting or revising this work, this was not expected.

By contrast, in KS3/4, the tasks were much more extended in nature, covering several sessions and were framed solely within the Literacy/English curriculum. Inbuilt into these tasks was the opportunity/requirement to revise and reshape the written composition and modify the writing over time in order to improve the final outcome. Activities which sought to facilitate this process were planned by their teachers. The tasks in KS2/3/4 were more specific and somewhat more tightly framed and prescriptive and more 'genre driven'. Although diverse responses were encouraged the focus was more on form alongside content than at F/KS1 when freedom of expression and the children's ideas were seen to be central.

3.3.2 Teacher Stance

The teachers expected creative engagement and valued it although not all the activities planned fostered this fully. All the teachers held strong views on the role of interaction and collaboration in written composition and integrated such a stance into their pedagogical practice.

At F/KS1/KS2 the teachers viewed creativity as involving full child engagement, (both affective and cognitive) curiosity, play and independent learning, and expected language which was expressive and exploratory in response to the curriculum focus. This shifted somewhat in KS3/4 where the focus was more oriented towards the skills of written composition and accuracy in terms of the linguistic features of texts.

The teachers of KS2/3/4/ were very conscious of time constraints and perceived a tension between encouraging agency and creativity and ensuring curriculum coverage. This was less of a concern in F/KS1 where the curriculum was seen as more permeable. The teachers of the older learners voiced a critically reflective perspective of the NC, whereas the F/KS1 teachers viewed it as having a cross curricular, flexible and dynamic potential which they could creatively interpret.

The teaching of composition appears to be offer more support for content in terms of ideas and their expression at F/KS1 , whilst in contrast the older learners are provided with a clear set of technical features for inclusion in their work and the requirement to review it carefully. Although support for content is provided, this is generated through example and through focused group activities and less through children's generative engagement in open ended multimodal learning activities.

3.3.3 Compositional Knowledge

As children progress from Foundation Stage to KS 4, it appears they show increasing understanding and use of compositional knowledge in terms of both form and function In particular, they become increasingly aware of the audience and purpose of their writing, and show much more control of a wide range of genres and their attendant linguistic and organisational features.

As the children move through KS2-4, their knowledge of the processes involved also develops as does their metacognitive and metalinguistic capacity to describe both process and product. With increasing age the children became more aware of the value of their peers in composing and the benefit of having textual examples of the genre to lean upon. In KS2/3/4 they made increasing use of this knowledge, deconstructing published texts and reconstructing work in the same form and style. In F/KS1 the children were working with a much more implicit knowledge of genre.

3.3.4 Compositional Skill

The evidence suggests that from F to KS4 children also exert a greater degree of control of their compositional skills; their vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and use of paragraphs for example. With increasing age, orthographic conventions are adhered to with a greater degree of accuracy and in particular a much wider range of sentence structures are employed. In addition, their ability to self correct appears to increase with age and in KS3/4 they consciously seek to edit and refine their writing, checking for accuracy, appropriateness and meaning, both during composing and after initial drafts have been committed to paper or screen. This is much less common, and is less expected in the earlier years.

3.3.5 Compositional Process

All the learners were extensively involved in generating ideas, speculating, suggesting, and proposing possibilities for their writing. This often occurred in a whole class or small group discussion of a text prior to writing and through collaboration in drama activities. The extent to which these generative oral

encounters influenced the level of attainment in writing is not clear, although it was the case that the younger children were provided with more overtly playful extended periods of preparation for writing, set within an integrated curriculum.

The learners in KS2/3/4 spent considerably more time than those in F/KS1 focusing on reviewing and revising their compositions and commenting upon each others' work. The younger learners did engage thoughtfully as they wrote, selecting words carefully and making occasional changes during composing time. The older children however, not only reflected upon and changed their work as they wrote, but also focused on their emerging drafts and actively appraised, revised and shaped these, exercising an increasing independence of judgement and knowledge of language. In addition, the children in KS 2-4 tended to make more use of their peers' comments and were more involved in questioning and challenging others' ideas in order to develop their own compositions.

3.3.6 Learner Stance

The core feature of stance adopted by the children engaged in creative learning (regardless of Key Stage) was a clear sense of their own or others' intentions. Their goals, whether they were selected by the child or the teacher, were frequently explicitly articulated, and determinedly worked towards. In F/KS1 the writing tasks were fully integrated into a seamless curriculum in which the children were imaginatively immersed, so the writing was not perceived as a separate or labelled activity. In this way the compositional goal gained both meaning and purpose. In KS2/3/4 the task was differently contextualised and was set within a tighter and more demarcated literacy or English frame. The positioning of the task appeared to be highly influential with regard to the learners' views of the act of writing and their self esteem as writers.

The children's sense of identities as writers and learners also influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. The learners' persistence developed in response to the nature of the task, for example those in KS3/4 were expected to persist over time and sustain involvement and commitment to their writing. The youngest learners appeared to show less differentiated and much more uniformly positive attitudes to writing, with increasing age, the stance of the learners varied more markedly. It appeared that as the subject English became more differentiated, their attitude towards it became more explicitly shaped, alongside their awareness of themselves as writers.

3.3.7 QCA Creativity Framework and Progression in Writing in English

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity. They interrelate with all the aspects of the framework for documenting progression and should not be read separately from them.

Asking questions

There is little explicit evidence of the youngest children asking questions or challenging in the contexts' observed, although it is more than possible questions were framed internally and inaudibly. It is also possible that due to the clear nature of the written work set, which built upon previous exploratory play and immersion activities, the younger children did not engage in the same degree of explicit questioning as they had already orally

rehearsed/prepared their writing. The context of the work undertaken in KS3/4 was somewhat more collaborative in nature (in terms of small group work) and although each eventually wrote individually, this form of interaction did appear to prompt a more questioning and challenging stance. This was evidenced for example in KS3/4 when through debating and participating as groups, the children interrogated and evaluated their own and others' ideas. The children's questions were always treated with respect by their teachers regardless of key stage, however at KS3/4 the teachers fostered this kind of reflective questioning and discussion by supporting and requiring periods of review.

It is clear from this data that the older children invite others' evaluative comments more readily and pose more questions, or at least do so more explicitly in the context of written composition,

Making connections

There was a wealth of evidence of children making connections in diverse ways. Making connections seems immensely significant in encouraging children to see themselves as writers. When writing allows connections between home and school, and within domains, it seems to be embraced by children and the writing produced is rich. In many ways, the oral rehearsal we see with the youngest learners in this dataset creates a context in which writing emerges naturally. The immersion experienced in the earlier years in terms of the construction of the curriculum encouraged and enabled the learners to make both personal and cross curricular connections and draw upon their knowledge, for example of previous imaginative play, Tudor times, or the fictional world being explored.

During the end of KS2 and in KS3/4 the connections made however appeared to relate more closely to literacy issues, such as knowledge of the chosen genre, intertextual knowledge, their own and others' ideas and the drafting process. It is likely that in KS3/4 in particular, the literacy curriculum is less integrated and thus the relationships between ideas noticed and connections made are framed within the perceived boundaries of the lesson or of literacy as a domain.

It is clear that throughout the process of composing learners make multiple connections. In KS3 these connections appear to become more focused on the nature of the written task itself and potentially more limited as the subject is no longer immersed in a wider curriculum frame. The collaborative nature of the later year's tasks may also have prompted more connections to be made as ideas were shared and corporately generated.

Imagining

At the core of this strand of behaviour is the notion of possibility thinking, of the child generating ideas and envisaging alternatives. This was evident throughout the age phases studied. The younger children actively engaged in whole class or small group generative activities prior to writing in the context for example of role play. Various other forms of multimodal engagement also supported their ability to generate ideas. The older children in KS 3/4, more commonly engaged in 'imagination without the action' (Vygotsky, 1978) and proposed alternatives created in part from the conversational context and in part from the films for example that they engaged with. They were also expected to draw significantly from their own cognitive resources, whilst engagement was sought, the films observed were seen more as artefacts and

examples and were used less as a prompt for imaginative world making play. In contrast, the ideas and possibilities for the content of the writing which were generated in KS1 for example, related very closely to previous activities, such as creating a mini garden, recreating visual scenes, describing role play and so forth.

Clearly the children were all expected to generate ideas and envisage alternatives; however the pedagogic support for this involvement differed in kind and in degree and reduced somewhat as the children grew older.

Exploration

In most of the learning observed the children were involved in exploring: ideas, language, resources and fictional worlds. The teachers expected that this would enrich their compositions. The children in KS1 and the early stages of KS2 were immersed in a focus and explored multiple ideas and aspects of this focus, in a 'hands on' manner so that when it came to writing they brought a wealth of experiences to the composition. However their writing was completed at one sitting, so there was no real opportunity to keep compositional options and ideas open over time.

In contrast, in the latter stages of KS2 and in KS3/4, the work observed involved drafting, reviewing and revisiting previously produced writing. This necessitated keeping ideas and options open and selecting strategies to improve and enrich the work. From KS1 there was evidence of children exploring language options in and through sharing written work with one another and their teacher, however this was sustained and developed much further and more explicitly in KS2-4.

Critical reflection

In the writing observed and documented, the children were all involved in reflecting upon their work and were able to comment upon the outcome evaluatively. Even in the KS1 examples which were completed at one sitting, the young people were aware of which parts were better/stronger in their writing and why they had chosen particular words or phrases. One individual in KS3 did find this more difficult, which may have been due to personality issues, the remainder however engaged in reflecting thoughtfully upon their work, both during the compositional process and at the close of the session or composition. This often led to making significant changes in KS2-4. In KS 3 /4 there was evidence of the children also considering the written work of their peers in a critically reflective manner.

4. A FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRESSION

The themes discussed in Section 3 can be represented within an evolving Progression Framework to be found, as noted previously, in Appendix 10. The Progression Framework, which builds on what is known about progression in writing in English and musical composition together with the early work on Creative Learning reported in 1.5.1, 1.5.2 and 1.5.3 encompasses a number of possible 'building blocks', or elements involved in the progression of creative learning in the two domain areas investigated, namely, for both subjects:

- Task
- Product outcome
- Teacher stance

- Composition knowledge
- Composition skills
- Composition process
- Learner stance
- Policy on Creative Learning: the QCA framework

The emergent progression framework encompasses early work on Creative Learning in which conditions, behaviours, stance and processes were identified as elements of creative learning. In the PICL Pilot progression framework, the pupil behaviours and processes have been combined together and subsumed within the composition process, as previously summarised in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 8: Creative Learning elements (Emergent from Cambridge Symposium 2005)

Conditions	Experience of the unknown, multi-modality, a learning leap
Pupil behaviours	Immersion, playfulness, risk-taking, insightfulness, agency
Pupil stance	Self-determination, agency
Processes	Imagination Divergent thinking Generativity

Please see next page for the full emergent progression framework in Table 9 (also found at Appendix 10)

There were also a number of questions which we identified for further exploration in and following the Interim Report of PICL, as follows.

- The children’s awareness of the transitional experience between key stages
- Their sense of the role of interaction (and opportunities for this) during the compositional process, as balanced with composition done alone, and the extent to which this becomes increasingly fundamental to the generation, performing and appraising of ideas.
- Their views on what mediates (i. e. constrains or enables) their composition in writing and music.
- Their perspectives on the role that knowledge of musical and English elements and materials, genres, conventions and styles plays in their composition work.
- Their awareness of the processes of composing in music and writing and the differences and similarities in these
- Their awareness of the need to persist and sustain openness in the tasks set particularly in the face of increasing difficulty, challenge or limitations.
- The extent to which questioning and challenging are significant parts of creative learning particularly in Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1.

Some of these we found insufficient data to comment on, as follows:

- Learners’ awareness of transitional experience between key stages: although we had very little data which conveyed learner perspectives, through observation we documented many aspects of the transitional experience. The learner perspective on transition between the key stages in terms of

- creative learning would inevitably form an aspect of a future study on progression, and might need to be documented in specially targeted ways.
- Learners' views on what mediates their composition in writing and music: without specifically attempting to access the learners' inner dialogues regarding their views on what might or not mediate their composition this study was only able to draw out very 'surface' data on this question. Deeper probing of learner perspective in this area could certainly contribute to a future study of progression, and again would need to be accessed in specifically targeted ways.
 - Learners' perspectives on the role that knowledge of musical and English elements and materials, genres, conventions and styles plays in their composition work: again there was evidence of learners using knowledge within subject areas in analyses of both process and product. Understanding how explicit learners' understanding of the role of this knowledge is, might be tracked in a future study, particular in relation to aspects of the framework such as teacher stance and task structuring.
 - Learners' awareness of the processes of composing in music and writing and the differences and similarities in these: this was particularly difficult to track in later stages where learners were becoming more specialist and therefore potentially less aware of processes within their less preferred area, and less able or interested to discuss and articulate differences and similarities. This might be further investigated in a future study through careful selection of learners with vested interests in both subjects, and possibly through a greater sense and operationalisation of learners (as well as teachers) included in a co-researching capacity.

However those we can comment on here are:

- Learners' awareness of the role of interaction during the compositional process
- The influence of learner stance particularly in terms of persistence
- The extent to which younger learners are engaging in questioning and challenging (QCA framework).

In addition, we decided to explore:

- The role of teacher stance in creative learning

In addition, we began to see relationships between learner stance and the stance of the teacher.

What follows is analysis of each of these, again analysed in relation to each of the cases selected earlier.

4.1 The Role of Interaction in Musical and Written Composition

The research team takes the view that collaboration (sustained engagement with others in the service of a collective goal) is a sub-set of interaction (some involvement with others but not necessarily in the sustained service of a collective goal, in part because much less is articulated externally/verbally). What we see in the data is a move over the key stages from interaction to close engagement (ie collaboration), but by Yr 10 in both written and musical composition, in this particular study, awareness seems to shift away from both interaction and collaboration per se to more individualised creative engagement. The analysis for each case learner underlying this can be found in Table E in Appendix 11.

Awareness of Purposeful Collaboration

Across the KS's there was growing awareness of the different collaborative roles available to students and of their own personal preference for different roles in both writing and music. At all stages, students demonstrated awareness of leader/follower relationships and of working more equally to 'bounce ideas' off each other. They were increasingly aware of taking more subtle complementary collaborative roles, that is different roles within the collaborative situation, which complemented each other and brought different contributions to that collaboration, for example 'planner' and 'idea generator' were roles identified by one learner. This was particularly exemplified in writing in English. Students also increasingly demonstrated the ability to step back (i. e. be metacognisant) and discuss in greater complexity their role-taking and different ways of collaborating.

The evidence suggested that, by Year 6, it seemed more apparent to students that creating and working in groups has the potential to mislead the outcome (in relation to appropriateness). In Year 1 it took the teacher to highlight this, whereas by Year 6, it was discussed by the students as problematic in both music and writing.

Also across the Key Stages, there was increasing awareness of cumulative collaboration. That is, in writing and music, in Reception and Year 1, there was awareness of generating ideas in collaboration, with awareness of reviewing and evaluating ideas collaboratively more apparent by Year 3. By Year 6 there was a greater awareness of these contributing to accumulations of process/outcome over time, with a growing emphasis on group as well as personal responsibility. After Year 6, this was less apparent in writing in English (NB in relation to this, it might be suggested that writing in English is often not structured as a collaborative activity, particularly in later Key Stages where writing is seen to be a largely individual activity even when the preparatory or support work fosters interaction and even collaboration – a state of affairs certainly open to debate), but still evident in music.

Table 9: Emergent framework for Progression in Creative Learning¹²

Task ¹³	Product Outcome ¹⁴	English / Music Composition Process	English /Music Composition Skills	English / Music Composition Knowledge	Learner Stance (clustered characteristics)	Teacher Stance <u>Toward</u>	QCA Framework (2005a, 2005b ¹)
		<p>BOTH SUBJECTS Learner engagement w. process: - Immersion - Playfulness - Intention</p> <p>Composition process - Generating - Capturing - Sharing - Committing - Reviewing / judging ideas</p>	<p>ENGLISH Using tools of composition such as: varied sentence structure, paragraphing, punctuation and orthographic conventions</p> <p>MUSIC Memory Performance skills Using musical materials to develop ideas Symbolisation Composition-listening Performance-listening</p>	<p>ENGLISH Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form) Role of memory, significance of repetition vs novelty/improvisation (knowledge first, composition next?) Knowledge of audience and purpose (function) Understanding of appropriateness by pupils</p> <p>MUSIC Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form) Knowledge of audience and purpose(function)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - self-determination - agency - intentionality - persistence - toleration of ambiguity - enactive - reflectiveness - open attitude 	<p>knowledge and learning, creativity/ creative learning teaching 4 creativity/creative learning learner Stance towards professionals curriculum interaction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning and challenging • Making connections, seeing relnships of ideas, entities. • Envisaging what might be – possibility thinking, using imagination Exploring ideas, keeping options open • Reflecting critically on ideas, actions, outcomes; both their own and those of others. <p>+ Risk taking</p>

¹² Analysis also paid attention to background – i.e. how task and product-outcome contextualised, wider climate of classroom / lesson, how time was used, modes of engagement (extent of multi-modality), extent to which learning leap involved/expected, role of enjoyment, staff communication / collaboration (see Appendix 12).

¹³ Tasks were simply logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression was implied in tasks set.

¹⁴ Product outcomes were again logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression could be detected.

Ongoing awareness of difference between own & collaborative process

The evidence demonstrated an ongoing awareness of the difference between one's own process and collaborative process. In music in particular, there was evidence by Year 7 of increasing awareness of the differences between working on your own and in collaboration, particularly relating to sharing responsibility in groups; and a tension in group work regarding differences of opinion and not being able to 'choose your own way'. By Year 10, the students demonstrated an increasing wish to work individually but with a tension between this and students' perceptions of how bands work collaboratively.

Awareness of Networks of Interaction

Throughout the key stages there was awareness of gleaning ideas from within the wider network of interaction, both from peers and others (teachers, parents, the latter less so later on). These interactions appeared to become more intensified for adolescents as peer pressure/judgement shaped interactions. There was also ongoing awareness of using each other and others as sounding board when working on individual creative ideas and when performing (or sharing) outcomes/products which resulted from creative learning. In music, by Year 10 there seemed to be much less use of interaction, as the source for ideas/examples brought into the school directly from home or elsewhere, which does not appear to be so extreme for writing in English.

4.2 Learner Stance

The following were common qualities both exhibited by the learners and encouraged by their teachers:

- agency
- intentionality
- self-determination
- openness of attitude
- being enactive
- reflectiveness
- persistence

These are analysed in Table F, to be found in Appendix 11, with reference to each of our case learners. Analysis highlighted for us the ways in which children appeared to internalise their teachers' attitudes toward composition tasks, and yet the ways in which children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin. Some interpreted tasks narrowly, others with much greater openness. By the same token, children's experiences of time and the styles of engagement developed and encouraged by their teachers varied widely, and are likely to have influenced the development of learner stance. Previous (and often external to school) experience in the domain – especially in music – also influenced the stance that learners brought to their experience of composition. Given these multiple influences on the development of pupil stance (and there are no doubt many more), the following comments are therefore offered tentatively.

Intentionality, self-determination and agency

The core features of stance adopted by children in relation to composition tasks in both writing and music, were related to their intentionality and self-determination, whereas agency whilst present decreased over time. We see evidence of increasing intentionality and self-determination in both subject

areas, in all of the learners tracked across the key stages. We also see from KS3 to KS4 a marked increase in emphasis on individual achievement within the broader learning environment, which may be reflected in increased self-determination and intentionality. As children became older, the taking of risks became more and more personal and more and more connected with the process of composition; with the younger learners risk was more to do with working out how to 'read' the teacher's request – i.e. it was more task-focused.

In FS/KS1, writing tasks and, to a lesser degree, music tasks, were experienced within a seamless curriculum in which children were imaginatively immersed so that writing in particular was not labelled as a separate activity. In both subjects, children working together was a feature of classroom practice. The structure of the domain was given different emphasis; in music children were encouraged to invent their own systems for documenting music making, but whilst in English they were encouraged to adopt personal ways in to written composition, they were nevertheless using Standard English and thus applying knowledge and skill in perhaps a more structured way.

From KS2, more emphasis was placed in both subjects on meaning, purpose and appropriateness of compositional work, and children were increasingly encouraged to reflect on what they felt to be salient about them.

By contrast, agency decreased with task over time so in KS3 and KS4 we see some reduction in agency in both subjects through lack of choice in task, and yet we also see an increased commitment, intentionality and self-determination within the domain with age. Agency is of course affected by personal identity as a mediating factor, as is the nature of the task, and the teacher's stance as well as the demands of the specific domain.

Openness of attitude

The awareness of choice and an openness of attitude in terms of how compositions could be developed, is evident with from FS onward, although openness of attitude is less evident in the middle primary years for writing than for music; this may reflect an increased emphasis on curriculum coverage, learning the conventions of the domain, and increasing concern about external assessment, particularly as English is one of the core and assessed subjects. It may also reflect the way in which English is taught during the middle years with the influence of the Literacy Hour having an impact on offering imaginative opportunities which expect and foster openness of attitude.

In writing in particular, children's sense of identities as writers and learners influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. The youngest learners appeared to show less differentiated and highly positive attitudes toward writing. With increasing age, the stance of the learners varied more markedly. It appeared that as the subject English became more differentiated, their attitude toward it became more explicitly shaped alongside their awareness of themselves as writers.

In music, we see a gradual reduction in choice and exploration such that by KS3 and KS4, the symbolic world of composing changed such that the process of composing involves less choice and more strategies for composition-made-easy. We see a much greater tendency for children to

adapt to and adopt a prescriptive, more mechanical, staged approach to composing which appears to have less relationship to their personal identity and more to do with a teacher-framed curriculum and assessment programme.

Being enactive

Whilst being enactive is manifest in learner stance in both subjects from FS to KS1, by the top end of KS2 being enactive is seen more in music than writing, although it does reappear in KS3, disappearing again in KS4; this aspect of learner stance may reflect the nature of the English curriculum and/or how teachers interpret it with respect to English composition.

Reflectiveness

Whereas the younger learners are characterised more by their spontaneity and playfulness in both domains, there is nevertheless evidence of children reflecting on compositions right from FS onward. As learners move through KS2, KS3 and KS4, they are expected to be increasingly reflective – something which is explicitly mapped in to the curriculum.

Persistence

The learners' persistence developed in response to the nature of the task, for example those in KS3/4 were expected to persist over time and to sustain involvement and commitment to their writing, whereas persistence was both less evident in the youngest learners but also less evident in the expectations of the classroom. By Y3, however, we are seeing persistence as a feature of learner stance in both subject areas – from Y1, an increased awareness in children that this is to be valued in composition.

4.3 Questioning and Challenging

We were concerned to explore the extent to which questioning and challenging are significant parts of creative learning particularly in F and KS1. In both subject areas, music and English, there is limited evidence of the children in F and KS1 employing questions and challenging themselves and others. This may well be task-related and a product of the deep support and immersion offered, which may reduce the content and organisational risks encountered in composing. In addition, the pedagogy in these years was oriented towards fostering individual's success and a praise culture. One of the KS1 children did however show signs of beginning to push himself in writing, in this instance the teacher reset the task in a slightly adapted form as she perceived insufficient challenge had been offered or seized by the children.

However, we were struck by the non-verbal nature of questioning and challenging in younger learners in particular, in that depth of engagement often suggested a depth of questioning which was private, silent and 'invisible' in a sense. And yet, our observations suggested that there was continuous questioning and, at times, also challenging of the known, present in a FS child's exploration of, for example, a rhythm using percussion instruments, or their exploration of possible scenarios through play which they then represented within a piece of creative writing. It seemed to us, then, that the suggestion that questioning and challenging were less present in younger learners was not the case, but that it was less visible in the conventional sense. For the older learners, being set collaborative tasks prompted the asking of questions of one another, and reviewing of one another's work.

4.4 Teacher Stance

During and following the Interim Report it became apparent that teacher stance was an important influential factor to be considered when analysing creative learning. The areas which emerged within which the teachers had particularly pertinent stances were:

- Stance towards knowledge and learning, including subject specific stance
- Stance towards creativity and creative learning, including in different subject areas and progression
- Stance towards the learner including learner + outcome, children's relationship with ideas, links with home and teacher expectations
- Stance towards teaching for creativity/creative learning, including task, structure/freedom, resourcing and time
- Stance towards curriculum including in school and NC
- Stance towards professionals including others and self
- Stance towards interaction/collaboration

Analysis of teacher stance across all the learner cases is demonstrated in Table G n Appendix 11 with discussion of the findings detailed below.

Stance towards knowledge and learning

The teachers' stance towards knowledge in general was dominantly towards multimodal (particularly kinaesthetic) and collaborative learning in Foundation Stage, KS 1 and 2, starting from a strongly child-centred and child-focused perspective in the Foundation Stage.

In KS 3 and 4, the approach to knowledge and learning becomes much less multimodally varied (although still strongly visual and auditory, and featuring collaboration and interaction) and the teachers' stance shifts more towards more skills oriented activity and tasks in both written composition. Although still multimodally varied in music, knowledge and learning was viewed as much more skills oriented in music in KS 3 and 4.

Stance towards creativity/creative learning

Particularly in FS, KS 1 and 2, and particularly for the music specialist, kinaesthetic and collaborative learning was highlighted as key to creativity/creative learning. Teachers of early key stages also appeared to expect and value creative learning as part of the formative role of children's development. Across the key stages, progression was viewed by the teachers as grounded in

- having the time to understand each learner as an individual
- increasing understanding and application of knowledge and (particularly thinking) skills, with the focus increasingly shifting off children's artistic voice
- increasing ability to explore and review

And by KS4, for the teachers increased agency, self-determination and experimentation were much more important. There is also a marked shift in the teachers' balance between group and individual creativity towards the latter.

Stance towards learner

Across all key stages the teachers' stance is towards the learner as an individual (but within their own culture) of whom the teacher has high expectations. There seems to be more allowance for spaces outside of school as the root of individual's learning earlier in the KS's. For instance, in

KS1 the teacher structured a writing session around the sounds and sights of fireworks, helping the children make connections and building on recent experience.

Stance towards teaching 4 creativity/creative learning

Across all KS's, teachers emphasised the balance between structure and freedom. Early on, structure related to exploratory and discovery approaches, with structures/boundaries set in order to encourage exploration of possibilities, and intervention judged so as not to interrupt this exploratory flow. Increasingly structure was related to subject specific knowledge (styles/conventions/ appropriateness) and skills, but always with teacher taking dominant control of structure/boundary. This was often achieved in the later stages through modelling (in written composition particularly, the teacher perceived teacher modelling and standard setting through feedback as a vital part of the process across KS3 and 4). Teachers appeared to take a tighter approach to structure at the beginning of KS3 which gave learners less independence, and then allowed more freedom for complexity, agency (see above) as they shifted to the end of KS4 (with the freedom appearing to be greater in writing than in music)

In writing in English particularly, creativity was modelled as an individual process by KS3. In music, the teacher stance to composition teaching shifted from creative teaching, from encouraging experiencing direct playful involvement with musical materials/elements through making and doing in FS-KS1, to creating, perceiving, making and doing in KS1-2, then to perceiving, making and particularly performing music in KS3-4.

In this area of creative composition, time and resources were highlighted as in short supply by all teachers.

Stance towards curriculum

Between Reception and the end of KS2, curriculum was viewed as cross curricular, and the Foundation Stage and national curriculum were viewed as positive, having potential and dynamic (although teachers note that the formal curriculum needs to be *interpreted* in this way). In writing in English, by KS3 and 4, the National Curriculum is viewed as 'problematic + restrictive' time and content wise, particularly in relation to reading time. In music, by this KS, there is a strong curricular emphasis for the teacher in this study on exam preparation.

When these stance areas were compared to the learners' awareness of different aspects of creative learning (such as, for example, interaction/collaboration), and to aspects of learner stance as detailed above, there was strong mirroring or transference of some aspects of each teachers' stance to the learners they were working with. Particularly relevant to the study of progression in creative learning, were the teachers' stance towards creativity/ creative learning, the learner, and teaching for creativity/creative learning. In these areas the teachers' stance on such aspects as progression, task, structure/ freedom, resourcing, time, and expectations of learner were often to be seen mirrored in learner stance and awareness of parallel areas. However, as noted in learner stance above, children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin: interpretations could be wide or narrow and they could vary greatly within the same class. It should also be noted that this mirroring was seen to a lesser extent for teacher/learner relationships by KS4.

5. FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

This section aims to draw together the emergent findings from across Sections 3 and 4 and to begin to highlight the main conclusions that can be offered in relation to the original research questions. These were:

1. How is creative learning BROADLY characterised in these early years settings and schools?
2. How can we describe progression in creative learning, from Foundation Stage to KS4, in music and writing in English?
3. What can we learn about transition across the Key Stages in terms of progression in these areas?
4. What are the questions for further exploration that arise from this scoping study?

The questions are addressed in turn. Question 4 is addressed in Section 6: Recommendations.

5.1 Creative Learning and how it was characterised

We took our focus here to refer to ways that teachers characterised creative learning in the provision of opportunities offered to children in English and Music composition in classroom contexts.

5.1.1 Key Features of Creative Learning

The data revealed shifting perspectives among the teacher group's perception of creative learning from relatively domain-free (multimodal in nature) across Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2, to very strongly domain situated by Key Stages 3 and 4, when creative learning in music or in writing in English was also imbued by the teacher's own 'take' on the subject area. In the case of each of the Key Stage 3 and 4 teachers, they were artists in their domain in their own right, and their stance on creative learning is strongly indicative of their own relationship with their creative work (Jeffery, 2005).

Teachers' values and practices concerning conditions for creative learning and expectations of pupil behaviours¹⁵ on the whole shifted over time, as children moved through the key stages, as shown in Table 10.

¹⁵ Both were identified as aspects of creative learning by researchers at the Cambridge Symposium on Creative Learning April 2006, as introduced in 1.5.1. Only conditions for creativity and expectations of pupil behaviours are discussed here, since pupil stance and pupil processes are discussed elsewhere).

Table 10: Analysis using the Cambridge Symposium Creative Learning elements

<p>Conditions</p>	<p><u>Experience of the unknown</u> All of the teachers valued this to some degree, although in some contexts the unknown did not involve a large step beyond the known. Learning tended to be contextualised in shared and familiar group contexts (the home corner, a shared playful space, a class topic) with learners from FS to the top end of KS2 (although not exclusively; musical work with FS learners involved introduction of new material and skills). In KS3 and KS4, tasks were contextualised only within the subject structure and so in a sense the experience of the unknown became more dominant.</p> <p><u>Multi-modality</u> Whilst this was a feature in FS, KS1 and the lower end of KS2, the multi-modal condition became less evident in the upper end of KS2 and in KS3 and KS4.</p> <p><u>A learning leap</u> Whilst learning leaps were valued and expected, the nature of the leaps varied in depth, the nature of the task in some cases constraining the potential for leaps, and at others offering great scope. There was no clear progression across key stages in expectations.</p>
<p>Pupil behaviours</p>	<p><u>Immersion</u> This was valued in every classroom although not always achieved; where tasks were matched well to learners the immersion of learners in tasks occurred more readily.</p> <p><u>Playfulness</u> Playful engagement was valued in every classroom although manifest more kinaesthetically at the younger end of the spectrum.</p> <p><u>Risk-taking</u> Analysis suggested that risk became more personal as learners grew older; however the nature and experience of risk could be explored further in an extension study.</p> <p><u>Insightfulness</u> Tasks varied in the extent to which they demanded insight of learners, with the demands implicit within tasks requiring on the whole increasing depth of insight into tasks within the subject.</p> <p><u>Agency</u> As documented in section 4.2 whilst learner agency was valued by teachers it actually decreased in the upper key stages.</p>

5.1.2 Learning and Teaching Approaches

Co-participation between children and between children and teacher, an element of creative learning documented in other literature (Craft, Burnard, Grainger, 2005 and Craft, 2005, Jeffrey, 2001, Jeffrey, 2005, Jeffrey and Woods, 2003) was evident FS, KS1 and KS2 but shifted from KS2 to KS3 to become more like opportunities to work together and less of a process of co-owning processes or ideas. Similarly, the pedagogical strategies which Woods (1990) identified as supporting creative learning, of valuing relevance, innovation, control and ownership in learning opportunities offered to students, are much more in evidence in the FS, KS1 and KS2 than in KS3 and KS4. This is in part a product of the assessment context which emphasises the evaluation of individual rather than collaborative work, as learners grow older.

Elements of possibility thinking (Burnard, Craft and Grainger, in press, Craft, 2001, Craft and Jeffrey, 2004, Craft et al, 2005), emphasising the role of the enabling context, in which pedagogy and learning interact to nurture the posing of questions, play, immersion, innovation, risk taking, being imaginative and self-determination (Craft et al, 2005), were seen however in every classroom, although played out in increasingly domain-focused ways by KS3 and KS4.

As discussed earlier in the report, there was evidence in all key stages of the QCA creativity framework:

- asking questions
 - making connections
 - envisaging what might be
 - exploring options
 - evaluating
- (QCA, 2005a, 2005b).

However, whilst the asking of questions was noted to be less visible and less externalised in the younger learners it was embodied within children's musical thinking, explorations and play.

Where learners were working with a professional musician (which was the case in FS, occasionally in KS1, KS3 and KS4) or writer (which was the case in KS3 and KS4) we saw apprenticeship models of pedagogy and learning (Griffiths & Woolf, 2004, Jeffery, 2005) in action as teachers worked alongside learners to enculturate them into the ways of the discipline. In Key Stages 3 and 4 this enculturation is palpable, and learners are expected to interact with the rules, practices and judgements of the field. There were individual differences between teachers in Key Stages 3 and 4 in the extent to which learners were measured against the creative composition practices extant in the adult musical or writing world. Feedback to this end was increasingly valued – and particularly by the English teacher in KS3 and KS4.

The scope and development of apprenticeship models of pedagogy and learning should be further investigated in an extension study. These contrast with standard classroom practices and bear further exploration in terms of achievement and progression. Our analysis yielded evidence of a powerful effect of adult attitudes on learners, who internalised teachers' intentional attitudes from their encounter with composition tasks and make them their own.

5.1.3 Emergent Definition of Creative Learning

Analysing our data against the definition of creative learning introduced in 1.5.1.3, as follows:

Creative learning develops our capacity for imaginative activity, leading to outcomes which are judged by appropriate observers to be original and of value. (Spendlove, Wyse, Craft, Hallgarten et al, 2005)

we see that *imaginative activity* increases in depth but narrows in scope over the key stages. In FS, KS1 and KS2 imaginative activity is situated within a broader frame of multimodal, playful engagement, often in a collaborative context and holistic development, becoming increasingly subject-specific by Key Stages 3 and 4.

Composition *outcomes* in English and music shift from those arising from direct playful involvement with writing and musical materials and elements through making and doing in FS and KS1, to creating, perceiving, making and doing in KS1 – 2, then to perceiving, making and in the case of music, performing it, in KS3-4. Outcomes are reviewed from FS to KS4, with increasing emphasis on this in KS3 and KS4.

The judgement of outcomes in terms of *originality* throughout the key stages is undertaken by teachers in our data (and so the exploration of who might be an appropriate observer is not explicit). Criteria are not focused overtly on originality until Key Stages 3 and 4, when the opportunity, capacity and expectation to review is extended further to learners, such that judgements of originality are made in a perhaps more participative way than with younger learners.

As far as *value* is concerned, children are offered tasks from KS1 to KS2 which on the whole enable them considerable scope. Their teachers appear to expect and value creative learning as playing a formative role in child development. Tasks enable learners to ascribe value, within a framework offered by adults, who define the context for tasks. In KS3 and KS4 the ascribing of value is undertaken much more overtly by teachers, grounded in a depth of understanding and application of knowledge and skills, with the focus shifting away from the learner's own artistic voice.

It is clear that across the key stages, creative learning is increasingly focused on *self-determination and experimentation* and there is a marked shift in balance between group and individual creativity toward the latter, which may of course reflect the ways in which assessment is currently couched in schools, with a powerful emphasis on the individual.

It is also clear that across the key stages teachers emphasise the balance *between structure and freedom*; for the younger learners structure relating to discovery and exploratory approaches, with structures and boundaries set in order to encourage the exploration of possibilities; provocations and interventions were sensitively judged so as not to interrupt the exploratory flow. Increasingly, structure was related to subject-specific knowledge (styles, conventions, appropriateness) and skills, with the teacher holding dominant control (often through modelling). Teacher control over structure appears tighter at the start of

KS3, with less opportunity for pupil independence; this gradually allows for greater complexity and freedom toward the end of KS4.

Perhaps most significantly however, creative learning was evidenced in this study, in the act of producing knowledge. As such, we propose a new definition of creative learning as follows.

Creative learning can be viewed as significant imaginative achievement as evidenced in the creation of new knowledge as determined by the imaginative insight of the person or persons responsible and judged by appropriate observers to be both original and of value as situated in different domain contexts.

5.2 Progression in Creative Learning – Music and Writing

In the case of each subject area the pilot project focused on progression in composition, and as with other findings the following are offered tentatively. The research team propose the Progression Framework found in Appendix 10 as an analytical tool for understanding progression within musical composition and composition in writing. The elements are seen as building blocks which are both distinct and inter-related. However two of the issues which this approach do not encompass are the question of raised ceilings and increasing expectations as domains shift, and the question of whether creative learning can be ‘scaled’, i.e. measured on some kind of spectrum of attainment when the domain itself is changing and expanding rapidly, and where capabilities (and therefore expectations) are enhanced by the moment. Both of these could be further explored in an extended study.

In what follows we draw out what seemed to the research team to be the most significant findings regarding progression in these subject areas, commenting first on some contextual factors, then the QCA framework and then on task, subjects and learners.

5.2.1 Contextual Factors

Values and practices dominant within each key stage for teachers and experienced by learners, were made visible during this study. These included approaches to pedagogy as well as to curriculum, in particular the nature of the curriculum elements and traditions in how they are regarded in relation to one another (particularly FS to KS2), as distinct areas of knowledge (particularly KS3 and KS4). Approaches to school organisation and culture were also distinctive in different key stages, and the external frameworks, particularly for assessment (which affects practice increasingly powerfully in the later years). This contrasted with the holistic, highly personal approach in the early years classrooms which we researched. We thus documented a gradual separation to a subject-based, less integrated and less personal approach – whilst still involving hands-on engagement.

Also significant are teachers’ own views of subjects, of tasks which may be appropriate, and of the nature of achievement in each subject, all explored in the remainder of 5.3. Teachers’ views of creative learning (as discussed in 5.2), in particular in relation to the domain in question, also affect the progression we see evidenced in the children and subjects studied, becoming more and more dominant over time and particularly in Key Stages 3 and 4.

But perhaps most significant of all was the relationship between teacher and learner, and the role of authentic knowledge on the part of the teacher about the learner's capabilities and interests in the relevant subject; in this very small sample we see a decrease in depth of relationship from FS to KS4, this would be worth exploring further in an extended study.

5.2.2 QCA Framework

The following aspects proposed by QCA (2005) are perceived as aspects of pupils' behaviour and evidence of learner creativity. They interrelate with all the aspects of the framework for documenting progression and should be read alongside them

Asking questions

As already noted, there is little explicit evidence in either music or writing in English of the youngest children asking questions or challenging in the contexts' observed, although the research team suggest that an area for future exploration would be the extent to which such questions were framed internally and inaudibly. The nature of the tasks which built upon open-endedness, agency and ownership, for the youngest children, may also have meant that the younger children did not feel the need to engage in the explicit questioning to teachers but posed musical questions to themselves, as evidenced in musical exchanges – and that in the case of English oral rehearsal was imbued with questioning such that in the act of writing children's questioning was of a lower (and inaudible) order.

The nature of the work undertaken in Key Stages 3 and 4 being initially so much more collaborative (at the start of KS3, at any rate) in music and written composition in English, meant that although each child ultimately composed their own piece, this emerged from exploration with others. In the case of music the older learners engage with their own questions as they revise their pieces, often without being asked explicitly to do so; in part an artefact of working with technology for composition and in part a reflection of the centrality of posing musical questions in learning how to compose. Whilst in KS4 in particular the emphasis is very much on the assessment of individual composition in music, then, inherent to this is the posing of and response to musical questions.

In writing in English, learners in KS3 and KS4 worked collaboratively, debating and interrogating one another's ideas with questioning and challenging inherent to this, such that their individual compositions were then informed by the views of others.

Making connections

There was a wealth of evidence of children making connections in a range of qualitatively different ways; making connections seems to be a core feature of how children see themselves as composers in music, and as writers in English.

Younger learners made connections between home and school; in English, experiences at home influenced the content and direction of writing – and their sense of themselves as writers was influenced by experiences of writing at home. Similarly in music, younger learners made connections with musical experiences out of school.

In terms of the subjects themselves, making connections beyond the domain of English continues to be a feature of the experience of younger learners. Oral rehearsal plays a significant role, in which immersion in playful and multimodal contexts encourages personal engagement with the relevant knowledge, for example of Tudor times or the fictional world being explored. In music, younger learners made connections between sounds and sound sources, patterns and patterning, materials made and played in previous pieces, songs and recorded listening repertoire.

In both subjects toward the end of KS2 and in KS3/4 the connections made however appeared to relate more closely to literacy and musical lesson or subject boundaries; in turn perhaps defined by the separation of subjects.

Imagining

In both subjects children are encouraged to engage in possibility thinking – to generate ideas and envisage alternatives, moving from an multimodal space where their own ideas were generated, to one in KS3/4 where, particularly in writing, imagining was much less multimodal. In KS3/4 if anything multimodal engagement in music increased as pupils produced and performed compositions as windows into their musical thinking. Pedagogic support for imagining differed in kind and in degree and reduced somewhat as the children grew older, whilst the degree and depth of expectation in what learners would be able to imagine in their compositions, increased.

Exploration

In both music and writing in English, learners from FS to KS2 were immersed in hands-on exploration such that when they came to compose in music or English they were able to bring and draw a wealth of ideas which informed and enriched their compositions.

Learners in KS1 and the early stages of KS2 were increasingly engaged in exploring a focus, exploring multiple ideas and aspects of it with intention. In the case of English, composition might be completed in one sitting, reducing the possibility of keeping options and ideas open over time; in the case of music there was a gradual shift to encompass performing as a culmination of composition. In the upper end of KS2 the emphasis in composing in both music and writing shifted to involve greater drafting, reviewing, revisiting, selecting strategies to improve work in a more sustained way, which was developed much further in KS3 and KS4.

Critical reflection

The learners from all key stages engaged in critical reflection as emerging out of their sustained engagement in the making of music or written composition. Even from the earliest years, learners were aware of how good ideas were – both their own and others.

In writing, even in the KS1 examples completed in one sitting, learners were able to critically analyse their work in terms of why they had chosen words or phrases or what was better or stronger in their writing. This on the whole increased over time such that in KS3/4 learners increasingly changed their work as a result of critical reflection, and learners were able to explore the work of their peer in a critically reflective manner.

In music, from FS-KS2, reflective activity was not always 'critical'. In KS3/4 the critical reflection became more pronounced, distributed among peers, co-

learners, teacher and system; a finding corroborated in the work of Dillon, (2004); Barrett (2005, 2003); Webster (2003) and Younker (2003).

5.2.3 Tasks

The nature of tasks used in relation to progression was significant. In music children were encouraged to shift through different kinds of tasks. In KS1 tasks tended to occur through the *making* of and *playing with* music rather than *creating* music. In KS2 tasks tended to engage children more in the *creating* of music where children began to focus on the expressive (rather than the representative) purposes of music with an emphasis on working as a team. Task designs changed dramatically in KS3 with challenges increasing and more forced/fixed choices, structured around adult-as-standard models and an essential development in knowledge and skills.

In writing in English, it was felt that the diversity of the tasks set inevitably framed the degree of creative learning possible. The tasks varied in terms of time scale, complexity and degree of support offered for composing. In Foundation and KS1/2, the writing tended to be undertaken at one sitting and built directly upon previous multimodal learning activities, with no time provided for revisiting or revising this work. By contrast, in KS3/4, the tasks were more extended in nature and were framed solely within the Literacy/English curriculum. Inbuilt into these tasks was the opportunity/requirement to revise, reshape and modify the writing over time. The tasks in KS2/3/4 were more specific and somewhat more tightly framed although diverse responses were encouraged. A few of the tasks offered limited challenges, highlighting the need for teachers' understanding of the nature of creative learning to be enhanced, in order to plan for progression more explicitly.

Across the different subject areas, both demonstrated task setting that tightened and became more bound in specialist subject knowledge and skills. Both subjects showed tasks which introduced more strongly the notion of creating in an ongoing way through revising and reshaping overtime. English written tasks early on in the Key Stages were more connected to other learning experiences than those in music. Music tasks showed more emphasis placed on team work in Key Stage 3 as part of task progression than in English. The lack of any framework for assessing collaborative creativity at any of the key stages was noticeable. This is an emergent area of study, and work undertaken in the higher education context (Bryan, 2004) suggests that developing a climate of trust, a learning ethos which is problem-solving orientated, and an assessment framework which looks at skills rather than propositional knowledge, may be useful for future work on progression in creative learning.

In addition to inherent variation in tasks offered, learners interpreted tasks differently; some quite narrowly, others with greater openness. Teacher input, learner perceptions of teacher input and learner stance (and previous experience) were vitally important in trying to explain the characteristics of creative learning progression in relation to task. These findings are corroborated in the work of Seddon, 2004; Seddon, forthcoming; Seddon & O'Neill, 2003; Barrett (2003) and Burnard (1995).

5.2.4 Learners

The common features of stance across key stages were agency, self-determination, intentionality, being enactive, openness and persistence.

The core features of learner stance adopted by children in both music and writing in English, which, in fact increased over time, were *intentionality and self-determination*. In FS/KS1, the structure of the domain was given different emphasis; in music children were encouraged to invent their own systems for documenting music making, but whilst in English they were encouraged to adopt personal ways in to written composition, they were nevertheless using Standard English and thus applying knowledge and skill in perhaps a more structured way. From KS2, more emphasis was placed in both subjects on meaning, purpose and appropriateness of compositional work, and children were increasingly encouraged to reflect on what they felt to be salient about them. From KS3 to KS4 there was a marked increase in emphasis on individual achievement within the broader learning environment, which may be reflected in increased self-determination and intentionality.

However, the possibility of *agency* within tasks lessened over time. By KS3 and KS4 lack of choice in task particularly reduced agency in both subjects, although self-determination and intentionality were still possible within these constraints of choice. It is suggested earlier that agency is particularly affected by nature of task as highlighted here, as well as being influenced by the nature of personal identity, and the teacher's stance as well as the demands of the domain; this is documented in music in the work of Stauffer (2002) and is in part reflected in writing research undertaken by Myhill (2001).

The *awareness of choice and an openness of attitude* in terms of how compositions could be developed, is evident from FS onward, although openness of attitude is less evident in the middle primary years for English than for music. This may reflect an increased emphasis on curriculum coverage, learning the conventions of the domain, and external assessment. In writing in particular, children's sense of identities as writers and learners influenced their perspective and ability/confidence to take compositional risks. The youngest learners appeared to show less differentiated and highly positive attitudes toward writing. With increasing age, the stance of the learners varied more markedly. In music, there is a gradual reduction in choice and exploration such that by KS3 and KS4, there is a much greater tendency for children to adapt to and adopt a prescriptive approach to composing which appears to have less relationship to their personal identity.

Whilst *being enactive* is manifest in learner stance in both subjects from FS to KS1, by the top end of KS2 being enactive is seen more in music than written composition in English, although it does reappear in KS3, disappearing again in KS4; this aspect of learner stance may reflect the nature of the English curriculum and/or how teachers interpret it with respect to English composition.

There is nevertheless evidence of children reflecting on compositions right from FS onward in both domains. However the *level of persistence* in their activities is less constantly seen. It developed in response to the nature of the task, for example those in KS3/4 were expected to persist over time and to sustain involvement and commitment to their writing, whereas persistence was both less evident in the youngest learners but also less evident in the expectations of the classroom.

Analysis post Interim Report also highlighted for us the ways in which children appeared to internalise their *teachers' attitudes toward composition tasks*, and which therefore led to learners internalising the notion of progression inherent

within those tasks. It is therefore important in our discussions of progression in creative learning that we emphasise this mirroring or transference, in particular of teachers' stance on such aspects as task, structure/ freedom and time. However, as noted previously, children also interpreted tasks with a personal spin: interpretations could be wide or narrow and they could vary greatly within the same class. It should also be noted that this mirroring was seen to a lesser extent for teacher/learner relationships by KS4.

Following the Interim Report we also investigated the *role of interaction* in composition. What we see in the data is a move over the key stages from interaction to close engagement (ie collaboration), but by Yr 10 in both writing in English and music awareness seems to shift away from both interaction and collaboration per se to more individualised creative engagement. Alongside this was a growing awareness among learners of the different collaborative roles available to them, with an increasing awareness of cumulative collaboration, alongside a growing awareness and experience among learners of tensions between working alone and working with others. Yet there was also a consistent awareness throughout the key stages of gleaning ideas within wider networks of interactions (from peers and others including teachers, parents and others), which seem to become intensified for adolescents. However pitfalls in creating and working in groups were also highlighted at the top end of KS2, such that it could lead to misleading the outcome.

5.3 Progression and Transition Across the Key Stages

It should be noted that despite setting up the study to include progression across year-ends and across the end of one key stage and start of the next, the data were inconclusive as far as transition (question 3) was concerned. The study did however reveal that between Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1, and Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3, learners appeared to experience disempowerment in each subject, as rather than being asked to build on what they could do already, they were offered tasks which demanded little of them, to the extent that they appeared to become somewhat disengaged. To some degree, this could be attributed to teachers appearing to have little operationalised knowledge about children's capabilities and experience outside of school in music or writing – and their enthusiasms for these (and thus capacity to engage with children's interests). However, the research team were also aware, on occasion, of teachers interpreting their involvement in the research as to some extent requiring 'special' lessons to be taught for research data collection and analysis. This could lead to tasks being designed and taught which were not entirely within the existing 'flow' of children's learning. This could therefore account to some degree for the apparent appearance of teachers' low operationalised knowledge of children's capabilities, and the resulting lack of evidence of transition. The research team are cognisant of this issue in relation to setting up research sites in any future developments of the study, particularly in relation to developing a deeper understanding of authentic transition.

Whilst, given the small number of cases the occurrence of two among the four transitions may have been chance, it certainly highlights a possible area for further exploration.

We also noted a generalised shift from collaborative toward an emphasis on individual creativity in terms of outcomes, from KS3 onward, which may have reflected the assessment context.

6. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION

If teachers, creative practitioners and schools are to successfully develop creative learning across the curriculum, depth of attention will need to be paid to what it might mean to develop learning in a way which progresses, for all students, and in all subjects of the curriculum. This pilot project sought to explore the potential for defining and interpreting progression in creative learning in the two areas of musical and written composition, has firmly underlined a change from relatively domain-free, multi-modal engagement across Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 to very strongly domain-situated creative learning by Key Stages 3 and 4. It has inevitably raised further questions for exploration. The further exploration of these is particularly relevant in the context of possible changes in the curriculum which could bring creativity into a more central place (QCA, 2006, as well as the current Creativity Review commissioned by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Department for Education and Skills, due to report to ministers in February 2006. In terms of domains themselves, changes are emerging, such that for example, in relation to English QCA have begun to reconceptualise the curriculum, and in *Taking English Forward* (QCA, 2005c) frame it around creativity, competence, cultural understanding and criticality.

6.1 Extending the Study of Progression in Musical and Written Composition

We would recommend that further work is done to prioritise. In terms of the two subjects selected for the pilot, music and English, we would prioritise the following questions. However we would recommend that these are undertaken in the context of vibrant creative partnerships; whilst there were elements of partnership evident in the pilot schools, on the whole the data did not reflect partnership work as strongly as it might have done.

6.1.1 The Nature of Creative Learning

Teachers', learners' and creative practitioners' perspectives on creative learning could be probed further, with reference to those which surfaced in the pilot. It was clear that over the course of the key stages, creative learning became increasingly situated within the domain itself. Future work would need to be situated within specific, and perhaps contrasting, parts of the curriculum in order to further understand the nature of progression in creative learning within these. As part of further work, it would be useful to encompass much closer investigation of:

- The *framing of tasks* by teachers and the *interpretation of tasks* by learners
- The *use of time* by teachers and *learners' sense of time* in engaging with tasks
- ways in which younger learners engage in *questioning and challenging*
- the nature and role of *connection-making* across the key stages
- the experience and *role of risk* in creative learning across the key stages
- the nature and *role of relationships* between learners and between learners and adults across the key stages
- the *nature and distinctions between individual and collaborative creative learning*
- the *engagement between creativity in particular domains and the assessment arrangements in place for these*; in particular the extent to which, in some

- areas (such as musical composition), means for assessing collaborative creativity may be appropriately developed
- learners' own perceptions of *how teachers' expectations of them with respect to creativity shift or remain consistent, in the transition across key stages*
 - the *nature and impact of teacher interventions* in developing creative learning
 - the *impact of pedagogical approaches* on creative learning achievement

It is particularly important to situate such explorations in the context of specific domains of learning, since it was clear that creative learning was evidenced in this study in the production of knowledge.

What characterises creative learning as evidenced in this pilot is:

significant imaginative achievement as evidenced in the creation of new knowledge as determined by the imaginative insight of the person or persons responsible and judged by appropriate observers to be both original and of value as situated in different domain contexts.

6.1.2 Development of the Progression Framework

The progression framework proposed here for analysis could be tested against a wider data set. This would mean exploring all parts of the framework, i.e. context, task, product outcome, subject process, subject skills, subject knowledge, learner stance, teacher stance and the QCA framework.

Particular elements of it could be emphasised, to include

- exploration of *interactions* between elements of it; for example, interaction between teacher and learner stance, and interaction between learner stance and task, interaction between subject knowledge and teacher stance etc.
- investigation of *pedagogical approaches* including apprenticeship and other models
- documenting of *teachers' engagement with children's interests*
- explicit introduction of the students' *experience of transition* across year end and key stage with respect to musical and written composition

In addition, two further questions could be explored:

- whether progression in creative learning changes significantly over *time* (such that what a five year old could do in 2000 might be any different from what a five year old in 2006 or 2010 might be able to do in either subject),
- what the progression framework suggests for whether creative learning in musical or written composition could be *meaningfully 'scaled'*.

6.2 Broadening the scope

Whilst this was a scoping study, considerable data has been collected and a range of complex insights gained. The study has uncovered the complexity of defining progression in creative learning in two areas of the curriculum; composition in writing and in music. There is much to be learned from the study, particularly in the current context, as teachers seek to develop creative learning in a variety of curriculum contexts, and need to learn to plan for progression, being aware of what this involves for themselves and for learners.

In the broader context of advice from QCA to ministers on the re-shaping of the 11-19 curriculum to include creativity and other skill areas as being at least as significant as the content areas of the curriculum (QCA, 2005) and in the context

of the current Creativity Review being undertaken by DfES and DCMS, it is vitally important that we gain a deeper understanding of the nature and scope of progression in creative learning across the curriculum.

A powerful case can be made for further work to document and characterise creative learning a situated within domains, through an extension study. This should consider the possibility of including curriculum areas where the content is growing and changing rapidly (for example, ICT) as well as those where the content is perhaps growing less fast (for example, science and technology). ICT may be a special case in that the impact on ICT on other subjects is considerable, and this of course includes the subjects already studied in PICL PILOT, in particular music, where learners do not need to have been learning an instrument in order to be able to compose music if using ICT; and in both subjects (as well as in others) ICT can perform the role of 'preserving' composition. Consideration should certainly be given to extending the work already undertaken in this initial study, in music and writing.

Any extension study of this sort should also include powerful and peer-recognised examples of partnership activity, in order to link together creativity, culture and community as is being done across the work of Creative Partnerships. Partnership work in schools is also an approach to teaching and learning increasingly advocated and resourced through the work of, for example, Creative Partnerships and NESTA, but was also a concern of the Creativity Review led by DCMS and DfES which reports in February 2006.

Future work should be closely linked to questions of the nature of assessment in creative learning, and should take account of the more detailed recommendations given in 6.1 of this report.

Work from PICL Pilot and from any extension study could inform thinking about the assessment and documentation of learning in skill areas within the curriculum. Given the current interest at policy level in placing greater emphasis on skills but within a framework of raising achievement, it is our strong recommendation that further work is commissioned in the area of progression in creative learning.

7. REFERENCES

- Bailey, M. (2002) 'What does research tell us about how we should be developing written composition', in R. Fisher, G. Brooks and M. Lewis (eds) *Raising Standards in Literacy*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Barrett, M. (2003). Freedoms and constraints: Constructing musical worlds through the dialogue of composition. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach music composition* (pp. 3-30). MENC: The National Association for Music Education.
- Barrett, M. (2005). A Systems view of musical creativity. In D. Elliott. (Ed.) *Praxial Music Education: Reflections and Dialogues* (pp. 177-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bearne, E. (2002) *Making Progress in Writing*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. (1987) *The Psychology of Written Communication*, Hillsdale, NJ: Louis Erlbaum.
- Bissex, G (1980) *GYNS AT WRK: A Learner learns to Read and Write* Cambridge MA: Harvard University press.
- Britton, J., Burgess, A., Martin, N., Macleod, A. and Rosen, H. (1975) *The Development of Writing Abilities*, London: Macmillan.
- Bryan, C. (2004), Assessing the creative work of groups, in Miell, D., Littleton, K. (Eds) (2004), *Collaborative Creativity: Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Free Association Books.
- Burnard, P. (1995). Task design and experience in composition. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 5 (2), 32-46.
- Burnard, P., Craft, A. & Grainger (in press) Documenting 'Possibility Thinking': a journey of collaborative inquiry. *International Journal of Early Years Education*.
- Burnard, P. & Younker, B.A. (in review) An application of activity theory to the study of interaction in peer collaboration in creative music making. *International Journal of Educational Research*.
- Burnard, P. (in press). Rethinking the imperatives for reflective practices in arts education. In P. Burnard & S. Hennessy (Eds.) *Reflective practices in arts education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Burnard, (in press). Understanding children's meaning-making as composers In I. Deliege & G. Wiggins (Eds.), *Musical Creativity: Multidisciplinary research in theory and practice*. London: Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis.
- Burnard, P. (in press) The individual and social worlds of children's musical creativity. In G. McPherson. *The Child Musician*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Burnard, P. (in press) Perspectives on and routes to understanding musical creativity. In L. Bresler *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Burnard, P. (2004) Using critical incident charting for reflecting on musical learning. *The Mountain Lake Reader: The Study and Practice of Teaching*. Spring, 7-21.
- Burnard, P. (2004) Transitions in creative learning: rethinking music education contexts. In Bartel, L (Ed.) *Questioning the Music Education Paradigm*, Alberta: Canadian Educator's Association, pp. 52-76.
- Burnard, P. (2004) Adolescent realities and changing perspectives on school music. In Shand, P. (Ed) *Music in Schools and Teacher Education Entering the 21st century*, International Society of Music Education (ISME), University of Western Australia Press, pp.91-97.
- Burnard, P. (2004) Pupil-teacher conceptions and the challenge of learning: Lessons from a Year 8 music classroom *Improving Schools*, 7 (1), 23-34.
- Burnard, P. & Younker, B.A (2004) Creativity and individual composing pathways: perspectives within a cross-cultural framework'. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(1), pp. 59-76.
- Burnard, P. (2004) Thinking about composing and learners' forms of representation. In Shand, P. (2004) (Ed) *Music in Schools and Teacher Education Entering the 21st century*, International Society for Music Education (ISME), University of Western Australia Press, pp.33-41.
- Cope, B and Kalantzis, M. (1993) (eds) *The Powers of Literacy: a Genre Approach to Teaching Writing* London: Falmer.
- Craft, A. & Jeffrey, B. (2004), 'Creative Practice and Practice which Fosters Creativity, in Miller, L. & Devereux, J. (Eds), *Supporting Learners' Learning in the Early Years*, London: David Fulton in association with The Open University.
- Craft, A. (2001), 'Little c Creativity' in Craft, A., Jeffrey, B., Leibling, M., *Creativity in Education*, London: Continuum (pp 45 – 61).
- Craft, A. (2005), *Creativity in Schools: Tensions and Dilemmas*, Oxford: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Craft, A., Burnard, P., Grainger, T. (2005), Reflections on Creative Learning, notes circulated to participants following international Symposium, *Documenting Creative Learning* at Cambridge University April 2005. Unpublished document.
- Craft, A., Burnard, T., Grainger, T., Woods, P. with Burns, D., Duffy, B., Leese, M., Keene, J., Haynes, L. (2005), Documenting Possibility Thinking. Paper presented at *Documenting Creative Learning Symposium: What, Why and How?* University of Cambridge, April 2005.
- Creative Partnerships (2005) website:
<http://www.creativepartnerships.com/aboutcp/cpphilosophy> (last accessed 21 July 05).

- D'Arcy, P. (1999) *Two Contrasting Paradigms for the Teaching and Assessment of Writing*, Leicester: National Association for the Teaching of English.
- Dillon, T. (2003). Collaborating and creating using music technologies. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39(8), 893-897.
- Dillon, T. (2004). It's in the mix baby: exploring how meaning is created within music technology collaborations. In D. Miell & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Collaborative Creativity, Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Free Association Books.
- Dillon, T. (forthcoming) Current and future practices: embedding collaborative music technologies in secondary schools. In J. Finney & P. Burnard (Eds.), *ICT and Music in the Secondary School*. Open University.
- DfEE (1998) *The National Literacy Strategy Framework for Teaching*, London: DfEE.
- DfEE (1999) *All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education*, London: DfEE.
- DfES (2003) *Excellence and Enjoyment: A Strategy for Primary Schools*, Nottingham: DfES.
- Dyson, A.H. (2001) 'Where are the childhoods in childhood literacy? An exploration in outer (school) space', *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 1(1): 9–38.
- Fairclough, N (1989) *Language and Power* Harlow Longman .
- Fautley, M. (2005). A new model of the group composing process of lower secondary school students. *Music Education Research*. 7(1), 39-58.
- Feldman, D. H. (1993). Cultural organisms in the development of great potential. *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments*. NJ: Louis Erlbaum, 225-251.
- Feldman, D.H. (1999). The development of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 169-188). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feldman, D.H., Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Gardner, H. (1994), *Changing the World*, Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. (1981) A cognitive process theory of writing *College composition and communication* 1(1) 120-160.
- Freedman, A. and Medway, P. (eds) (1994) *Learning and Teaching Genre* Portsmouth NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Gardner, H. (1982). *Art, Mind, and Brain*. New York: Basic Books.
- Glover, J. (2000). *Children Composing: 4-14*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Grainger, T., Gooch, K. and Lambirth, A. (2003) 'Playing the game called writing: learners' voice and view', *English in Education*, 37(2): 4–15.
- Grainger, T. Gooch, K. and Lambirth, A. (2005) *Creativity and Writing*:

- Developing Voice and Verve in the Classroom* London: Routledge.
- Graves, D. (1983) *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Griffiths, M. and Woolf, F. (2004), *Report on Creative Partnerships Nottingham Action Research*, Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.
- Hall, N. (1987) *The Emergence of Literacy* Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Halliday, M. (1978) *Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Hargreaves, D. & Galton, M. (1992) Hargreaves, D. J., & Galton, M. (1992). Aesthetic learning: Psychological theory and educational practice. In B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.), *The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing* (pp. 124-150). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press.
- Harste, J. C. Woodward V.A. and Burke,C.L. (1984) *Language Stories and Literacy Lessons* Portsmouth NH Heinemann.
- Hayes, J.R. and Flower,L.(1980) Identifying the organization of writing processes n L. Gregg and E. Steinberg(eds) *Cognitive Processes in Writing* NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jeffery, G. (Ed) (2005), *The Creative College: Building a Successful Learning Culture in the Arts*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Ltd.
- Jeffrey, B. (1997), Framing Creativity in Primary Classrooms. In Craft, A., Dugal, J., Dyer, G., Jeffrey, B. and Lyons, T. (1997), *Can You Teach Creativity?* Nottingham: Education Now.
- Jeffrey, B. & Woods, P. (2003), *The Creative School: A framework for success, quality and effectiveness*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Jeffrey, B. (2001), Challenging Prescription in Ideology and Practice: The Case of Sunny First School, in Collins, J., Insley, K., Soler, J. (Eds), *Developing Pedagogy: Researching Practice*, London: PCP Publications Ltd.
- Jeffrey, B. (2005), *Final Report of the Creative Learning and Student Perspectives Research Project (CLASP)* (A European Commission Funded project through the Socrates Programme, Action 6.1 Approved April 2005). London: Tufnell Press.
- Jeffrey, B. and Craft, A. (2003) Creative teaching and teaching for creativity: distinctions and relationships. Paper given at the *British Educational Research Association Special Interest Group in Creativity in Education Conference. 3rd February* (The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes).
- Jeffrey, B. & Craft, A. (2004), Teaching Creatively and Teaching for Creativity: Distinctions and Relationships, *Educational Studies*, Vol. 30, No.1, March 2004.
- Jeffrey, B. and Woods, P. (2003) *The Creative School: A Framework for Success, Quality and Effectiveness*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Kratus, J. (1989). A time analysis of the compositional processes used by children ages 7-11. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37(1), 5-20.
- Leung, B.W. & McPherson, G. (2003). Professional composers' and curriculum planners' perceptions about creativity in Hong Kong music programs. *Music Education International*, 1, 67-90.
- MacDonald, R. & Miell, D. (2000a). Creativity and Music Education: The Impact of Social Variables. *International Journal of Music Education*, 36, 58-68.
- MacDonald, R. & Miell, D. (2000b). Musical Conversations: Collaborating with a friend on creative tasks' In R. Joiner, K. Littleton, D. Faulkner & D. Miell (Eds.), *Rethinking Collaborative Learning* (pp. 65-78). London: Free Association Books.
- Marsh, K. (1995). Children's singing games: composition in the playground? *Research Studies in Music Education*, 4, 2-10.
- Marshall, S. (1963) *Creative Writing*, London: Macmillan.
- Maybury, B. (1967) *Writers' Workshop*, London: Batsford.
- Morgan, L., Hargreaves, D. & Joiner, R. (2000). Children's collaborative music composition: communication through music. In R. Joiner, K. Littleton, D. Faulkner & D. Miell *Rethinking collaborative learning*. (pp. 52-64). London: Free Association Books.
- Myhill, D. (2001) Crafting and creating, *English in Education*, 35(3): 13–20.
- National College for School Leadership (NCSL) (2005)
<http://www.ncsl.org.uk/index.cfm?pageid=randd-activities-creativity>
- Nystarnd, M. Greene, S. and Wiemelt, J. (1993) Where does composition studies come from ? An intellectual history *Written communication* 10(3) 267-333.
- Packwood, A. and Messenheimer, T. (2003) 'Back to the future: developing children as writers', in E. Bearn, H. Dombey and T. Grainger (eds) *Classroom Interactions in Literacy*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005a), *Creativity: Find it, promote It! – Promoting pupils' creative thinking and behaviour across the curriculum at key stages 1, 2 and 3 - practical materials for schools*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005b) website :
<http://www.ncaction.org.uk/creativity/about.htm>
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005c) *Taking English Forward* London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2006) website:
<http://www.qca.org.uk/14932.html>
- Ross, M. (1984). *The Aesthetic Impulse*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Savage, J. & Challis, M. (2001). Dunwich revisited: collaborative composition and performance with new technologies. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(2), 139-150.

Sawyer, K. (Ed.). (1997). *Creativity in Performance*. London: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Seddon, F. (2004). Cross-cultural collaborative computer-mediated composition in cyberspace. Paper presented at a conference *Musical Collaboration* of the Society for Education, Music and Psychology Research (SEMPRE), Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom, April, 2004.

Seddon, F. (forthcoming). Music e-learning environments; young people, composing and the internet. In J. Finney & P. Burnard (Eds.) *ICT and Music in the Secondary School*. Buckingham: Open University Press. (In Press).

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.

Sharples, M. (1996). An account of writing as creative design. In C.M. Levy and S. Ransdell (eds), *The Science of Writing – theories, methods, individual differences and applications* (pp9-28). Mahwa, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sharples, M. (1999), *How we write - writing as Creative Design*. London: Routledge.

Söderman, J. & Folkestad, G. (2004). How hip-hop musicians learn: strategies in informal creative music making. *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 298-313.

Spendlove, D. and Wyse, D. (2005), Definitions and Barriers: Teachers' Perceptions of Creative Learning. Presented at *International Symposium Documenting Creative Learning: What, How and Why?* University of Cambridge, April 2005.

Spendlove, D., Wyse, D., Craft, A. and Hallgarten, J. (2005) Creative Learning. Unpublished working document, May 2005.

Stauffer, S. (2002). Connections between the musical and life experiences of young composers and their compositions. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(4), 301-322.

Swanwick, K., & Tillman, J. (1986). The sequence of musical development: A study of learners' composition. *British Journal of Music Education*, 3(3), 305-339.

Vass, E. (2004a), Developing creative writing through peer collaboration. Paper given at *British Educational Research Association Conference*. UMIST, September 2004.

Vass, E. (2004b), Understanding collaborative creativity. An observational study of young children's classroom-based joint creative writing. In Miell, D. and Littleton, K. (Eds), *Collaborative Creativity*. London: Free Association Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society*, Harvard, MA: MIT Press.

- Woods, P. (1990), *Teacher Skills and Strategies*. London: Falmer Press.
- Webster, P. (2003) Asking music students to reflect on their creative work: Encouraging the revision process. In I. Yip, C. Leung & W. Tong Lau (Eds). *Curriculum Innovation in Music* (pp. 16-27.) The Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Wiggins, J. (2002). Creative process as meaningful musical thinking. In T. Sullivan & L. Willingham (Eds.), *Creativity and music education* (pp. 78-88). Canadian Music Educators' Association as the first in the Biennial Series: University of Alberta.
- Woods, P. and Jeffrey, B. (1996) *Teachable Moments: The Art of Creative Teaching in Primary Schools*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Wray, D. and Lewis, M. (1997) *Extending Literacy: children reading and writing Non fiction* London: Routledge.
- Wyse, D. and Jones, R. (2001) *Teaching English, Language and Literacy* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

APPENDIX 1: PICL PILOT research sites and partners

Researchers and Sites on PICL Pilot, Feb 2005 – Jan 2006

University Based Research Partners

Anna Craft The Open University A.R.Craft@open.ac.uk

Pam Burnard Cambridge University pab61@cam.ac.uk

Teresa Grainger Canterbury Christ Church University tmg2@cant.ac.uk

Researcher from August 2005

Kerry Chappell The Open University kerrychappell@btopenworld.com

Anchor teachers

1. Mrs. Jean Keene, Reception Teacher, Cunningham Hill Infants School, St Albans AL1 5QJ

Year 1 teacher

Angela Bettridge

2. Dawn Burns, Head Teacher/Y2 Teacher, Hackleton Primary School, Northampton, NN7 2AB
3. Dominic James, Assistant Head, North Walsham High School, Norfolk:
Dominic is the anchor link for Teacher Researchers in two schools:

North Walsham High School:

Andrea Ball, English Co-ordinator

Paul Blake, Music Teacher

North Walsham Primary School:

Mrs. Vivian Draper, Y6 Teacher,

Steering Group

Anna Craft, The Open University

Karen Littleton, The Open University

Dorothy Miell, The Open University

Peter Twining, The Open University

Eva Vass, University of Otago, New Zealand

APPENDIX 2: OVERALL RESEARCH DESIGN

Terms 05	Artefacts	Drawing	DP	Video (VSR)	Interview	Observation
Summer	1 x per learner (or one per learner evidencing making, performing, appraising processes?)	Include as appropriate as part of U/researcher visit			U/Researcher Visit- observation and interviews of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher • Pupils [with drawing] • C/Partner 	U/Researcher Visit: Creative Learning in class
Midterm Research Review					U/Researchers meet to review data from 5 sites. Data = EYrs and Primary: 3 teachers x 3 artefacts = 9 KS3 – 4: 1 teachers x 6 artefacts = 6 Total data set possibly 15 items	
Summer (end)	1 x per learner					
Collab Review June 20	Teacher brings evidence of at least 3 artefacts per learner	Teacher brings evidence of drawing		Teacher brings evidence of video data if they have it	U/Researchers and Anchor Teachers meet to interrogate data and to test findings from earlier review.	
Autumn	1 per learner	Include as appropriate as part of researcher visit			Researcher visits school. Observe and interview: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher • Pupils [with drawings] • C/Partner 	

Sites n = 5

Anchor Teachers n=4

Class Teachers n = 7

2 @ R -Yr1 (Jean Keene + Angela Bettridge)

1 @ Yr2 & Yr3 (Dawn Burns)

3 @ Yr 6 & Yr 7 (Vivian Draper + Music/English specialists)

1 @ Yr 9 & Yr10 (Dominic James + Music/English above)

0 @ Yr 11 & Yr 12 (Dominic James + Music/English as above)

Total 4 anchor teachers; 3 'onward' teachers

Pupils

3 Foundation to KS1

3 KS1 to KS2

3 KS2 to KS3

up to 6 KS3 to KS4

up to 6 and beyond

= up to 21 pupils

2. Multiple Case study: Type of Case study is Educational Case Study

We are therefore employing case study methods which involve the collection and recording of data about a case or cases (9 per pupil). We are studying the particularity and complexity of a single case. In other words we are investigating Creative Learning as evidenced through:

- a. artefacts of each learner as representations of events i.e. making, presenting, appraising) and coming to understand its activity within important circumstances (through compositional activities e.g. Music and Writing) (Stake, 1995; Stenhouse, 1988; Stake, 2000);
- b. Reflection on these artefacts by children, teachers and creative partners using various strategies (see Section 2.1)
- c. Teacher / learner / creative partner led observations of classroom work
- d. University researcher/ researcher led observations of children, teachers and creative partners working, and interviews with each

What is important here is the:

- 'particularity' (a case or cases)
- collecting and recording data
- contextual understanding
- illuminating complexity and complex issues at work
- reporting and presenting the findings

Educational Case Study is a type of case study which focuses on the understanding of the educational action. What we are concerned with in this study is 'to enrich the thinking and discourse of educators either by the development of educational theory or by the refinement or prudence through the systematic and reflective documentation of experience' (Stenhouse, 1988, p. 50).

In addition we are working collaboratively with the teachers as mediators of interpretation and thus as co-researchers.

2.1 Artefact Collection Techniques i.e. Reflective Documentation of Creative Learning

1. **Collection of pupils' compositional work in writing and music** (evidenced through processes of making, performing, appraising)
2. **Artefacts can include evidence from contexts** of 'making', 'performing' & 'appraising'
3. **Artefacts can be collected and documented in the form of:**
Objects (could include written work and audio recording) with written or audio account

2.2 Strategies for reflection

These may include:

1. Critical incident charting
2. Stimulated Recall
3. Video Stimulated Recall
4. Talk and draw technique
5. Draw and write technique
6. Photojournalism

2.3 School-led observation strategies

These may be led by teacher, creative partners and children as appropriate; such decisions to be made by teacher researchers in consultation with University researchers. Methods include:

1. Video documentation with reflections
2. DP = Digital Photos with reflections
3. Drawings = with reflections – all will do this (see schedule on first page)

APPENDIX 3: INFORMATION SHEET GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS



The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA

Tel: (01908) 652652 (office) or (01582) 761531 (home)
Email: creativity-in-education@open.ac.uk or
A.R.Craft@open.ac.uk

Open Creativity Centre

www.opencreativity.open.ac.uk

PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING (PICL) PILOT STUDY BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR HEADS, TEACHERS, PARENTS, PUPILS

This study seeks to explore ways of documenting and understanding Progression in Creative Learning from Foundation Stage through to Key Stage 4 (five cohorts in all), which runs across the Summer and Autumn terms of 2005, finishing at the end of November. The target subject areas are composition in English and Music, with an ICT dimension where possible. We will be following three pupils in each of the five cohorts, from May until November. It will involve:

- Each teacher collecting a small number of samples of learners' work in the summer and autumn terms (advice will be provided on what kinds of things to select and when; the material should evidence the processes of making, performing and appraising)
- Each focus teacher completing a reflective commentary sheet on all data.
- A collaborative review day to look at this data on June 20th (venue to be confirmed – probably central London)
- Two visits to the classroom by a member of the research team (one in the early Summer term and one in the early Autumn term), to meet with each of the three target children, to interview the teachers involved in English and music composition with them, and to undertake observations.

On the practical side, PICL PILOT will provide supply cover for the focus teachers at up to £120 per day for:

- Four days in total to be spread each of the Spring, Summer and Autumn terms, to enable you to collect and analyse data in school with others where that is appropriate. **We will expect the teacher to complete a reflective commentary on the learners' work within this time.** We may also be able to fund more days later.
- One further day of supply cover for the Review Meeting on 20th June. If a second review meeting is arranged we will provide supply cover for that too.

Where the review meeting/s mean teachers have to travel, we will cover travel and subsistence. All data will be treated as confidential and any reporting will be anonymised.

**Anna Craft, (Open University) Teresa Grainger(Canterbury Christ Church University College) and Pam Burnard (Cambridge University)
PICL PILOT Research Partners**



The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA

Tel: (01908) 652652 (office) or (01582) 761531 (home)
Email: creativity-in-education@open.ac.uk or
A.R.Craft@open.ac.uk

Open Creativity Centre

www.opencreativity.open.ac.uk

APPENDIX 4: PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

Progression in Creative Learning (PICL) Pilot Project
Consent Form for Head Teachers, Teachers, Parents and Children
MARCH 2005

1. I have read and had explained to me details relating to the PICL Pilot project (on Information Sheet).
2. I have had explained to me the purposes of the pilot project and what will be required of teachers and pupils. I agree to the arrangements described in the Information Sheet.
3. I authorise that the data be used for research purposes as long as anonymity in print is guaranteed.

Head Teacher: _____ Signature: _____

Focus Teacher: _____ Signature: _____

Parent / Carer: _____ Signature: _____

Pupil: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX 5: Reflective Commentary Sheet: PICL PILOT

Teacher:

School:

Date:

Learner:

Age:

Context and Activity: English/Music/ICT

	<i>What was this pupil doing DURING the activity?</i>	<i>Reflecting on pupil learning AFTER the activity</i>
<i>Making</i>		
<i>Performing</i>		
<i>Appraising</i>		

APPENDIX 6: University Researcher Draw Task Prompts

Lesson Focus	Learner	Age	Date	Context

Focus of Talk and Draw task: What is the learner’s ‘explanation’ of the process (which raises issues of individual differences)
We are examining the generative process and attempting to identify compositional sequences, aspects of the experience and probe issues concerning what is distinctive about the learner’s stance/ the kind of approach (e.g. enactive/reflective/feelingful). How did they get the first idea? How did they connect ideas from beginning to middle? How did they develop ideas? Were there specific feelings, story, images or emotions, sounds, ideas central to the piece?

Questions for Foundation-KS2 Can you draw the story of your composition?
Can you draw the journey you took to make this piece?
Can you draw the path you took to make this piece?

APPENDIX 7: Extent of data set for Final Report

Note: learners' names have been changed

TRANCHES 1 and 2

Foundation Stage (R): Cunningham Hill

5.5.05 UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL COMPOSITION

Interviews with:

1. Grace
2. Lucy
3. Imram

Informal discussion with teacher

Late May 05 TEACHER DATA MUSICAL COMPOSITION

Teacher's evidence and notes on later MUSICAL COMPOSITION activity with Grace, Lucy, Imram.

23.6.05 UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Observational photographs

Interviews/Draw task with

1. Grace
2. Lucy
3. Imram

Informal discussion with teacher

Draw Task and imaginative play which led to it, has been recorded and transcribed.

Key Stage 1 (Y2): Hackleton

27.05.05 UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL AND WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Observation of both

Interview, transcribed with:Cherry about her writing

Drawing task also transcribed with Cherry, Andrew and Briony

Interview taped and transcribed with teacher

Taped collaborative music composition and transcribed with Andrew, Briony and Cherry

June 20th discussion with teacher and receipt of 1 set of complete data for written composition and musical composition for Cherry, Andrew and Briony. Teacher has completed reflective commentary on each of these 6 pieces and has taken related photos and provided a CD of their work to contextualise it. Work also discussed with researcher and notes made.

Key Stage 2 (Y6): North Walsham Primary School

EARLY JUNE: UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT, OBSERVATION OF MUSIC SESSION (nb no composition occurred, hence re-visit in July)

Interviews with:

Toby

Fiona

John

Mrs Vivian Draper, Y6 teacher

Video data captured

JUNE: FIRST SET TEACHER DATA RECEIVED (ENGLISH)

This data was however received without reflective commentary; attempts to provide this through other means have failed, thus English data set aside for now. No Musical Composition data was received from this teacher.

MID JULY: UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT, OBSERVATION OF FURTHER MUSICAL COMPOSITION

Video stimulated recall with pupils of previous visit

Interviews with

Toby

Fiona

John

Mrs Vivian Draper

Further video of pupils, this time engaged in musical composition collected.

Key Stage 3 (Y9): North Walsham High School

UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER VISIT TO NORTH WALSHAM HIGH SCHOOL, EARLY JUNE.

Observation of English and Music lessons (video recorded)

Interviews with

1. Kevin Year 9 boy
2. Stewart Year 9 boy
3. English Teacher
4. Tara Year 9 boy
5. Louis Year 9 boy
6. Music teacher

Dominic James, Assistant Head

MID JUNE TEACHER DATA (ENGLISH) RECEIVED

This data was, like the Y6 data, received without reflective commentary. Discussion with teacher during data surgery addressed this issue.

No first-tranche data has been received from the Music teacher for Y9.

TRANCHE 3

Key Stage 1 (Yr 1): Cunningham Hill

2.11.05 RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL + WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Interviews with:

1. Grace
2. Lucy

Interview with Angela Bettridge, onward teacher, music specialist teacher, Philip Bainbridge and informal discussion with Jean Keene, anchor teacher.

Participant observation with fieldnotes of music and written composition.

Digital photos taken of case students, their artefacts and the site.

Key Stage 2 (Yr 3): Hackleton

19.10.05 RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL + WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Interviews with:

1. Cherry
2. Anthony
3. Briony

Interview with Dawn Burns, anchor teacher.

Participant observation with fieldnotes and video capture of music and written composition.

Collection of written + music composition artefacts.

Key Stage 3 (Yr 7): North Walsham High

27.9.05 RESEARCHER VISIT WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Interviews with

1. Toby
2. John
(Fiona, ill)

Interview with Andrea Ball, English teacher.

Participant observation of English class with fieldnotes and digital photo capture.

Written composition artefacts collected.

18.10.05 RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL COMPOSITION

Interviews with

1. Toby
2. John
(Fiona, ill)

Interview with Paul Blake, music teacher.

Participant observation of music class with fieldnotes and video capture.

Mini disc recording of musical composition received on a later date for Toby and John.

Key Stage 4 (Yr 10): North Walsham High

27.9.05 RESEARCHER VISIT WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Interviews with

1. Tara
2. Louis
3. Clive

Interview with Andrea Ball, English teacher.

Participant observation of English class with fieldnotes.

Written composition artefacts collected.

18.10.05 RESEARCHER VISIT MUSICAL COMPOSITION

Interview with:

1. Kevin
2. Stewart

Interview with Paul Blake, music teacher.

Mini disc recording of musical composition received on a later date for Kevin and Stewart.

No teacher reflections were received for Tranche 3.

An overview of this dataset, also given in main text as Table 4 follows overleaf.

Tranche 1 Spring 05 Collected by Teachers and by University Researchers	Tranche 2 Summer 05 Collected by Teachers	Tranche 3 Autumn 05 Collected by Researcher
FS Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Jean Keane @ Cunningham Hill)	FS Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Jean Keane @ Cunningham Hill)	
KS1 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)	KS1 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)	KS1 Grace, Laury, Imram Music + English (Teacher: Angela Bettridge @ Cunningham Hill)
KS2 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teacher: Vivian Draper @ North Walsham Junior)	KS2 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teacher: Vivian Draper @ North Walsham Junior)	KS2 Cherry, Anthony, Briony Music + English (Teacher: Dawn Burns @ Hackleton)
KS3 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS3 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball)	KS3 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS3 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball)	KS3 Toby, Fiona, John Music + English (Teachers: Paul Blake + Andrea Ball @ North Walsham High)
		KS4 Kevin, Stewart Music (Teacher: Paul Blake @ North Walsham High) KS4 Tara, Louis, Clive English (Teacher: Andrea Ball @ North Walsham High)

APPENDIX 8: PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK AT INTERIM REPORT

Sixth Draft, 21 July 05; emerging from co-analysis

CONTEXTUAL FACTORS and CONDITIONS	English / Music Composition Process	English /Music Composition Skills	English / Music Composition Knowledge	Learner Stance	QCA Framework
BOTH SUBJECTS	BOTH SUBJECTS	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	These perhaps boil down to the question: What degree (and nature) of personal involvement is there?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning and challenging what they see around them and what they already know to be the case. • Making connections, seeing relationships between ideas, entities, • Envisaging what might be – possibility thinking, using imagination • Exploring ideas, keeping options open – having enough time to continue an exploration • Reflecting critically on ideas, actions, outcomes; both their own and those of others.
<p>Contextual factors:</p> <p>time</p> <p>informed observation, documentation and sensitive provocation</p> <p>gender</p> <p>multi modality</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <p>Experiencing unknown</p> <p>Risk taking encouraged</p> <p>Collaboration</p> <p>Learning leap</p>	<p>Agency</p> <p>Immersion</p> <p>Playfulness</p> <p>Intention</p> <p>Insightfulness</p> <p>Generating ideas</p> <p>Capturing ideas</p> <p>Taking risks</p> <p>Committing ideas</p> <p>Reviewing ideas</p> <p>How did they approach composing? Brainstorming, drafting, redrafting, editing, recording/saving and polishing or publishing, <u>find</u>, <u>focus</u>, <u>fix</u>, <u>finalise</u>, re-inventing from new or old.</p>	<p>Using tools of composition such as : varied sentence structure, paragraphing, punctuation and orthographic conventions</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Memory (extent of repetition will effect ability to replicate, development, exploration)</p> <p>Performance skills</p> <p>Use of musical materials to develop ideas</p> <p>Symbolisation</p> <p>Compositional skills (e.g. composition-listening; performance-listening)</p> <p><i>Ongoing question: Are there general skills of composition that can be viewed and taught as progressive or are skills much more individualised and specialist?</i></p>	<p>Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form)</p> <p>Knowledge of audience and purpose(function)</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Tonal and stylistic knowledge</p> <p>Compositional forms & sound structures</p> <p>Medium selection and use</p> <p>Use of compositional devices</p> <p>Transformation, extension and development of ideas</p> <p>Knowledge of how sounds communicate or express</p> <p>Musical materials</p> <p>Musical elements</p> <p>Organisational features/form</p>	<p>Might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - self-determination - autonomy - agency - intentions - inspiration - goals - judgements - reflectiveness - being enactive - persistence - toleration of ambiguity - open attitude 	

(QCA, 2005a, 2005bⁱⁱ)

APPENDIX 9PICL PILOT Analysis Procedure 18 September 2005

1. Defining the case = DONE = i. each artefact (surrounding data) ii. each KS iii. Each learner
2. Steps in the analysis:
 1. Using one artefact (i.e. one written or musical composition) as minicase, conduct a CONTENT ANALYSIS of the composition – DESCRIBE THE PRODUCT/ARTEFACT . . . what KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS are evidenced?
 2. Using raw field notes, taken during OBSERVATIONS, - i.e. written up fieldnotes - what supports or contradicts or informs otherwise, this analysis? What people, events or PROCESSES were OBSERVED. What were the main themes or issues evidenced along the path to completion?
 3. Using INTERVIEW DATA FROM LEARNER. . . what supports or contradicts or informs otherwise, this analysis? Using INTERVIEW data – the words as the basic medium, note the nature of the JOURNEY, from the learners' perspective.
 4. Using the data from the TEACHER INTERVIEWS AND REFLECTIVE COMMENTARY, document the 'making', 'presenting' and 'appraising' featured from the data from the teachers perspective
 5. LEARNER STANCE – return to the same data and fill out a document summary form which can be attached to the document it refers to, re. the salient points about 'learner stance'.
 6. Using QCA pedagogical qualities AS CODES (e.g. making connections, posing questions. . .), and drawing upon previous document analysis of artefact, interview and observation, illustrate in a table, how/when these were evident.

APPENDIX 10: PROGRESSION IN CREATIVE LEARNING – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK Eighth Draft, January 06

BACKGROUND:

Includes how task and product-outcome contextualised, wider climate of classroom / lesson, how time was used, modes of engagement (extent of multi-modality), extent to which learning leap involved/expected, role of enjoyment, staff communication / collaboration.

Task ¹⁶	Product Outcome ¹⁷	English / Music Composition Process	English/Music Composition Skills	English/ Music Composition Knowledge	Learner Stance	Teacher Stance	QCA Framework (2005a, 2005b ⁱⁱⁱ)
		<p>BOTH SUBJECTS</p> <p>Learner engagement w. process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Immersion - Playfulness - Intention <p>The Composition process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generating ideas - Capturing ideas - Sharing ideas - Committing ideas - Reviewing / judging ideas 	<p>ENGLISH</p> <p>Using tools of composition such as:</p> <p>varied sentence structure, paragraphing, punctuation and orthographic conventions</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Memory (extent of repetition will effect ability to replicate, development, exploration)</p> <p>Performance skills</p> <p>Using musical materials to develop ideas</p> <p>Symbolisation</p> <p>Composition-listening</p> <p>Performance-listening</p>	<p>ENGLISH</p> <p>Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form)</p> <p>Role of memory, significance of repetition vs novelty/improvisation (knowledge first, composition next?)</p> <p>Knowledge of audience and purpose (function)</p> <p>Understanding of appropriateness by pupils</p> <p>MUSIC</p> <p>Knowledge of text structure/organisation. (form)</p> <p>Knowledge of audience and purpose(function)</p>	<p>(clustered characteristics)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - self-determination - agency - intentionality - persistence - toleration of ambiguity - enactive - reflectiveness - open attitude 	<p><u>Toward</u></p> <p>knowledge and learning,</p> <p>creativity/ creative learning</p> <p>teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</p> <p>learner</p> <p>Stance towards professionals</p> <p>curriculum</p> <p>interaction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning and challenging • Making connections, seeing relnships of ideas, entities. • Envisaging what might be – possibility thinking, using imagination [imagining, also being imaginative] • Exploring ideas, keeping options open • Reflecting critically on ideas, actions, outcomes; both their own and those of others. <p>+ Risk taking</p>

¹⁶ Tasks were simply logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression was implied in tasks set.

¹⁷ Product outcomes were again logged, for later analysis to consider the extent to which progression could be detected.

APPENDIX 11: DATA ANALYSIS REPRESENTATION TABLES

TABLE A: MUSIC OVERVIEW

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
Grace Recept (Cun/ Hill)	Compose rhythm for others to repeat	Production of two pieces for repetition; first being a rhythm, second being a song.	Children's ideas scaffolded	Instrument - -selection/use M/Materials – rhythmic.structure M/elements – structure, patterns	listening performing memory perception generative	<i>Making</i> music play generating capturing sharing committing	agency self determination intentional being enactive persistence openness
Grace Yr 1 (Cunningham Hill)	In groups, use instruments and body percussion to represent sounds of fireworks in song	Photos	Child centred Non-interventionist	Instrument - -selection/use M/Materials – rhythmic.structure M/elements – structure, patterns	listening performing memory perception generative	<i>Creating</i> music play generating capturing working cooperatively committing find-fix ideas	agency self determination intentional being enactive persistence openness
Cherry Yr 2 (Hackleton)	Group compose music to reflect Lydia Grace's train journey	Graphic score	As above +Modelling	Instrument - -selection/use /control/ practice M/Materials – rhythmic.structure M/elements – structure, duration, timbre, dynamics	As above + Symbolization -invent their own sound representation - memory+	<i>Creating</i> music play generating capturing working cooperatively +guided review +questioning	agency self-determination intentional being enactive persistence openness <u>+a little reflective</u>
Cherry Yr 3 (Hack/on)	Group compose/notate/perform arrangement of Greensleeves. Instrument selection open.	Score + video of composition to accompany the tune of Greensleeves and accompany music on the laptop. ??? data	As above +Adult-as-standard model +connection making. +progression +awareness of being creative +higher expectations	As above plus Expressive purpose -genre - new cultural contexts Instruments - playing - performance - +practice - use of established model	symbolization+ representation+ memory+ performative+ motor coordination ensemble	<i>Making</i> music play generating capturing working cooperatively +questioning	agency self-determination intentional being enactive persistence openness <u>reflectiveness+</u> evaluation

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
John in Yr 6 (North Walsham Junior)	In groups, compose music expressing a storm to accompany part of Kensuke's Kingdom	Paired piece for guiro and drum (Jack). Three part structure with expressive use of dynamics and tempo.. No scoring.	As above Cooperative Collaborative Creativity = producing something beyond the obvious	As above +form +contrast + closure Instruments+ + control +practice	Listening Performing Memory Perception Generative Performative Ensemble	<i>Creating</i> music Play; generating Capturing; working individually;sometimes cooperatively sometimes collaboratively	agency self-determination intentional being enactive persistence openness+ agency <u>reflectiveness+</u> evaluation
John in Yr 7 (North Walsham High)	Compose a repeating pattern as part of a group.	Using e/keyboard and backing track, Clear contrasting closing section	Awareness of individual differences/ what is salient about student musical background/ motivation	<u>As above+</u> + repetition + contrast + form, accompanying each other in rhythm, knowledge of dynamics, structure of piece of music. memory	Listening+ Performing+ Memory+ Perception+ Generative Performative+ Ensemble+ <u>Skills+</u>	<i>Creating & making</i> -more collaborative connections, generating	(-) agency self-determination (+) intentional being enactive persistence(+ challenge -less openness?) <u>+reflectiveness+</u> +evaluation+
Kevin in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)	Remix, recording of Axel F. samples; editing, selecting appropriate samples to 'fit'; analysis; revising, refining ideas	Developed understanding. Move between individual-group-individual; traditional to digital techniques.	Knowledge/skillp rominence Less agency More self determination <u>Time</u> and space and resources for learning crucial	+++ICT Developed understanding of musical elements, particularly role of texture, role of harmony in melody and accompaniment; role of expressive selection of timbres, style, remixing, editing, selection, rearranging. +++Symbolic forms +++the ability to use symbols to convey meaning takes a specific form in musical knowledge	As above PLUS ICT medium/genre Remixing Editing Selecting Refining Recording	As above PLUS <u>+reviewing</u> Perform individually <u>knowledge + skills</u> applied specifically to <u>generating ideas</u> <u>- less play</u> + focus on performative and generative skills	(-) agency self-determination (++) intentional being enactive persistence(+ challenge -less openness?) <u>+reflectiveness+</u> +evaluation+ '+ individual creativity + adolescent context/identity +symbols - little negotiation
Kevin in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)	Compose a 2 part melody	Advanced use of harmony applied to writing a two part melody; emphasis on counterpoint)	-more structured approach -development in knowledge, skills and understanding	more sophisticated forms of musical knowledge + particularly its technical and theory-based and technical aspects	- mechanical, preascribed staged approach - technical and theory-based development	As above -less exploratory -more structured --development of technical ability in composing and performing	+ individual creativity + adolescent context/identity the ability to use symbols - little negotiation

**TABLE B
ANALYSIS OF MUSIC CASE DATA AGAINST QCA CREATIVITY FRAMEWORK**

Learner	Asking Questions	Making Connections	Imagining	Exploration	Critical Reflection
Grace (Reception)		Making connections to previous musical events/experiences	Recognising possibilities Generating alternatives	Exploring sounds and sound sources and patterns	Selection Self-correction
Grace (Yr 1)		Making connections between text, sound, image from life experience	Generating ideas Envisaging what might be Suggesting possibilities	Exploring sounds and sound sources and patterns	Choosing and reflecting
Cherry (Yr 2)	Teacher modelled questioning after performances Some questioning modelled	Connecting past and present contexts to identify what next to do	Envisaging what might be Suggesting possibilities Suggesting alternatives	Exploring sounds, sound sources, patterns, and expressive options	Personal & collaborative review of options Guided reflection by teacher's use of modelling
Cherry (Yr 3)	Some questioning of effectiveness of ideas; parts to whole	Links to prior activities New knowledge created in use of symbols	Envisaging what might be/ generating alternative possibilities	Exploring sounds, and appropriateness of musical materials	Some critical /evaluative reflection with and through peers. Degree unknown
John (Yr 6)	Questioning re use of instruments g	Making connections between instrument choices in his piece and another Seeing relationships between ideas	Suggesting possibilities Generating alternatives Envisaging sound effects to stories and imaginative play	Exploring own and others ideas, options, possibilities	Focusing and then refocusing as strategy to keep others on task. Judges quality and goodness of ideas and peers
John (Yr 7)	Questioning and challenging in the group what they had already created	Making connections between his ideas, those of others and his part played in collaborations	Imagining, going beyond the actual, to create new parts to his story	Exploring his own and others' ideas	Reflecting critically on his own ideas + other people's ideas without fixing them
Kevin (Yr 9)	Questioning and challenging evidenced in use of ICT	Making clear connections between his music knowledge and ways of expressing in music at home and school,.	Generating solutions Imagining appropriateness of fit Awareness of expressive constraints		Reflecting critically on compositions made in school and home

Kevin (Yr 10)	Questioning and challenging	Making connections, seeing relationships – evidenced within drafting process	Generating solutions Imagining appropriateness of fit		Reflecting critically on ideas
--------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

TABLE C: WRITING OVERVIEW

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
Grace Rec (Cunningham Hill)	Play in paper submarine, later drawing/ description.	Two single clause sentences.	Expecting engagement to be multi-modal, personal exploration within a teacher-provided structure, developing pupil ownership and perspective and involving where appropriate collaboration with others (to include written composition element).	Form and function, appropriate tools, expressed time. Very aware of need to have knowledge of spellings in order to get ideas down.	Manipulated sentence structure to relate relationships between people and between objects. Full stops.	Immersion and hands on play used to generate, capture and review ideas.	Agency and intention open attitude, enactive Tolerant of ambiguity Reflectiveness
Grace Yr 1 (Cunningham Hill)	Discussing fireworks, drawing and writing sounds Task below child's ability	Drawing of a firework and writing its sounds.	Expecting multi modal engagement, determining structure and freedom, valuing children's ownership, and perspective, collaboration and cross curricular potential.	Appropriate sounds. Knowledge of function unclear.	Use of descriptive phrases.	Some immersion, playfulness, generating` and capturing.	Agency and intention, open attitude, enactive, reflectiveness. There is marked difference in the scope of these when she talks about writing at home.
Cherry Yr 2 (Hackleton)	Write fictional postcard in role based on very well known tale and characters.	Retelling events, describing fictional activities.	Expects creative engagement, offers multi-modal immersion as preparation, talk as a precursor too. Autonomy and persistence expected and a fully integrated approach adopted.	Appropriate format, composition language and tone. Inventiveness. Aware of using her knowledge of both process and product, well articulated.	Some correct punctuation and spelling. Descriptive words.	Immersion and intention, playful, generating from reading activities, capturing, and reviewing.	Agency and intention, self determination and reflectiveness.
Cherry Yr 3 (Hackleton)	Letter set in Tudor times, preparation involved Tudor dance, discussion of an example as a class and in pairs	Retelling fictional events, describing scenes and people.	Expects improvement in ability to explore ideas including reading, reviewing, remembering + research skills. Learning viewed as lifelong, experiential + collaborative. Also conscious of need to	Appropriate format, and content, attempts to use given Tudor phrases. Function clear, consciously draws on content knowledge of Tudors.	Punctuation and correct spelling evident. Use of descriptive phrases and words. Some Tudor terms not quite approp. employed.	Immersion and intention, playing with language, generating and selecting ideas, committing and capturing.	Agency and intention, self-determination and reflectiveness. Persistence: challenged herself to risk using Tudor terminology.

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
			interpret + be flexible with NC to be creative.				

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
John in Yr 6 (North Walsham Junior)	Storm poem using episodic structure expressively. Multi-modal preparation, use of body, structural and verb support.	Short rhyming storm poem and draft of poem ideas.	Sees creativity as universal, needing boundaries and humour and child initiative, also takes a cross curricular approach and profiles learning through senses.	Appropriate structure and rhyming, but no knowledge of rhythm shown.	Appropriate punctuation, misuse of capitals , some descriptive words.	Generating ideas Play, intention, committing and capturing ideas. Learning to review through reading + responding.	Agency and intention, enactive, self – determination.
John in Yr 7 (North Walsham High)	Shaping a narrative draft with an autobiographical slant. In 3s an interview to get ideas about character	Early draft and initial thoughts	Specific frames tasks used to increase knowledge, interactive teaching, focus on audience and reviewing. Sees NC as problematic and restrictive.	Past and present tense, authorial perspective, structure, style, and conventions. Awareness of greater emphasis on knowledge about structure.	Application of verb distinction (some misuse of meanings), paragraphs and sentence structure .Spelling + punctuation not strong (NB Jack is dyslexic).	Generating, capturing and sharing ideas. Intentionality inconsistent. Immersion. Plan, generate and commit ideas, check punctuation, review.	Lack of choice reduced self-determination and enaction. Tolerance of ambiguity and open attitude fostered. Emphasis on exploring and reflecting on ideas. Collaborative work prompted sharing responsibility for own and others work encouraging persistence.

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
Louis in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)	Film review + trailer Class identifies	Coursework folder contains	Teacher source of standard setting for	Approp. language style, awareness of audience.	Approp. sentence structure, length	Immersion, generating ideas	Self-determination enactive

Learner	Task	Product Outcome	Teacher Stance	Knowledge	Skill	Process	Learner Stance
	sales points , watched and discussed films, put ideas into a plan.	number of drafts.	style, modelling idea generation. Clear that space needs to be given for individually preferred mode of engagement.	Appropriate length relating to snappy review used.	and style. Developed use of punctuation. Skill in reviewing drafts, connected to knowledge and use of corrections to improve successive drafts.	during reviewing, sharing and committing. Questioning and challenging others' opinions. Multimodal process.	reflectiveness Importance of multimodality: allowed individuals to engage in ways that suited them. Aware of the need to persist
Louis in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)	Detective story. Visualisation, students establish ideas for their acharacter.		Sees freedom and constraint in task, perceives transition as moving from structure/prescription to more freedom; simplicity to complexity. Perceives teachers need to work with individuals, but time constraints. Teacher models individual creativity as solo process	Imagining, planning, brainstorming and language style for a detective story with awareness of audience. Teacher's perspective mediates the role that knowledge of genres, conventions and style play in composition.	Appropriate genre, text length/style for story.	Intentionality and immersion. Generating and committing ideas, aware of creative process.	Agency, self-determination, self aware and conscious of developing identity as a writer and commitment to this. Persistence shown.

TABLE D: ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH DATA AGAINST QCA CREATIVITY FRAMEWORK

Learner	Asking Questions	Making Connections	Imagining	Exploration	Critical Reflection
Grace (Rec)		Making connections to life	Imagining/hypothesising/pretending	Exploring resource and words	Selection and reflection
Grace (YR 1)		Making connections between text, sound, image from life experience	Envisaging what might be , suggesting possibilities	Exploring possible sounds	Choosing and reflecting
Cherry (Yr2)		Connecting to work on text over the term	Imagining and empathising with fictional reader of letter	Hands on exploration	Personal evaluative reflection also prompted by teacher
Cherry (Yr3)		Cross curricular connections	Envisaging what might be/ generating alternative possibilities	Exploring language	Critical reflection with and through peers
John (Yr 6)	Questioning and challenging in debate and through role play for other case studies, less so for Jack	Making connections between ideas in his story, and between different subject area approaches to creative learning	Possibility thinking	Exploring options and others' ideas	Critical examination of text
John (Yr 7)	Questioning and challenging in the group what they had already created	Making connections between his ideas, those of others and his story	Imagining, going beyond the actual, to create new parts to his story	Exploring his own and others' ideas	Reflecting critically on his own ideas + other people's ideas without fixing them
Louis (Yr9)	Questioning and challenging evidenced in debating	Making connections, seeing relationships – evidenced within drafting process of review, as ideas are put down, take shape	Generating ideas	Examining options	Reflecting critically and evaluating ideas

		and are connected together.			
Louis (Yr10)	Questioning and challenging	Making connections, seeing relationships – evidenced within visualisation and drafting process	Imagining options	Examining choices	Reflecting critically on ideas

TABLE E: CHILDREN’S AWARENESS OF ROLE OF INTERACTION DURING COMPOSITIONAL PROCESS

Learner	Their sense of the role of interaction during compositional process
<p>Grace in Recep (Cunningham Hill)</p>	<p>Working in purposeful collaboration (eng) - child taking lead role in collaboration (mus + eng) - collaboration using verbal sounding board /Equal collaboration with similar roles (eng) Within wider network of interaction/ gleaning ideas from around them (eng)</p> <p>Exchange also shows children debating how to collaborate</p>
<p>Grace in Yr 1 (Cunningham Hill)</p>	<p>‘Glean’ ideas from each other/ network of interaction and seem aware of doing this. (mus)</p> <p>Group misleading - Q of group pushing music product in the wrong direction – to one child appropriateness matters + to another it doesn’t. (mus)</p> <p>Leader/follower relationship discussed by child (general)</p> <p>Collaboration quite competitive (to do them better than Laury) (eng)</p> <p>Children perceive adults as source of sounding board too – mummy + daddy at home (in Recep = Mrs Keene as source too) (eng)</p>
<p>Cherry in Yr 2 (Hackleton)</p>	<p>Complementary creative collaboration (mus) Awareness of collaboration using verbal sounding board (mus) Awareness of collaboration using verbal sounding board, for act of generating ideas (eng)</p>
<p>Cherry in Yr 3 (Hackleton)</p>	<p>Purposeful collaboration to generate ideas (mus) Sharing and collaborating and reviewing/judging as a class (eng + mus) (more evidence of this than above) Class collaboration to generate ideas/ + glean ideas from wider network (eng) Peer partner collaboration for evaluation and selection of ideas (eng)</p>
<p>John in Yr 6 (North Walsham Junior)</p>	<p>Awareness of cumulative creative work with others over time. (mus) Teacher recognises child as aware of complementary roles in creative collaboration (mus) Awareness of working collaboratively to evaluate + improve work/ gleaning from others too (mus) Aware of complementary collaborating (idea generator + planner) on story itself(eng)</p>
<p>John in Yr 7 (North Walsham High)</p>	<p>Awareness of working collaboratively to improve quality of ideas for story. (eng) Awareness of potential for group misleading/ negatively influencing outcome (eng) Actively generating ideas (eng) Collaborative work raises the expectation by having responsibility for someone else’s work too. (general) Trying out different ways of collaborating (mus) Working on how to collaborate (general) Shows insight into mechanism for collaboration/ evaluating + refining collaboratively Insight into differences in responsibility between working on own + collaboration (mus)</p>

Learner	Their sense of the role of interaction during compositional process
	Aware of tension within dynamics of collaboration
Louis in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)	Aware of wider network of interaction + use of teacher for gleaning ideas and feedback.
Louis in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)	Researcher comment - Emphasis on their peer network when making decisions about writing preference – the social context is crucial factor in the behaviour of adolescents
Kevin in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)	Sharing, gleaning ideas from networks of interaction as source for ideas/examples. Interaction occurs through peer pressure/ peer judgement/ self appraisal
Kevin in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)	Collaborative issues; self-determination, individual creativity preferred at Year 10. Sensitive to peer partner COLLABORATION and evaluation. INTERACTION not perceived as source for ideas/examples. Little evidence of cooperative awareness in school Much evidence of cooperative awareness, roles and creative/cultural processes as 'seen' as the 'things' of band culture Recognition of pieces and genres of music – manifestation of 'pride' associated with sharing musical pleasure; an enjoyment not shared in school music The satisfaction he feels as a band member (allegiance/trust)

TABLE F: LEARNER STANCE

Learner	Learner stance
Grace R	<p>Demonstrates evidence of: <u>agency</u> and <u>intention</u> and <u>being enactive</u> (in organising others as well as herself) <u>open attitude</u>, (aware that she has choices) <u>autonomy</u> (working at length and with concentration) <u>Toleration of ambiguity</u> (easy transitions across multiple foci in multi modal play) <u>Reflectiveness</u> (she talks aloud about the quality of her drawing, deciding when it is complete) <i>Persistence less evident</i></p>
Grace Y1	<p>Demonstrates evidence of : <u>intentionality</u> <u>self-determination</u> <u>agency</u> <u>persistence</u> Through her engagement with tasks and the comments she makes during interview about these (although the scope of all of these appears to be much greater in writing done at home judging by what she says in her interview) We also have evidence of: <u>Being enactive</u> <u>Reflectiveness</u> <u>open attitude</u> <u>toleration of ambiguity</u> <u>self-determination/agency</u> Grace seems engrossed in her activity throughout, and demonstrates a strong sense of what she wants to achieve, and whether she is happy with what she is producing. Again there is a marked difference in the scope of these when she talks about writing at home.</p>
Cherry Y2	<p>Demonstrates evidence of: <u>Agency</u> and <u>intention</u> (Eng and Mus) <u>self determination</u> (Eng and Mus) <u>reflectiveness</u> (Eng and Mus though less of this evident in music)) openness (mus) being enactive (mus) <i>persistence</i> evident in music and less evident in English</p>

<p>Cherry Y3</p>	<p>Demonstrates evidence of: <u>Agency and intention</u>, (Eng and mus) <u>self-determination</u> (Eng and mus) <u>reflectiveness</u> (Eng and mus – capacity to evaluate particularly evident in music)</p> <p>openness (mus) being enactive (mus)</p> <p><u>Persistence</u>: (Eng and mus).</p>
<p>John Y6</p>	<p>Demonstrates evidence of:</p> <p><u>Agency and intention</u> (Eng and mus) <u>Being enactive</u> (Eng and mus) <u>self-determination</u> (Eng and mus) <u>openness</u> (Eng and mus)</p> <p><u>persistence</u> (Eng and mus)</p> <p><u>reflectiveness + evaluation</u> (Mus in particular)</p>
<p>John Y7</p>	<p><u>Agency</u> REDUCED THROUGH LACK OF CHOICE IN TASK (both Eng and mus)</p> <p>Mixed pattern across the tasks observed in the two subjects: <u>Self-determination reduced in English, increased in music</u> <u>Being enactive</u> discouraged in English, encouraged in music <u>Open attitude</u> encouraged in English, discouraged in music</p> <p>However, evidence of the following being fostered in learner stance: <u>Tolerance of ambiguity</u> (Eng) <u>Intentionality</u> mus) <u>exploring and reflecting on ideas</u> (Eng and mus) Collaborative work prompted sharing responsibility for own and others work encouraging <u>persistence</u> (Eng) Individual <u>persistence</u> encouraged through challenge inherent in task (leading to less openness in it) (Mus)</p>

<p>Louis (Y9) (Eng)</p>	<p><u>Self-determination</u> enactive <u>reflectiveness</u></p> <p>Importance of multimodality: allowed individuals to engage in ways that suited them.</p> <p>Aware of the need to <i>persist</i></p>
<p>Louis (Y10) (Eng)</p>	<p><u>Agency</u> and <u>self-determination</u> (self aware and conscious of developing identity as a writer and commitment to this) <u>Persistence</u> shown.</p>
<p>Kevin Y9 (music)</p>	<p><u>Agency</u> further reduced</p> <p><u>self-determination</u> (and individuality) increased</p> <p>Evidence of <u>intentionality</u> <u>being enactive</u></p> <p><u>persistence</u>(+ challenge-less openness?)</p> <p>Increased <i>reflectiveness</i> and evaluation</p> <p>Noticeable deepening of importance of adolescent context/identity</p> <p>++++the ability to use symbols to convey meaning takes a specific form in musical knowledge - little negotiation</p>
<p>Kevin Y10 (music)</p>	<p>Increase in <u>self-determination</u> and <u>autonomy</u> in relation to the group (in that the creativity in composition of individuals is increasingly valued over collective work)</p> <p>adolescent context/identity +++the ability to use symbols to convey meaning takes a specific form in musical knowledge - little negotiation</p> <p>-the learning process for each individual is complex</p>

TABLE G: TEACHER STANCE

Learner	Teacher Stance
<p>Grace in Recep (Cunningham Hill)</p>	<p>JEAN <u>Stance toward knowledge and learning</u> Including subject specific: composition seen as born of multi-modal engagement in both domains <u>Stance towards teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u> Including structure + freedom: teacher provides some structure but expects pupil engagement and exploration to flow from this Including resourcing: Practical resources needed to encourage multi modal exploration Including time: As much time given to exploration in composition, as 'fixing' Including task: multi-modal engagement and exploration encouraged in both domains <u>Stance toward learner</u> Including learner + outcome: Believes children will make own journeys, independently + together Including children's relationship with ideas: Believes children will develop ownership of ideas – tasks set to facilitate this Including expectation: teacher expects multi-modal engagement; experiential learning encouraged <i>Home links NOT explicit in either piece</i></p> <p><u>Stance towards professionals</u> Including other professional: Relationship with TA seen as vital; collaboration with music teacher, frequently referred to as a 'real professional', seen as significant. Including self as professional Self seen in relation to children's meaning making and playful engagement; refusal to take on formality perceived in changing FS curriculum, insistence on continuing a child-centred programme of learning and teaching <u>Stance towards curriculum</u> Including national curriculum School and FS curriculum seen as offering multiple cross-curricular potential – a sense of 'anything is possible' and that learning is to be approached through what children value and can make sense of.</p> <p><u>Stance towards interaction</u> Including collaboration Collaboration both valued and encouraged in both music and English composition</p>
<p>Grace in Yr 1 (Cunningham Hill) For music - No</p>	<p>ANGELA <u>Stance toward knowledge and learning</u> Teacher is both demonstrating and expecting multi modal engagement Interested in experiential learning</p>

Learner	Teacher Stance
<p>teacher reflection</p> <p>For English - No teacher's reflective commentary</p>	<p>Valuing and encouragement of composition as multi-modal</p> <p>Teacher expectations reducing range of pupil responses where appropriate</p> <p><u>Stance toward learner</u></p> <p>Teacher expecting multiple approaches</p> <p>Teacher sensitivity to individual journeys</p> <p> Including children's relationship with ideas</p> <p>Valuing children's ownership</p> <p> Including child's creative space can begin at home</p> <p>Valuing children's perspectives including those beginning at home</p> <p><u>Stance toward teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u></p> <p> Including balance between structure + freedom</p> <p>Structure and freedom both important; balance must be struck</p> <p> Including task</p> <p>Teacher determining the framework for the children.</p> <p>Belief that structure should be increased</p> <p><u>Stance towards curriculum</u></p> <p> Including towards National Curriculum</p> <p>National Curriculum seen as having cross-curricular, dynamic, potential</p> <p><u>Stance towards interaction / collaboration</u></p> <p>Collaboration valued</p> <p>MUSIC TEACHER STANCE</p> <p><u>Stance toward learner</u></p> <p>Valuing children making their own meaning</p> <p>Expectations rise as children get older</p> <p><u>Stance toward knowledge and learning</u></p> <p>Challenging children and not doing their learning for them. they work out the answers</p> <p> Including importance of skills</p> <p>Structure of core skills leading to freedom in musical composition</p> <p><u>Stance towards creativity/creative learning</u></p> <p>Experiential learning is part of it</p> <p>Recognises + values the collaborative elements of creativity</p> <p><u>Stance toward teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u></p> <p> Including resourcing</p> <p>Resourcing valued particularly for collaborative creativity</p> <p> Including structure together with freedom</p> <p>Structure and freedom both important; balance must be struck</p> <p> Including Time</p> <p>More needed</p>

Learner	Teacher Stance
	<p>JEAN <u>Stance towards professionals</u> Including other professionals High expectations of other professionals + trust in domain knowledge + experience</p>
<p>Cherry in Yr 2 (Hackleton)</p>	<p>DAWN <u>Stance on creativity/creative learning</u> Including progression Staff communication and attention to each child's progress is key Also suggests that developing sophistication in thinking skills and greater knowledge and skill breadth to draw on is important for progression in creative learning.</p>
<p>Cherry in Yr 3 (Hackleton)</p>	<p>DAWN <u>Stance on creativity/creative learning</u> Including progression Ability to explore ideas improves including reading + research skills, looking back at ideas, looking back at things that they've learned, and remembering to pull those together <u>Stance towards knowledge + learning</u> Experiential learning Sees collaboration as central Lifelong learning perspective. <u>Stance towards curriculum</u> Focus on experiential learning engagement and participation and acute awareness of children's understanding of the purpose and connection making. Including towards the national curriculum Conscious of difference, need to be interpreted be creative and create coherent learning opportunities Stance developed from observation of children's engagement and from results High expectations and freedom to be flexible with NC</p>
<p>John in Yr 6 (North Walsham Junior)</p>	<p>VIVIAN <u>Stance on creativity/creative learning</u> As related to achieving As extension of core activity something out of the ordinary/ beyond the obvious <u>Stance on knowledge + learning</u> Through senses, within boundaries + with humour Stance on curriculum Cross curricular approach valued <u>Stance on teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u> Freedom within boundary</p>

Learner	Teacher Stance
<p>John in Yr 7 (North Walsham High)</p> <p>English</p>	<p>ANDREA</p> <p><u>Stance towards teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u> Including task Prescriptive tasks used to increase knowledge of styles, conventions becomes important for Yr 7 + strong sense of appropriateness. Ability to review/judge comes from reading which there isn't enough of. Including time Needs more time with individual students</p> <p><u>Stance towards creativity/creative learning</u> Actively teaching reflecting, reviewing, towards committing, questioning/challenging what they have previously written. Pushing for ability to review understand convention of outside reader and accompanying appropriateness.</p> <p><u>Stance towards interaction/collaboration</u> Viewed as a precursor and contributor to writing creatively not a way of writing creatively.</p> <p><u>Stance towards curriculum</u> Structure is problematic + restrictive.</p>
<p>John in Yr 7 (North Walsham High)</p> <p>Music</p>	<p>PAUL</p> <p><u>Stance towards knowledge + learning</u> Including music specific Implication that certain musical knowledge and skills are more difficult to grasp eg improvisation and so therefore should come later in the progression.</p> <p><u>Stance towards creativity/ creative learning</u> Students' understanding of how they can manipulate the elements of music knowledge + skills play strong role Including time For reinforcement + for each student is crucial Including progression Transition across Yr 9 and 10 is about greater agency, self determination + enaction Role of peer pressure on achievement Shifting role of knowledge and process</p> <p><u>Stance towards creativity/creative learning</u> Relevance as important to creative learning Import of experimentation + agency</p> <p><u>Stance on interaction/collaboration</u> Q of how ideas are generated</p> <p><u>Stance towards professionals</u> Teachers need rejuvenation</p>

Learner	Teacher Stance
<p>Louis in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)</p> <p>English</p> <p>Louis in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)</p> <p>English</p>	<p>ANDREA</p> <p><u>Stance towards teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u> Teacher models individual creativity as solo process Including task Freedom and constraint of task Including time Constraints – time management – managing creative process - Working to FINAL deadlines Transition issues: Structure/prescription graduates to more freedom; simplicity to complexity Detailed teacher feedback/ teacher reviewing essential</p> <p>Stance towards learners Teachers need to work with individual learners; individual needs; one size does not fit all</p> <p>Stance towards curriculum U/researcher comment: Teacher stance towards preparation for exams and relationship to creative learning</p>
<p>Kevin in Yr 9 (North Walsham High)</p> <p>Kevin in Yr 10 (North Walsham High)</p>	<p>PAUL</p> <p><u>Stance towards creativity/creative learning</u> Experimenting with ideas most emphasised learning process Tension between teacher expectation and pupil expectation/needs in creative learning Including progression (music specific) Group creativity through to individual creativity? Transition from Group/collaborative creativity to Individual creativity</p> <p><u>Stance towards learners</u> Teacher thinking about pupil interests, enculturation Teacher's perception/labelling of students; influences of FIMT, making key distinction between musicians and non-musicians; players and non-players</p> <p><u>Stance on teaching 4 creativity/creative learning</u> Including task Become more defined by the end of Year 9</p>

ⁱ Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005a), *Creativity: Find it, promote – Promoting pupils' creative thinking and behaviour across the curriculum at key stages 1, 2 and 3 - practical materials for schools*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005b) website : <http://www.ncaction.org.uk/creativity/about.htm>

ⁱⁱ Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005a), *Creativity: Find it, promote – Promoting pupils’ creative thinking and behaviour across the curriculum at key stages 1, 2 and 3 - practical materials for schools*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005b) website : <http://www.ncaction.org.uk/creativity/about.htm>

ⁱⁱⁱ Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005a), *Creativity: Find it, promote – Promoting pupils’ creative thinking and behaviour across the curriculum at key stages 1, 2 and 3 - practical materials for schools*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2005b) website : <http://www.ncaction.org.uk/creativity/about.htm>