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This article tests whether teacher’s ability to promote creativity is altered by their perceptions of students’ potential to become more creative. They surveyed 119 educators with a questionnaire asking about creative mindsets, students’ potential, self‐efficacy for teaching creativity, and other factors. They found that if teachers believe that student creativity was innate, then they were less likely to believe that they could teach creativity and less likely to be successful at doing so. The chief finding of this article is that many teachers believe that creativity cannot be taught and that this becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Other teachers have what the researchers called a “creative growth mindset” which means they believe students can develop more creativity. The researchers believe that this mindset will be more successful for teachers to have in developing student creativity.
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This article examines why teachers are mistaken in their beliefs about whether or not children are creative. They find it many times teachers are not able to correctly categorize a student as being creative or not. They surveyed 136 teachers using a psychology scale from Gough's (1979) called the Creative Personality Scale. They found that more often than not teachers believe that students were not creative. In other words, teachers were needlessly pessimistic in the creativity of the children that they teach. These misconceptions increased if teachers were teaching in fields where creativity is desirable, such as art education. It is important to study why teachers misperceived their student’s creativity because it may lead to classroom management problems and potentially a non-rigorous pedagogy.
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This is an overview article that examines how creativity is conceptualized in modern education research. They are focused primarily on defining creativity and testing the validity of those definitions. They use examples from the Centre for Creative Education's creative partnerships. They also examine how teachers assess creativity in students. Additionally, they suggest ways that these assessments can be flawed. Based on this overview of the research on creativity in education, they offer best practices for implementing schoolwide policies which stimulate the creativity of students.
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This a classic article in education research that was one of the first to investigate a pedagogy specifically designed to promote creativity. It takes a qualitative approach which examined case studies of students in classrooms and used an assessment that was based on the author's subjective interpretation of the creativity level of the outcomes of student artwork. It advocated for two extensions of the common art education of the time. The first innovation is for students to be guided in art methodology so that their creativity can flow. In other words, students will be able to focus on creation rather than developing specific art technical skills if they are guided in art skills. Second, the author advocates for differentiating the level of guidance by each students’ technical skills, so that more advanced students will spend more time on creativity and less time rehashing skills that they already know. This will allow the more advanced students to focus on creativity.
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This article looks at the relationship between student engagement and creativity. It makes the basic point that students have to be engaged first before they can be creative. It talks about how creativity and engagement are interlocking components and cannot be separated when teachers think through their pedagogy. In other words, the authors argue that to have a student be creative, we must first have them be engaged. If a teacher wants to develop creativity in students, they must work also on developing lesson plans that engage students to create a commitment to task.
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This article examines art education in the UK with an emphasis on a debate that exists in that country's education system on whether to promote STEM or focus more on creativity. What they find by studying art education in the UK is that many art teachers do not follow the pedagogical system that has been advocated by the national ministries of education in the UK, but rather develop what they call “signature pedagogies”. These signature pedagogies are unique to each art teacher, but share a couple of common features. First these teachers focus on freedom of expression and allowing the students more leeway in the outcomes of their work. Second, they focus much more on process than on outcomes. So that what is important in the classroom, is how the students are working rather than what they achieve. The authors suggest that these “signature pedagogies” are valuable in promoting creativity.

1. **Kim, K. H. (2011) “The Creativity Crisis: The Decrease in Creative Thinking Scores on the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking”, *Creativity Research Journal,* 23:4, 285-295 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2011.627805**

This article focuses on a phenomenon whereby a classic measurement system for creativity has been showing a decrease in the last few decades. The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking uses student’s ability to come up with creative outcomes to either verbal of figural prompts as a test of their creativity. Using standard rubrics, these responses or drawings are subjectively graded. This author shows that over the last few decades the scores on these tests have been decreasing. What makes this interesting is that in a similar time period standard tests of IQ have actually been increasing, This suggests that factors that determine creativity have been less effective and it has possible extensions to the changing focus on STEM education and less focus on the creative arts in public education.
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**creative thinking. *Journal of Creative Behavior,* 36, 183–200.** [**https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2002.tb01063.x**](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2002.tb01063.x)

This article examines how across many nations there has been a backlash to the push for less art education. One of the chief justifications of those groups that want to increase art education is that it can promote creativity. But these authors find that many of the attempts to create a pedagogy that is designed to promote creativity is divisive and leads to great controversy. By studying the prior literature, they suggest a series of potentially beneficial techniques that schools can use to adopt a pedagogical system that will promote creativity in students. Among these beneficial reforms are teacher training, new ways to evaluate learning, use of information technology, changing students’ expectations of what education is, and developing more serious ways to include student input.
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This article examines the relationship between students with behavioral problems and creativity. The chief argument is that students who are lacking in creativity may feel pressured and unhappy in school which will lead to them lashing out through behavioral problems. To assess this potentiality, the authors used three measures of creativity, the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking-Figural [TTCT], Runco Ideational Behavior Scale [RIBS], and Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students-Revised Edition [SRBCSS-R] and correlated them with behavioral problems in Korean schools. Across all three measures of creativity, they find a strong correlation with behavioral problems. This indicates that at least within Korean school systems there is a correlation between those students who lack creativity and exhibit problems fitting within schools. While not causal, these correlations are interesting and potentially suggest ways that creativity is related to important social issues.
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This study examined the so-called 4th grade slump, which has been found to show that students around 4th grade began to exhibit less creativity using standard measures. This research takes a longitudinal approach, whereby the same students are measured in 4th, 5th, 7th and 9th grade to see if the slump that were recorded in the prior research maintains over a long period. It finds that students are in fact diverging around 4th grade and that by 9th grade similar levels of gaps in creativity that were discovered in 4th grade between these students still remain. This suggests that the 4th grade slump is real and that for some reason around this time period students start to diverge in levels of creativity. The authors suggest that pedagogy should focus on developing creativity in students from the 4th to 9th grade.