2017

The Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline in Higher Education Institutions

Fatih Aktas
Lehigh University

The Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline in Higher Education Institutions

By

Fatih Aktas

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Comparative and International Education

Lehigh University

May 2017

Certificate of Approval

The dissertation of Fatih Aktas is approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in

partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____
Date Approved

_____
Dr. Iveta Silova
Dissertation Advisor

_____
Dr. Jill Sperandio
Co- Advisor

_____
Dr. Peggy A. Kong
Committee Member

_____
Dr. Gregory M. Reihman
Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge my appreciation for the support and contribution of everyone who guided me during this project.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere appreciation and deepest respect to my academic advisor, Dr. Iveta Silova, for her constant encouragement, constructive feedback, endless patience, and optimism in the development and completion of this research. She always listened to me, consistently challenged me to think deeper, and inspired me to step further out of my comfort zone. It has been one of the most rewarding experiences working and having discussions with her. I have learned a lot from her. She has been an excellent role model for me.

I am thankful to my dissertation co-chair Dr. Jill Sperandio and my committee members: Dr. Gregory M. Reihman and Dr. Peggy Kong for their contributions to my dissertation and for their advice and constructive feedback. I also would like to thank all the professors at Lehigh University with whom I had a chance to collaborate. I would especially like to thank to Dr. Alexander W. Wiseman, Dr. Sothy Eng, Dr. Laurence Upton, and Dr. Robert Leight for their guidance and support.

I am grateful for the financial support I received during my education at Lehigh University. I especially would like to acknowledge Fulbright Scholarship, which was instrumental at the start of my graduate study in the United States. I am greatly indebted to Gizem Oztimur Toprak for her constant assistance, encouragement, guidance, and tremendous support. Thank you very much for being a wonderful supporter. I am very grateful to Yalin Kilic Turel, Mevlude Bakir, Safak Akin, Ozlem Gul, Sultan Yilmaz, and Turkish Human Resources Education and Health Foundation (TIKAV) for their support and constant encouragement. I am

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Abstract

As a result of globalization and the digital revolution, the concept of creativity has become increasingly central to education policy and practice, particularly during the times of growing uncertainty and accelerating change. On the one hand, the calls for creativity are driven by an economic imperative and instrumental values. The argument is that there has been a shift from an industrial-based economy to a knowledge-based economy to a creative economy. In such an economy, accessing knowledge is much easier than ever before. While producing knowledge still forms the basis of a strong economy, it is argued that what one can do with what s/he knows has become increasingly important, thus necessitating employers to be more creative and innovative. On the other hand, calls for creativity are also driven by the social and personal development of individuals, approaching the concept of creativity more holistically. From this perspective, creativity can help individuals not only grow professionally but also personally, intellectually, and collectively. While there is a wide range of creativity discourses, the increasing importance attached to the creativity concept has already resulted in the growth of creativity related programs in higher education. In particular, there has been an increase in the degree-, certificate-, and award-bearing programs in creativity across higher education institutions. Building on a social constructivist perspective and adopting critical discourse analysis (CDA), this study examines how universities approach the conceptualization and institutionalization of the concept of creativity by undertaking content analysis of program mission statements, curriculum materials, and interviews with a sample of program directors, faculty members, and experts in creativity and innovation to better understand the history, evolution, and the structure of their creativity programs as well as the possibility of fostering creativity in higher education. Focusing

on degree-, certificate-, and award-bearing creativity related programs, the study examines which notions of creativity dominate in higher education programs and discusses the implications of these programs for higher education and the field of education more broadly.

The Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline in Higher Education Institutions

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, *or* it becomes "the practice of freedom," the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.

Paulo Freire (2005, p. 34)

The importance of creativity in the field of formal education has been continuously debated by many different stakeholders. From John Dewey (1929) and Paulo Freire (2005), to Maxine Greene (1995) and Martha Nussbaum (2010), scholars have discussed the goals and anticipated outcomes of education and the vital role creativity and imagination play in the field of education. In addition, various international organizations such as the World Bank (King & Rogers, 2014), United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2015), and numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs) set their priorities for education by emphasizing creativity. Many governments and policymakers around the world also actively engage in the discussion on how creativity and critical thinking could be fostered in educational settings.

The rationales behind the need for a more creative approach to education vary. On the one hand, the calls for creativity are driven by an economic imperative. It is based on the assumption that "technological progress, organisational change and intensified global competition have driven a shift from manual work to 'thinking' jobs that emphasise a whole new range of skills, from problem-solving and communication to information and risk management and self-organisation" (Seltzer & Bentley, 1999, p. vii). The argument is that there has been a shift from an industrial-based economy to a knowledge-based economy, a term popularized by Peter Drucker (1968). In such an economy, knowledge is perceived as the most crucial element of economy and thus countries compete with each other for being at the forefront of producing knowledge. However, in the context of globalization, rapid technological progress, and increased connectedness, accessing knowledge has become much easier than ever before. While producing knowledge still forms the basis of a strong economy, it is argued that what one can do with what s/he knows has become more and more important, thus necessitating employers to be more creative and innovative. Richard Florida (2002) argues that the new economy is a creative economy:

> That driving force is the rise of human creativity as the key factor in our economy and society. Both at work and in other spheres of our lives, we value creativity more highly than ever, and cultivate it more intensely. The creative impulse-the attribute that distinguishes us, as humans, from other species-is now being let loose on an unprecedented scale. (p. 4)

Creativity as an economic imperative, which is based on a dialectical relationship between education and labor market expectations, is often promoted by international institutions

4

such as the United Nations and the World Bank, as well as by policymakers. For example, the World Bank report states that, "creativity and innovation are promoted not only by the education system but also by economic policies that ensure such skills are valued by employers and lead to improved productivity and labor market success" (King & Rogers, 2014, p. 3). Similarly, in *'All our futures: Creativity, culture, and education'* report, Prime Minister Tony Blair stated that "Our aim must be to create a nation where the creative talents of all the people are used to build a true enterprise economy for the twenty-first century—where we compete on brains, not brawn" (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE), 1999, p. 5).

Another rationale behind creativity in education emphasizes "the social and personal development of young people in communities and other social settings" (Banaji et al., 2010, p. 35). Scholars working within this conceptual framework suggest that there are many challenges - ranging from technological to personal - that education systems around the world are facing and that creative education has the potential to address such challenges. With the technological challenge, the argument is that new technologies bring about significant changes in our lives and thus "education must enable young people to explore and be sensitive to the impact of new technologies on how we live, think and relate to each other: that is sensitive to their cultural implications" (NACCCE, 1999, p. 62). Furthermore, due to new technologies, accessing knowledge has become relatively easy and that is why what a learner can do with what s/he knows is more crucial than ever before (NACCCE, 1999). It is also argued that all learners possess a wide range of capabilities and education system should enable learners to unlock their abilities rather than hamper them (NACCCE, 1999). Assuming that creativity can help societies

and individuals deal with challenges they face in social and cultural spheres, a more holistic perspective of creativity can be more useful.

Notwithstanding the proliferation of the debates regarding the importance of creativity in education, there has been no agreement on whether creativity should be taught as a skillset (reflecting an economic perspective) or a mindset (reflecting a more humanistic approach). Increasingly, however, the type of creativity that most policy-makers desire in students today is "a domesticated form of creativity, linked tightly and directly to economic productivity" and framed narrowly by neoliberal economic discourses about the creative economy (Larsen, 2013, p. 1). This has implications not only for how we think about creativity, but also how we think about the broader purposes of education. Perhaps one may argue that an excessive focus on an economically-driven conceptualization of creativity may reduce its function to employability, hampering development of necessary skills that are crucial to solving the problems encountered today. In this context, creativity may become another skill to be readily commodified.

Since there is a wide range of discourses on creativity in education, it is important to examine which creativity discourses are more likely to be adopted in higher education, how creativity is institutionalized in higher education programs, and how different programs conceptualize creativity in their curricula. Given the fact that most degree bearing programs in creativity are primarily located in English-speaking countries in North America and Western Europe, the main focus of this research is to explore academic programs in the countries of these regions. Within this context, the main goal of this exploratory research is to examine the emergence of creativity-related degree programs in higher education institutions. In particular, this research explores the following questions:

1- Which universities provide degree bearing programs in creativity? What kinds of degrees do they offer? What was the main impetus for creating such programs in higher education institutions?

2- How do universities conceptualize creativity degree programs? Which notions of creativity dominate? How are these conceptualizations reflected in program mission statements, degree descriptions, curricula, and course syllabi?

3- What implications does the institutionalization of creativity have for higher education and the field of education more broadly?

In this regard, chapter II addresses the changing education paradigms in the context of globalization and conceptually scrutinize why there is a need for a more cross-disciplinary (and creative) approaches to education. Furthermore, chapter II provides an in-depth insight into the emergence of creativity as an academic discipline and analyzes literature concerning potential factors behind the emergence of creativity-related degree programs in higher education.

Chapter III provides a theoretical framework of the study, explaining how social constructivist perspective and critical discourse analysis (CDA) can help to capture the dynamic process of the institutionalization of creativity. Drawing on Berger and Luckmann (1966) and Jørgensen & Phillips (2002), the chapter presents underlying assumptions of discourse analytical approaches, suggesting that (1) language is not merely a reflection of pre-existing reality; it is also instrumental in constructing reality, (2) discourses operate in particular contexts, acquiring their meanings by the dialectical relationship between texts, contexts, and the social subjects, and (3) power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse.

Chapter IV provides detailed information regarding critical discourse analysis as the methodological approach undertaken in this research. Drawing on Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional framework, the chapter presents how data in the research is analyzed through micro-level (detailed textual analysis within the field of linguistics), meso-level (discourse as a discursive practice), and macro-level, which deconstructs social structures and power relations in constructing the creativity concept. Moreover, the chapter provides detailed information regarding the sample, data sources (program descriptions/mission statements, curriculum, course syllabi, and interviews), and limitations of this research.

Chapter V presents findings of the research by drawing on four types of data sources, including program descriptions/mission statements, curricula, course syllabi, and interviews. Analysis of four different types of data sources results in the emergence of five common themes across the creativity-related degree programs in the sample. These themes are: (1) creativity as a skillset or mindset; (2) creativity as an inter/multi/trans-disciplinary and holistic approach to education; (3) creativity for meeting the needs of the market; (4) creativity for personal and/or professional development; and (5) creativity for change through leadership. Furthermore, the chapter discusses additional themes that emerged from semi-structured interviews and data analysis, which include: (1) assessment of creativity; (2) creativity and culture; and (3) creativity in the new public management context. Detailed analysis and discussion for each theme is provided in chapter V along with evidence from data sources.

Finally, chapter VI outlines conclusions and implications of this research study's findings. Particular emphasis is given to the implications for theory and research as well as implications for higher education administrators. Furthermore, the chapter draws attention to

certain dilemmas between how creativity discourses are constructed and whether fostering creativity under new public management (NPM) principles is possible. Referring to the possible negative impact of domesticating creativity under neoliberal economic discourses, the chapter concludes that there is a need to approach creativity more holistically and constructively rather than limit its functions to narrowly defined purposes. Undoubtedly, creativity not only can help societies to deal with not only changing economic circumstances in today's world, but is also useful for coming up with effective solutions to educational, social, political, and many other problems the world faces. Therefore, it is important to tap into the creativity concept to the fullest extent rather than perceiving it as skill set that should be possessed to meet demands of individual stakeholders.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Why There is a Need for a More Holistic and Liberal Approach to Education

Since the Industrial Revolution, education was equated with a factory model of schooling (Robinson, 2011). Indeed, the spread of mass schooling coincided with the emergence and rise of the industrial era. In this context, schools were stratified based on labor market needs and the concept of 'education for the labor market' was instilled in the minds of learners. Claiming that there was a skills shortage during the industrial era, educators and policymakers prioritized meeting the needs of the labor market and producing a qualified labor force. In this regard, the main purpose of education was reduced to equipping the learners with required skills for the labor market. Education was instrumentalized, commodified, capitalized, and seen only as an economic investment. As Schultz (1961) states, "Human wealth consists of improvements in human effectiveness arising from the fact that man has developed capabilities that result from investments in man" (p. 199). From this perspective, while certain kinds of skills and academic subjects became more important and valuable due to increased demand in the labor market (e.g., technical skills, math, science, and technology), the importance of other subjects (especially humanities and arts) was relatively glossed over. Furthermore, learners only focused on economic aspects of their education rather than approaching their learning process in critical and creative ways.

Educational systems in the United States and elsewhere placed a special emphasis on STEM subjects (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) as the term "STEM education" came to prominence in the 1990s at the National Science Foundation (Bybee, 2013). The main goal of education was identified as equipping learners with STEM skills, while the

primary outcome of education was predicted to be a decrease in ever-growing youth unemployment since there was strong demand for STEM skills in the labor market. Aiming to integrate more youth into the labor market, governments hoped to increase their GDP (gross domestic product) and become more competitive in the global economic system.

While education is seen as an economic investment from a human capital framework perspective, this approach to education has been criticized by many scholars arguing that the role of education should not be limited to income generation alone (Hoffman & Bory-Adams, 2005). And while we see a global commitment to education development through such discourse as UNESCO's 'Education for All', it is still unclear what education for all entails. Is 'education for all' aimed at meeting the needs of the labor market? Or, is 'education for all' aimed at cultivating liberal humanitarian education?

Developed by Amartya Sen (1985, 1999) and Martha Nussbaum (2000, 2011), the capability approach offers a different point of view on education. Adopting a more holistic approach, Sen underlines the importance of both instrumental and intrinsic values of education. Instrumental values of education such as skills and education credentials are important; however, education also should provide intrinsic values to all learners (Tikly, 2013). Nussbaum (2003) outlines a list of intrinsic values, including:

> 'senses, imagination and thought' – 'being able to use the senses, to imagine, think, and reason – and to do these things in a truly "human" way, in a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education, including, but by no means limited to, literacy and basic mathematical and scientific training.' (p. 41)

Drawing on the capability approach, a combination of instrumental and intrinsic values of education should help learners figure out their own interests and passions. Rather than promoting exclusively STEM subjects by drawing attention to high economic returns, both STEM subjects as well as humanities and arts should be equally prioritized (Nussbaum, 2012). Indeed, students majoring in STEM subjects with an intention to earn high incomes, but who may not have particular interest in those subjects would see their occupations only as a means to provide them livelihood benefits rather than instruments to enjoy every minute of their working time and life. This practical approach in choosing a profession may make learners unhappy and less productive. This also questions the effectiveness of governments' investment into STEM education. My argument here is not to challenge the importance of STEM education. It is very natural for students and parents to ponder what they can do with their educational credentials in the future. Rather, a complete transformation of the relationship between education and the labor market is necessary. Instead of giving close attention to what kinds of skills the labor market will demand in the future, it is important to re-conceptualize how education policies can steer labor market regulations to match students' personal interests and passions. My argument is that learners should be able to turn their passions and dreams into their occupations. To put this into practice, policymakers, academics, and teachers should pave the way for robust education policies that will help learners get involved with courses that they would truly enjoy.

Paulo Freire (2005) states that education should help learners think and act critically. Similarly, Nussbaum (2010) argues that there is a strong need for humanities in education to have a healthy democracy. Education for conscientization and liberation is of vital importance for societies to build a strong, pluralistic, and inclusive democracy. Harvard University's

president, Drew Faust (2009), points out the importance of liberal arts in higher education by stating that:

> Higher learning can offer individuals and societies a depth and breadth of vision absent from the inevitably myopic present. Human beings need meaning, understanding, and perspective as well as jobs. The question should not be whether we can afford to believe in such purposed in these times, but whether we can afford not to. (p. 3)

In this context, universities should be spaces where students can engage not only in discussions about problems and the future of their societies, but also ponder how to lay the foundations of a just, more collaborative, and creative world. Education should foster imagination, curiosity, and creativity (Robinson, 2013). Increasingly, however, universities act as spaces where education is commodified for the sake of labor market requirements, focusing primarily on equipping students with a set of skills rather than holistic development and individual enhancement in search of a common good. At this point, it is hard to disagree with a Finnish educator and scholar Pasi Sahlberg's view on competition and education:

> I want nobody here in the room to leave thinking that Finland has the best education system in the world, that's an illusion that has been created by foreigners. Because in Finland we don't think of education as a global competition. We actually don't care if we are better than anyone else. Education for us is for individual enhancement and for the common good. (2014, New Jersey Education Association)

By and large, there is a strong need for transformation in education, which will require changing the mindset of governments, policymakers, and the labor market to view education in

broader context than competition and the means for livelihood. Although changing the mindset of governments will require effort and time, it is important to re-conceptualize education to solve our current problems. An educated person in the twenty-first century should be one who is conscious enough to acknowledge that most problems we are facing today are due to issues rooted in existing social and economic structures (WISE, 2014). Parallel to this, an educated person should be the one who takes an active role in dealing with these issues. As Keri Facer (2014) points out in one of her commentaries, "How do we create meaningful ways of earning a living that combine multiple ways of being?" I agree with this statement by emphasizing that education should help learners develop themselves holistically so that they live meaningful lives.

Creativity in the Education System

There is no doubt that creativity plays an important role in education. However, the critical question that must be asked is whether current educational systems around the world foster creativity or stifle it. In his famous TED talk: *How to escape education's death valley,* Sir Ken Robinson (2013) argues that current approaches in education systematically kill creativity. He demonstrates how standardized testing has become the dominant culture of education rather than being used diagnostically. In particular, he draws attention to the *'No Child Left Behind'* (NCLB) legislation in the U.S., questions possible implications of the narrowly defined purpose of education, and underlines that there should be equal emphasis on the so-called STEM disciplines, the arts, the humanities, and physical education. He argues that creativity can be fostered through diversity in disciplines and not through a culture of conformity.

In his book *Out of Our Minds: Learning to be Creative,* Robinson (2011) makes similar statements regarding linearity, conformity, and standardization by arguing that as students

progress in their education, their confidence in creativity decreases. Then, he asks 'why and how this happens.' Within this context, he demonstrates the contradictions between education reforms and their actual implications in education. Educational reform debates usually revolve around funding of and access to education, selection process, as well as raising standards. However, Robinson argues that only improving standards and increasing access to education may not solve the current problems in education. He also challenges the assumption that there is a linear relationship between education and employment. Because of this assumption, certain subjects such as science and technology can become more important in education due to their relevance to the labor market while the importance of other subjects may be ignored. However, he questions whether such an approach to education can lead countries to have scientists and technologists who are truly passionate about their fields.

Robinson argues that three main roles of education are personal, cultural, and economic and there should be equal emphasis on these three roles. By personal role he means 'to develop individual talents and sensibilities,' by cultural role, he means 'to deepen understanding of the world,' and by economic role he means 'to provide the skills to earn a living and be economically productive' (p. 67). However, although these three roles should have equal importance in education, the role of education in equipping students with necessary skills seems to dominate education policy and practice.

While Robinson (2011) demonstrates how schools and current education reforms stifle creativity and how standardized systems of education do not value creativity, Larsen (2013) argues that there is a similar trend in higher education institutions where the dominance of New Public Management (NPM) culture, which is characterized by marketization, privatization,

15

managerialism, performance measurement, and accountability in education, stifles creativity. Similarly, Marginson (2008) outlines the following NPM principles, which are typically found in higher education and can potentially inhibit efforts to develop creativity-oriented program and teaching/learning environments:

> funding-based economic incentives, user-driven production, product formats, the pricing and sale of outputs, entrepreneurial production, output monitoring and measurement, competitive ranking of personnel and of institutions, performance management, performance pay, contracts with and incentives to partner with industry and commercialize research motivations and products, and systems of accountability and audit including contracts with government that implement external controls. (p. 270)

These NPM principles conflict with the 'place perspective' in creativity research, which emphasizes the importance of 'diverse, flexible, autonomous, and non-conforming' environments on fostering creativity (Larsen, 2013). Under the NPM principles, which are shaped by neoliberal values, it is questionable how creativity can flourish in universities since competition - not necessarily collaboration - forms the basis of success. In fact, research suggests that structural reforms associated with new management practices in higher education "run counter to the known conditions under which creativity flourishes" (MacLaren, 2012, p. 159). Based on a review of recent literature, MacLaren (2012) suggests that "surveillance, performativity, the end of tenure, and rising levels of workplace stress are all closing off the space for real creative endeavour, characterised as it is by risk-taking, collaborative exploration, and autonomy" (p. 160).

To put it briefly, research suggests that the current education reform contexts in K-12 and higher education settings stifle creativity. Current trends in education and management reforms such as standardization of education, testing, and competition pose a dilemma for students who strive to enhance their creativity in educational settings. Therefore, it is important to note that while educators and policymakers call for a more creative education, it is important to first acknowledge the need for transforming existing education system to foster creativity.

Different Approaches to Creativity in Education

What does creativity mean? What does it look like in education? Is it a universal concept or a culture specific one? What kinds of tensions and dilemmas arise when encouraging creativity in schools? These questions and many others have recently been raised by academics and policymakers to better understand the creativity phenomenon and to make changes in education to meet students' needs. To start with the definitions of and approaches to creativity, Weiner (2000) states that "the word 'creativity' did not exist before 1870 and was not widely used until about 1950s. The concept, and the positive value we attach to it, might in fact be seen as hallmarks of our modern, secular, democratic, capitalistic society" (p. 1). Weiner (2000) further argues that meanings attached to the word "creativity" continue changing as our postmodern 'global culture' grows.

The definition of the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE) seems to be widely accepted in the field of education, defining creativity as "imaginative activity fashioned so as to produce outcomes that are original and of value" (NACCCE, 1999, p. 20, as cited in Craft, 2005). This definition seems to align with Sternberg

and Lubart's (1999) definition of creativity as "the ability to produce work that is both novel (i.e. original, unexpected) and appropriate (i.e. useful, adaptive concerning task constraints)" (p. 3).

Craft (2005) points out that while coming up with unique ideas forms the basis of different interpretations to creativity, some approaches focus more on locus (person, collective, or process), some focus more on the product (idea or physical outcome), and some focus more on impact (global or local). Likewise, there are some other interpretations concerning how to approach creativity. For example, Nolan (2004 as cited in Craft, 2005) argues that creative behavior forms the basis of creative thought and creative action. Adopting creative behavior has the potential to develop stronger creative thinking, which can possibly lead to more creative action. Nolan (2004) defines creative action as 'experiment and innovation' (p. 20 as cited in Craft, 2005). Craft (2005) also states that "innovation may be seen as the implementation of new ideas to create something of value, proven through its uptake in the marketplace" (p. 20). In this context, it can be argued that a product-driven approach to creativity might be seen more market-oriented, while locus-driven approach to creativity is likely to be more holistically oriented.

Larsen (2013) makes a similar point by suggesting that there are four dominant ways of conceptualizing and researching creativity, including creativity as product, people/person, process, and place. Creativity requiring products (such as inventions, publications, and art related works) are in the research area of 'product perspective' as the goal is to scrutinize the originality of these products. 'People perspective' research aims to better understand who creative people are and what kinds of features they possess. Rather than focusing on final products, this perspective investigates personality traits of creative people. The goal of 'process perspective' research is to examine cognitive and social processes that can trigger creativity. In particular,

Csíkszentmihályi (1996) argues that defining creativity without considering cognitive and social processes will simply be unrealistic: "to study creativity by focusing on the individual is like trying to understand how an apple tree produces fruit by looking only at the tree and ignoring the sun, soil, etc. that supports life" (as cited in Larsen, 2013, p. 3). On the other hand, 'place perspective' focuses more on what kind of environment can be more conducive to enhancing creativity (Larsen, 2013). In particular, it is argued that having welcoming and inclusive settings has a positive impact on enhancing creativity.

Different approaches to defining and researching creativity reveal some interesting tensions and dilemmas about how creativity is used in education institutions. In particular, in her book *Creativity in Schools: Tensions and Dilemmas*, Craft (2005) questions the universalized and market-linked versions of creativity which appear to dominate in education institutions:

> What implications does this approach to creativity, as both universalized and marketized, bring with it? What does it mean in terms of the relationships between culture and creativity? How does the universalized notion of creativity reflect difference in socio-economic context, and in political context, experienced by individuals and communities? What might be some of the consequences of accepting a view of creativity as anchored in the global market? (p. 85)

And more importantly, which notions of creativity should be encouraged in school settings? By asking "to what extent do we, in the marketplace at any rate, encourage innovation for innovation's sake and without reference to genuine need?" (p. 109), Craft (2005) draws attention to the need for 'critical reflection' while encouraging creativity. She also emphasizes the relationship between creativity and sustainability by stating that "If creativity is essential in

the search for sustainability, then memory is in turn vital to creativity. That holds true for individuals and for peoples, who find in their heritage - natural and cultural, tangible and intangible - the key to their identity and the source of their inspiration" (UNESCO, 2002, as cited in Craft, 2005, p. 149).

Although Craft (2005) poses these questions in the context of school reforms, equally important is to examine what types of conceptualizations of creativity are being institutionalized in higher education and what tensions and dilemmas these approaches may produce. In particular, different conceptualizations of creativity seem to highlight the tensions between (1) universalized versus context-specific notions of creativity; (2) market-oriented versus holistic notions of creativity; and (3) generic versus domain-specific approaches to creativity.

Universalized versus context-specific

Craft (2005) argues that the universalized version of creativity does not adequately consider the importance of cultural, political, and socio-economic contexts and thus may be perceived as 'culture blind' (Ng, 2003, as cited in Craft, 2005). Research shows that there are differences between Eastern and Western notions of creativity. And yet, it seems that the universalized notion of creativity is equated with the Western notion of creativity, reflecting a general tendency among Western scholars to think that Eastern societies are less creative than Western societies. For example, Morris and Leung (2010) argue that the 'creativity problem' in the East Asian societies has been at the forefront of policy discussions for a while, with books such as *Why Asians are Less Creative than Westerns?* and *Can Asians Think?* becoming bestsellers in Singapore, for example (see also Tan & Law, 2000). Therefore, it is important to scrutinize similarities and differences between the Eastern and Western notions of creativity.

Niu and Sternberg (2006) state that "In general, Easterners are more likely to view creativity as having *social* and *moral* values, and as making a connection between the new and the old. Their Western counterparts focus more on some special *individual* characteristics in understanding the concept of creativity" (p. 18, see also Niu & Sternberg, 2002). Furthermore, Niu and Sternberg (2006, p. 19) demonstrate people's conceptions of creativity across times and cultures in the table below:

Table 1. People's Conceptions of Creativity across Times and Cultures

	Western		Chinese	
	Ancient	Modern	Ancient	Modern
Genesis	God/gods/individual	Individual	Nature/individual	Individual
Defining Features	Novelty Moral goodness Everlasting renovation	Novelty Usefulness	Moral Goodness Everlasting renovation	Novelty Moral Goodness Usefulness

As can be seen from the table above, there are some similarities and differences between Western and Chinese notions of creativity. Modern Chinese understanding of creativity still includes moral goodness, which can be interpreted as "collective being or contribution to the whole society" (Niu & Sternberg, 2006, p. 35). This also leads us to think more about how creativity can be interpreted in terms of collectivist and individualistic frameworks. Niu and Sternberg (2006) discuss that in Western societies where individuality is praised, individuals may perceive creativity as something that will make them look different, in other words creativity is necessary to 'defy the crowd' (p. 24). Conversely, defying the crowd might not be a good approach to creativity in collectivist cultures that put more emphasis on the extent to which an individual's creativity may contribute to the goodness of society (Niu & Sternberg, 2006). While there are differences between Eastern and Western notions of creativity, it is still difficult

to draw a sharp line between them as both continue to affect each other. For example, Niu & Sternberg (2006) state that "as in the West, the ancient Chinese view of creativity also affects contemporary people's conception of creativity. However, also influenced by contemporary Western ideology and ideas of creativity, Easterners' current conceptions of creativity possess features of creativity from both Westerns and Eastern traditions. These features include originality, imagination, intelligence, individualism, and goodness (including both moral goodness and usefulness)" (p. 34).

Lubart (2010) also stresses that there are some similarities between Eastern and Western notions of creativity. For example, he states that universally, important indicators of whether a product or a process is creative are 'novelty and originality.' And yet, Lubart (2010) also acknowledges that the meaning of 'novelty' differs from one context to another. For example, while Western societies put more emphasis on breakthrough change in terms of novelty, Eastern societies seem to focus more on change that happens gradually (Lubart, 2010). And yet, Celik & Lubart (2017) encourage thinking more deeply about the breakthrough change concepts in Western societies as they argue that the industrial and digital revolutions happening in the Western world in fact are a result of collective progression for centuries in which the Eastern world has also contributed. Moreover, Celik & Lubart (2017) note that in the Western world, due to popular media, some breakthrough changes are only attributed to certain individuals by putting more emphasis on final product and glossing over creative process and team work. Celik & Lubart (ibid) also state that "what we call creativity in the West might be related to pride, hubris, non-conformism (egocentrism) in the East. Although Easterners also acknowledge novelty as an important aspect of a product in judging it as positive, it is nevertheless essential

for them to respect traditions to a certain extent when designing new products" (p. 42, Li, 1997 as cited in Celik & Lubart, 2017). And yet, Celik and Lubart (2017) caution not to generalize and draw sharp distinctions between Eastern and Western understandings of creativity as it is possible that certain features of each culture can be found within each other. For example, 'individualism or free thought', which are usually seen as features of Western culture, can also be seen in Eastern culture at the individual level while not much in public (Celik & Lubart, 2017). Likewise, the importance of collective work or following traditions can still take place at the individual level in Western societies, while may not be very visible in public (Celik & Lubart, 2017). Finally, referring to globalization and technological development in today's world, Celik and Lubart (2017) encourage us to focus more on the impact of multiculturalism on creative development. Since interaction between East and West has been increased thanks to the internet or other technological media, they argue that individuals have more opportunity to be in multicultural settings. Giving examples from some empirical research and stating that many well-known artists, inventors, and scientists are indeed immigrants (Simonton, 1999), they argue that being in multicultural settings may have a positive impact on creative development. While institutionalization of creativity-related programs in higher education is still in process, it is important to consider such cultural differences and ensure that students would be able to learn about both Western and Eastern features of creativity, and examine how to tap into multiculturalism while aiming to foster creative development.

Market-oriented (skillset) versus holistic (mindset)

'What drives creativity?' is an important question to consider when encouraging students to be more creative. Since the institutionalization of creativity programs in higher education is

still in process, there is need to better understand the potential role of intrinsic and extrinsic

motivation on fostering creativity. Collins & Amabile (1999, pp. 299-300) state:

> The intrinsically motivated state is conducive to creativity, whereas the extrinsically
>
> motivated state is detrimental. Intrinsic motivation is defined as the motivation to engage
>
> in activity primarily for its own sake, because the individual perceives the activity as
>
> interesting, involving, satisfying, or personally challenging; it is marked by a focus on the
>
> challenge and the enjoyment of the work itself. By contrast, extrinsic motivation is
>
> defined as the motivation to engage in an activity primarily in order to meet some goal
>
> external to the work itself, such as attaining an expected reward, winning a competition,
>
> or meeting some requirement; it is marked by a focus on external reward, external
>
> recognition, and external direction of one's work. (pp. 299-300, see also Amabile, 1983;
>
> Crutchfield, 1962; Harlow, 1950; Hunt, 1965; Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973; Taylor,
>
> 1960)

As evidence shows, by and large intrinsic motivation has much greater influence on

driving creativity than extrinsic motivation. And yet, Collins & Amabile (1999) also stress that it

is very hard to draw a sharp line between the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on

creativity. In particular, some research suggests that extrinsic motivations may not be as

detrimental in some cases (Collins & Amabile, 1999). For example, if the goal is to come up

with original ideas concerning a problem, intrinsic motivation will lead individuals to come up

with many creative solutions (Collins & Amabile, 1999). However, if there is many emphasis on

'persistence or evaluation' during creative process, then extrinsic motivation has the potential to

drive individuals to focus more on necessary qualifications to acquire in order to come up with

solutions (Collins & Amabile, 1999). Therefore, Collins & Amabile (1999) rather suggests that there is need for more 'integrated approaches' and states that "our understanding of the relationship between motivation and creativity cannot stand on its own but must be complemented by attention to personality, talent, culture, cognition, and other factors affecting the creative process. One thing we can conclude with confidence is that love for one's work is advantageous for creativity" (p. 308).

As stated earlier, creativity has been universalized and marketized, thus usually presented as one of the most important 21st century skills that individuals should possess in order to be successful in today's global marketplace. In this context, creativity has received great attention from a wide number of stakeholders including business leaders and politicians as well as education policymakers. Very positive meanings are attached to creativity and it is seen as a panacea to deal with complexities that have been introduced by accelerating changes introduced by technological developments. While increasing encouragement towards creativity is a very positive step, the way creativity is encouraged might be questionable. Rhetorically, it seems that creativity is encouraged through extrinsic motives. Creativity is usually seen as an end goal in order to achieve a certain level of success. Since it is marketized, individuals might think that they need to possess creativity skills just for the sake of meeting requirements of certain stakeholders. However, as Collins & Amabile (1999) suggests, an integrated approach to creativity might be much fruitful. Since the institutionalization of creativity degree programs is a recent phenomenon, it is important to scrutinize what drives individuals to participate in these programs and how these programs present themselves to the outside world. It is likely that program mission statements and descriptions might include more extrinsic motives to attract

more students. However, looking at program mission statements/descriptions or any other related textually based data will provide information only concerning the breadth of dissemination of creativity degree programs. To learn more about what drives creativity in creativity related degree programs and what students' aspirations are, there is also a great need for an in-depth analysis through conducting interviews with participants in these programs.

Generic versus domain specific

A thorough discussion on whether creativity as general or domain specific is beyond the scope and goal of this dissertation. However, since the debate about generic versus domain-specific features of creativity is one of the most vigorous topics in the creativity literature (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004; see also Brown, 1989; Runco, 1987), it is necessary to scrutinize the literature with regard to how creativity research approaches this issue. Plucker and Beghetto (2004) argue that "considerable evidence supports the idea that creativity has both specific and general components, and that the level of specificity-generality changes with the social context and as one develops through childhood into adulthood" (p. 153). Social context is important to consider because what is creative or not is socially situated (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004). Norms introduced by social contexts are very important indicators of whether an approach or a product is useful, novel, or appropriate in both specific and general components (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004). In some cases, even if an idea is unique, it can still be rejected by masses because it might be seen as extreme or may not have the potential to be implementable. Plucker & Beghetto (2004) give a historical example from Mendel's study with genetics as the great contribution of Mendel's work to the biology field was only acknowledged a generation later.

Lubart and Guignard (2004) state that "according to Amabile (1996), there are three components for creativity: domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant processes, and task motivation. Creativity-relevant processes include a cognitive style that facilitates coping with complexity and breaking one's mental set during problem solving, the use of heuristics for generating novel ideas (e.g., trying a counterintuitive idea when stuck on a problem), and a work style characterized in part by persistence sustained attention to a task" (p. 45). While the programs correspond to creativity-relevant processes, participants still need to have domain-relevant skills and task motivation in order to come up with creative solutions to problems they encounter. It should also be noted that environment plays an important role in the domain-generality of creativity (Sternberg, 2009). Individuals interact with multiple environments and each of these environments may foster or hamper creative thinking (Sternberg, 2009). While one's work place may open up possibilities for more creative thinking, his/her family environment may hamper these possibilities or vice versa (Sternberg, 2009). And yet, in order to be truly creative, there should be a balance between being and doing, as one should not turn on and turn off his/her creativity relevant skills depending on the context. If the goal is to have well-rounded, creative individuals and societies, it is not enough to be creative only in some situations or environments. While degree programs have the potential to encourage participants to think more creatively at a personal/professional level, it is also important to bear in mind whether participants' personal and/or professional development will lead to collective creativity.

The Emergence of Creativity as a Discipline

Although creativity has been historically encouraged at every level of education, it has not emerged as an academic discipline until recently. The disciplinary potential of creativity and

progress in creativity research was taken stock during the International Working Creativity

Research conference in August 1990 (Isaksen et al., 1993). The conference proceedings and

research papers published as a result of the conference suggested that creativity should be viewed

as an emerging discipline (Isaksen et al., 1993). Although the formation of a discipline can be

interpreted in many different ways (Krishnan, 2009), most disciplines have the following

features:

> a) a common set of core metaphors and concepts, b) a particular set of observed
>
> categories that structure experience, c) specialized methods for investigation, d)
>
> specification of means for determining accuracy or justification of claims, and e) an idea
>
> of the purposes to be achieved in investigation. (Petrie, 1992 as cited in Isaksen et al.,
>
> 1993, p. 29)

In his working paper, Krishnan (2009) identifies different perspectives that can explain

disciplinarity, including the philosophical perspective, the anthropological perspective, the

sociological perspective, the historical perspective, and the management perspective (see Table 2

below). For example, the philosophical perspective examines how knowledge is formed through

a discipline and to what extent knowledge reflects reality. From logical positivism/logical

empiricism perspective, knowledge should be grounded on rationalism and logical reasoning. On

the other hand, both social constructionists and postmodernists perceive academic disciplines as

discourses. Postmodernist philosophy approaches the creation of knowledge doubtfully, arguing

that all knowledge is "just a social construction and would be necessarily tainted by societal

power arrangements, which they serve" (ibid., p. 16). Social constructionists are criticized for

their approach to objective reality. Because of the disagreement between positivism and social

constructionism, another philosophical approach emerged, which is named as 'social epistemology.' According to this school of thought, "although the disciplines would be socially constructed and thus to some degree contingent, they are also epistemically efficient in producing new knowledge and evaluating knowledge claims" (ibid., p. 19).

A historical perspective on the emergence of a discipline examines academic disciplines through the lens of their historical development. This perspective aims to scrutinize social and political factors that might play important roles in the emergence and discontinuity of a discipline. Since political, social, and historical contexts are of vital importance, changes in these contexts can cause the emergence and disappearance of some academic disciplines. For example, there was an increase in the number of scholars studying terrorism studies after the September 11 terrorist attacks. Furthermore, the flourishing of terrorism studies led to changes in traditional security studies, as its name changed to 'strategic studies.'

A management perspective argues that there has been a significant shift in the relationship between higher education institutions and the labor market as if universities are only supposed to meet the demands of the labor market. Within this context, universities are more inclined to adapt themselves to labor market expectations and thus feel obliged to offer new courses and academic programs that can help their students be more competitive in the labor market upon their graduation.

Disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity debates from an education perspective revolve around curriculum, emphasizing that curriculum content should help learners grow personally but also increase the chances of their employment. Perhaps it may be argued that complexities that arise from fragmentation of knowledge result in an increase in numbers of interdisciplinary

courses offered in higher education institutions. This also may lead to a blurring of disciplinary boundaries that may enable learners to discover relations among different disciplines. While an interdisciplinary approach to education can help students free themselves from disciplinary narrow–mindedness, it also carries the risk of an uncritical stance towards knowledge. Krishnan (2009) states that "students might come to the conclusion that any position or viewpoint is equally valid and that it would be unnecessary to make a substantial effort understanding that position. So instead of making students more critical thinkers the exact opposite could happen: students might just embrace a convenient position of uncritical relativism" (p. 44). Furthermore, interdisciplinary degrees may not give employers clear and detailed information about employees' qualifications, which may result in a decrease of job opportunities for interdisciplinary degree holders. Therefore, it is argued that there is a need for disciplinary education prior to advancing in interdisciplinary research skills (Lattuca, 2001 as cited in Krishnan, 2009). More detailed information about disciplinary perspectives on disciplines can be found in the table below.

Table 2. Disciplinary Perspectives on Disciplines Matrix

Disciplinary Perspectives on Disciplines Matrix

	Philosophy	Anthropology	Sociology	History	Management	Education
Paradigm	Knowledge	Culture	Social Organisation	Time	Market	Personality Development
What Factors Encourage Disciplin-arity?	Language games/ discourses	Cultural identity and segmentation	Professionali zation/ Power Structures	Leadership of talented founders of a discipline	Past success of disciplinary organisation	Curriculum and the need for structured or 'disciplined' learning
What Factors Encourage Inter- /Transdiscip linarity?	Universa-lisation of knowledge	New forms of community and identity	Social Change/Decli ne of Professions	Maturation of a discipline/ lack of leadership	Better adaptation to the market	Changes of knowledge structures/new approaches to teaching
On Balance	Disciplines are needed for validating claims to truth	Disciplines offer a stable identity and are similar to tribal structures	Disciplinary structures are difficult to overcome because of the self-interest of power groups	Historically the number of disciplines has constantly expanded rather than declined	Disciplines are an obsolete form of the organisation of science and universities	Educators are more in favour of disciplinary education because of a concern that students may only be confused by competing claims to truth and world views

Source: From 'What are Academic Disciplines? Some observations on the Disciplinarity vs. Interdisciplinarity debate', p. 47, by Krishnan, A., 2009.

What May Cause the Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline?

The previous section focused more broadly on the emergence and disappearance of academic disciplines through the lens of a range of perspectives. In this section, the goal is to elaborate on the emergence of creativity as an academic discipline. By keeping in mind the arguments made towards academic disciplines, this section explores the underlying factors leading to the proliferation of creativity-related degree bearing programs in higher education.

The disciplinary potential of creativity is thoroughly analyzed in the edited book '*Understanding and Recognizing Creativity: The Emergence of a Discipline.*' (Isaksen et al., 1993). Although the book was published in 1993 and thus may not necessarily represent the most recent developments in creativity, it nevertheless provides important insights to better understanding the evolution of the creativity phenomenon. In particular, Isaksen & Murdock (1993) argue that "whether or not creativity studies becomes a discipline, the decision-making process that structures its conceptual development will need to address some variation of classical philosophical categories of ontology (the nature of its reality), epistemology (the nature of its knowledge) and axiology (the nature of its value)" (pp. 35-36).

Apart from the need for addressing philosophical variations in defining creativity as an academic discipline, recognizing the potential relationship of creativity with other social sciences is also important. As Magyari-Beck (1993) argues, investigating creativity without considering sociology, economics, history, or management science will not be very useful in understanding the phenomenon, and yet these disciplines also need to draw on psychology in order to provide deep insight into creativity. Therefore, Magyari-Beck (1993) urges for adopting a cross-disciplinary science of creativity, which might be more useful in tackling challenges arising from mono-disciplinary approaches.

Another underlying reason behind the institutionalization of creativity as an academic discipline can stem from the relationship between universities and the labor market. Considering the historical and the management perspectives, one can argue that the emergence of creativity-related degree programs might be a result of changes in economic, social, and political contexts. Given the fact that the rhetoric on competitiveness, connectedness, and entrepreneurship has

become commonplace among policymakers - resulting in viewing creativity as a panacea for surviving a harsh economic environment – the number of creativity-related degree programs in higher education is likely to increase in the near future. However, if only economic arguments form the basis of the emergence of creativity degree programs, this might also lead to the commodification of the phenomenon of creativity while not necessarily serving political and social needs of societies.

Finally, the emergence of creativity as a discipline could also be examined through a social-constructivist approach. Csíkszentmihályi (1999) explains:

> Originality, freshness of perceptions, divergent-thinking ability are all well and good in their own right, as desirable personal traits. But without some form of public recognition they do not constitute creativity. In fact, one might argue that such traits are not even necessary for creative accomplishment. (...) Therefore it follows that what we call creativity is a phenomenon that is constructed through an interaction between producer and audience. Creativity is not the product of single individuals, but of social systems making judgements about individuals' products. (p. 314)

The meanings attached to creativity can differ based on cultural, economic, historical, political, and social contexts. For example, creativity in the past was usually attributed to 'genius' and 'giftedness' (Gardner, 1993). However, there is a reconceptualization of creativity, which argues that anyone can foster their creativity under proper conditions as opposed to ascribing the concept of creativity to only a few genius individuals (Craft, 2005). Nevertheless, while a universalized version of creativity takes a more inclusive approach, it is important to

33

investigate how this reconceptualization of creativity is socially constructed and which meanings are attributed to it. One may properly ask whether the universalization of creativity has emerged mainly due to the changes in economic environments (Craft, 2005). It remains unclear to what extent the universalization of creativity considers cultural, political, and socio-economic differences as research shows variations between the Eastern and the Western conceptualization of creativity (Craft, 2005). Furthermore, as documented elsewhere, the type of creativity that is urged by policymakers might be a domesticated version of creativity, which narrows down the importance of creativity mainly to economic reasons. MacLaren (2012) argues that "a generalised call for more opportunities for creativity in education runs the danger of ignoring the political context and of the privileging of a fairly insipid notion of creativity over critical thinking" (p. 162). Given the fact that there are different meanings, values, and functions attributed to creativity, the social constructivist perspective can be useful to investigate how these degree programs identify creativity ontologically, epistemologically, and axiologically, how these degree programs rationalize the importance of creativity, and how they present themselves to the public audience.

CHAPTER III. THEORETICAL APPROACH

I will approach this dissertation research through a social constructivist perspective and use critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the theoretical and methodological approach. Originating from French poststructuralist theory, social constructionism questions universalizing theories such as Marxism and psychoanalysis (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Rather than paying more attention to established knowledge, social constructivists have a tendency to examine how and with which methods new knowledge is produced (Krishnan, 2009). Berger and Luckmann (1966) argue that "everyday life presents itself as a reality interpreted by men and subjectively meaningful to them as a coherent world" (p. 19). Putting it differently, they state that realities of a Tibetan monk and an American businessman vary as 'reality' and 'knowledge' notions are socially relative concepts. Similar logic may apply to the notion of creativity. As stated earlier in this research, the notion and definition of creativity also differ from one culture to another. Drawing on social constructivist perspective, I argue that varying definitions of creativity stem from the socially constructed reality of creativity (Reuter, 2015). What makes certain actions or products more creative than others is socially constructed and defined by certain criteria or judgement that vary from culture to culture. Russian psychologist Gaidenko (The Free Dictionary, 1979 as cited in Reuter, 2015) states that,

> Creativity always takes place under specific social and historical conditions, which profoundly influence it. Creativity is closely linked with the environment and with previously created cultural forms, whose complex network includes the agent of creativity.

Similar arguments concerning the social construction of creativity are also implied by prominent researchers in the field of creativity such as Howard Gardner and Mihalyi Csíkszentmihályi. For example, Gardner (1994) states that "no person, act, or product is creative or noncreative in itself. Judgements of creativity are inherently communal, relying heavily on individual experts within a domain" (p. 71). Likewise, Csíkszentmihályi (1994) argues that "it is impossible to define creativity independently of a judgment based on criteria that change from domain to domain and across time and hence one must conclude creativity is not an attribute of individuals but of social systems making judgments about individuals" (p. 143). Since creativity seems to be socially constructed, Csíkszentmihályi (1994) encourages creativity researchers to think more deeply about 'where is creativity?' instead of putting primary emphasis on 'what is creativity?'

Reuter (2015) states that "social reality and phenomena such as creativity are constructed, institutionalized, and handed down to new generations within fields as traditions until they are reconstructed, newly institutionalized, and handed down again" (p. 48). Given that 'creativity' is being currently institutionalized as an academic subject in higher education institutions, social constructionism will enable the research to capture the dynamic process of knowledge construction and institutionalization while it is still in progress.

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, p. 12) identify the main features of discourse analytical approaches, which are based on the following assumptions:

(1) Language is not merely a reflection of pre-existing reality; it is also instrumental in constructing reality.

(2) Discourses operate in particular contexts, acquiring their meanings by the dialectical relationship between texts, contexts, and the social subjects.

(3) Power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse.

Below, I provide a more detailed explanation of the assumptions above and discuss why I apply social constructionism and critical discourse analysis as the theoretical and methodological approach in this research.

Language is not merely a reflection of pre-existing reality

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state that language is not only a mere reflection of pre-existing reality, but also plays an important role in constructing reality. This approach does not deny the existence of reality, but argues that while the existence of objects is real, the meanings attributed to them are defined through discourses. They refer to a flood catastrophe as an example. While nobody questions material reasons that may cause floods, meanings ascribed to a catastrophe and the way of defining a phenomenon may vary. Some people may draw on meteorological discourses, while others may think that catastrophe is a result of global 'greenhouse effect.' Some may think that flood disasters take place due to political management issues, while others may ascribe it to God's judgment. While there may be many other discourses that attempt to explain why flood disasters happen, these different discourses manifest themselves through different types of actions. For example, discourses originated in a 'greenhouse effect' narrative may lead to changing regulations in environmental policies. In this context, language plays a crucial role in constituting the social world and relations as well as identities. It can be said that there is a dialectical relationship between the social world and discourses.

Discourses operate in specific contexts, acquiring their meanings by the dialectical relationship between texts, contexts, and the social subjects

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) argue that poststructuralism distances itself from structuralist theory when it comes to the conception of language. They state that "poststructuralism takes from structuralism the idea that signs derive their meanings not through their relations to reality but through internal relations within the network of signs; it rejects structuralism's view of language as a stable, unchangeable and totalising structure and it dissolves the sharp distinction between *langue* and *parole*" (p. 10). Meaning attributed to a word can differ based on different contexts. Since the structure is not fixed in poststructuralism, it can help us to understand the meaning of the creativity concept over time.

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state that structuralism considers *langue*, which is the structure of language, as the main object of a structuralist study. According to structuralists, *parole* as situated language use cannot provide insight into the structure since it is considered as randomly used and thus it cannot be a part of scientific research. On the other hand, poststructuralism challenges this approach as it sees that there is a dialectical relationship between language structure and language use. Similar to Jørgensen and Phillips (2002), Burr (1995) emphasizes the importance of context in constructing discourse, arguing that there is a historical and cultural relativism in understanding. By giving an example regarding how the notion of childhood has been transformed over the centuries, she draws attention to the importance of history, culture, and context in constructing each individual's and society's reality. Furthermore, she refers to Foucault (1976) to explain how the individual of today's western industrial society has been constructed. In particular, Burr (1995) draws on changing populations and moving from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy to demonstrate how these

changes led to new social practices and how these social practices are embraced by societies

without force or, as Foucault (1976) calls it, through 'disciplinary power' (p. 65). By the same

token, Foucault (1976) demonstrates how the conceptualization of population has emerged as

societies have undergone enormous changes because as the numbers of people increase,

countries see their citizens as human capital rather than seeing them as 'loyal subjects' under

their rules.

Finally, Van Dijk (2008) emphasizes that a context-free approach to discourse analysis

will not provide in-depth analysis of discourses since context plays an important role in shaping

discursive activities. Van Dijk (1988) identifies discourse as "not simply an isolated textual or

dialogic structure. Rather it is a complex communicative event that also embodies a social

context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception

processes" (p. 2). Van Dijk (2008) further states that one of the main goals of CDA is to

examine the impact of power on constructing discourses. While the aim is to reveal the

relationship between power and discourse, this relationship may not be adequately

comprehended without having full knowledge about context (Van Dijk, 2008). Meanings

ascribed to concepts differ according to history, culture, and changes in socio-economical models

and thus researchers using CDA should be aware of the importance of context while conducting

discourse analysis.

Power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse
To gain better understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge in

discourse analysis, one can refer to Michel Foucault's theory of power/knowledge. Foucault

claims that there is dispersion of power through social practices and thus it is not concentrated in

the hands of certain people, associations, or the state (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Instead of seeing power as repression, Foucault (1980) aims to uncover a productive network of power that forms the basis for the construction of our social world. Foucault (1980) states:

> What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (p. 119)

Foucault claims that power and knowledge complement each other, arguing that there is an intimate relationship between power and discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Furthermore, he questions the possibility of universal truth because there is no way to have a discourse-free talk (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Foucault (1980) explains how power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse by arguing that:

> Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (p. 131)

Furthermore, Jäger and Maier (2009) explain the concept of *power over discourse* by identifying discourses as supra-individual and by stating that "discourses take on a life of their own as they evolve" (p. 38). Within this context, they argue that while not everyone or every group contributes to the construction of discourse in the same manner, it is also not very easy to object to dominant discourse. They draw attention to the power effects of discourses by stating that these effects may not necessarily result from the intentional action of some groups by quoting Foucault that "[p]eople know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what what [sic] they do does' (personal communication, quoted in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p. 187 as cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 38).

To summarize, social constructionism and critical discourse analysis help scholars better understand the evolution of concepts and changes in meanings attributed to them. In scrutinizing how changes happen through the lens of historical, cultural, and socio-economical differences across time, it demonstrates how social practices, identities, and meanings are socially constructed. Within this context, the evolution of the creativity concept also can be understood through the lens of social constructionism. Similar to changes in meanings ascribed to the concept of population, the concept of creativity has risen to prominence due to changes in global market expectations and job prospects, increasing number of university graduates, and unemployment rates. At least, this is one of the most common discourses constructed on creativity; however, there are, of course, many other creativity discourses that have not yet gained much prominence. Since the emergence of creativity-related programs in higher education is a relatively new phenomenon and the number of these degree programs is likely to increase in the near future, I aim to demonstrate through adopting social constructivist

41

perspective and critical discourse analysis how meanings attributed to the creativity concept are

evolving and being reconstructed.

CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY

Given the complexity of the context and the multiplicity of meanings attributed to creativity as an emerging discipline, it is important to examine which creativity discourses are more likely to be adopted in higher education, how creativity is institutionalized in higher education programs, and how different programs conceptualize creativity in their curricula.

Methodological Approach: Critical Discourse Analysis

Fairclough (2013) identifies three features of CDA as relational, dialectical, and transdisciplinary (p. 3). He explains that CDA not only consists of analysis of discourse, but also includes analysis of relations of discourse with other factors and within itself. Fairclough (1992, p. 73) adopts a three-dimensional framework to examine the relationships between discourses and their reflection in daily practices, including micro-, meso-, and macro-perspectives.

Micro-level: Detailed textual analysis within the field of linguistics

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state that, according to Fairclough (1992), detailed textual analysis is important in discourse analysis as it can provide information about how discursive practices manifest themselves linguistically in texts. However, Fairclough (1992) also points out that textual analysis alone cannot reveal relationships between texts and social practices and structures. Herein, the important role of multidisciplinary approach in CDA comes into prominence.

At the micro-level, I will conduct linguistic analysis with the aim of determining semantic and lexical relations in the corpus (program mission statements and descriptions). In semantic relations, I will aim to reveal the influences of institutions on constructing meanings since it is possible that institutions may attach different meanings to clauses and sentences. In

lexical relations, the goal is to demonstrate similarities or differences in occurrences of certain words/word pairs in the corpus. Within this context, I first searched for certain adjectives, nouns, and verbs such as *creativity, innovation, critical,* and so forth. In addition, I looked for certain variants such as *edu-, glob-, compet- , employ-, entrepreneur-, and develop-*. After selecting relevant words, I analyzed the semantic relations. Conducting lexical and semantic analysis provided a better understanding about which discourses are dominant in texts and which meanings are attributed to the notion of creativity across various academic programs.

Meso-level: Discourse as discursive practice

At the meso-level, the study explores whether similar trends towards creativity appear in documents through discursive practices. Although documents in this corpus are produced by different stakeholders, it is very possible that there might be close relationship among them through a "genre chain." Fairclough (2003) identifies genre chains as "different genres which are regularly linked together, involving transformation from genre to genre" (p. 31). Within this context, I examined through a genre chain how certain trends towards creativity are represented more dominantly and how some of them may appear as less represented. Along the same lines, I paid close attention to producers and consumers of texts as well as the way they position themselves through discursive practices. By analyzing program mission statements, curriculum, and course syllabi at the meso-level, it is particularly important to find out which forms of creativity become more salient in texts, how each degree program frames the importance of creativity in education, and how their approaches are translated into curricula and course syllabi (e.g., reflecting an economic perspective, reflecting a more humanistic approach).

Macro-sociological analysis

As stated above, micro-level and meso-level analysis alone cannot help scholars to understand the dialectical relationships between texts and social practices. Wodak and Meyer (2009) state that there is a need for a multi-disciplinary and multi-methodological approach in CDA to examine social phenomena. Macro-sociological analysis can help scholars to deconstruct social structures and power relations that play an important role in constructing social practices. "The contribution of the interpretative tradition is to provide an understanding of how people actively create a rule-bound world in everyday practices" (Fairclough, 1992 as cited in Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 66). Through daily discussions and activities, some discourses gain more prominence than others. In particular, Wodak and Meyer (2009) argue that dominant ideologies are perceived as objective and remain unchallenged. Similarly, certain groups, which are in search of ways to increase their influence in society may manipulate public opinion, which may lead us to think more about the Gramscian concept of *hegemony (*Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Thus, one of the roles of CDA researchers is to reveal whether and how discourses perpetuate social domination, in which power holders discursively influence others. Within this context, I aimed to reveal how the construction of the concept of creativity in higher education institutions in texts is influenced by a macro-level social context. It is possible that certain actors and institutions may have different approaches to creativity, however, not all approaches are represented in texts equally. For example, it may be argued that a market-oriented approach to creativity may become more dominant in texts due to strong influences of economic institutions worldwide. Therefore, I paid close attention to current socio-economic contexts. By keeping this in mind, I aimed to explain social and educational consequences of certain discourses, arguing that influences of certain actors and institutions on the construction of creativity may lead to certain policy changes in higher education.

Data Sources

The sample of higher education degree programs in creativity in this study was selected based on the following criteria: (a) explicit use of *creativity* in program titles, mission statement, and program description; (b) credit–, certificate–, degree–bearing programs, or some kind of award (e.g. minor programs); and (c) English language academic curriculum. While performing the web-based research, special attention was given to program mission statements and descriptions. In addition to conducting web-based search, I contacted directors and faculty members of programs in the sample via e-mail to learn more about their programs and double-check and clarify information collected online to increase the reliability of the study.

Since creativity has been historically attributed to arts (e.g., creative writing, creative arts, and creative media), many creativity-related degree programs have been traditionally housed in arts departments. However, as documented elsewhere, the importance attached to creativity in dealing with current economic and social problems has resulted in the emergence of creativity degree programs that are not necessarily housed in arts departments and that rationalize the importance of creativity from different perspectives. Thus, creativity-related degree programs that are traditionally housed in arts departments were excluded in this research. Rather, the sample consisted of degree programs, which use variants of the term *'creat-'* in their titles, program descriptions, and mission statements (e.g., critical and creative thinking, creative entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation). In addition, there are some limitations associated with the sample that are particularly due to linguistic boundaries. For example, only creativity related programs in Anglophone countries were chosen because of the researcher's language abilities, which limited the scope of analysis. The sample only included academic programs that are in English and have websites in English and it is likely that there might be other creativity

related degree programs around the world offered in other languages. The total number of programs in the sample was defined only according to different degree types in creativity offered by an institution. In some cases, universities offered two separate degrees in creativity, while using the same mission statements or program descriptions. In other cases, universities had different program descriptions and mission statements, while offering different degree types. Therefore, while defining the total number of the sample, degree types offered were taken into consideration and different degree programs that have same mission statement were still treated as separate programs. Using these criteria, a search for creativity-related degree programs resulted in a total of 45 programs offered by 32 universities (see Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 below).

The programs varied significantly in terms of degree types offered. Most of the programs offered either a master's degree or a certificate (undergraduate and graduate). However, some other types of awards - such as minor programs - were still available for those who would like to study in one of these creativity-related degree programs. With regard to instruction type, the majority of the programs were offered either through on-campus or hybrid formats. However, there were ten degree programs that were offered through a fully online format. Additionally, 25 program directors, faculty members, or program coordinators responded to e-mails and answered most of the questions directed to them (see Appendix A).

It should also be noted here that some of the degree programs were directly for creativity and some of them were about creativity. For example, while the sample included programs such as the State University of New York's Creative Studies or Saybrook University's Creativity Studies that directly focus on fostering participants' creativity, the sample also included programs such as Falmouth University's Creative Education or Berlin School of Creative

Leadership programs that capitalize on creativity to foster executives' leadership skills or help

teachers to make teaching a more creative activity.

Table 3. List of Universities Offering Creativity Related Programs

Country	University
Australia	The University of Technology Sydney
Canada	Humber College, Sheridan College
Finland	Aalto University
Germany	Berlin School of Creative Leadership
Malta	The University of Malta
United Kingdom	City University London, Cranfield University, Falmouth University, Goldsmiths University of London, Newcastle University, The University of Central Lancashire, The University of Edinburgh
United States	Berry College, Brandeis University, Cornerstone University, Drexel University, Eastern Kentucky University, Pacifica Graduate Institute, Saybrook University, Syracuse University, Texas A & M University, The State University of New York (Buffalo State), The University of Massachusetts Boston, The University of Southern Maine, The University of Texas at Austin, The University of Houston, The University of Nebraska Omaha, The University of the Virgin Islands, Union Institute & University, Washington University in St. Louis, Western Connecticut University

Table 4. List of Universities Offering Creativity Related Programs by Degree - Award/ Instruction Type (Australia, Canada, Germany, Finland, Malta)

University Name	Program Name	Degree	Instruction
The University of Technology Sydney	Creative Intelligence and Innovation	Bachelor	On-Campus
Humber College	Creative Advertising	Bachelor	Hybrid
Sheridan College	Creativity and Creative Problem Solving	Certificate	On-Campus
Berlin School of Creative Leadership	Creative Leadership	Executive MBA	On-Campus
Aalto University	Creative Sustainability	Master	On-Campus
The University of Malta	Creativity and Innovation	Master	On-Campus

Table 5. List of Universities Offering Creativity Related Programs by Degree - Award/ Instruction Type (United Kingdom)

University Name	Program Name	Degree	Instruction
City University London	Innovation, Creativity and Leadership	Master	On-Campus
Cranfield University	Innovation and Creativity in Industry	MDes/PgCert/PgDip	On-Campus
Falmouth University	Creative Education	Master/PgDip	Hybrid

University Name	Program Name	Degree	Instruction
Goldsmiths, the University of London	Creative & Cultural Entrepreneurship	Master	On-Campus
Newcastle University	Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship	Master	On-Campus
The University of Central Lancashire	Creative Thinking	Master	Online
The University of Edinburgh	Interdisciplinary Creative Practices	Master	On-Campus

Table 6. List of Universities Offering Creativity Related Programs by Degree - Award/ Instruction Type (United States)

University Name	Program Name	Degree	Instruction
Berry College	Creative Technologies	Bachelor/Minor	On-Campus
Brandeis University	Creativity, the Arts and Social Transformation	Minor	On-Campus
Cornerstone University	Creativity and Innovation	Minor	On-Campus
Drexel University[1]	Creativity and Innovation	Certificate/Master	Online
Eastern Kentucky University	Applied Creative Thinking	Minor	Hybrid
Pacifica Graduate Institute	Engaged Humanities & the Creative Life	Master	Hybrid
Saybrook University	Creativity Studies	Certificate	Online
Syracuse University[2]	Creative Leadership	Bach/Certificate/ Minor	Hybrid
Texas A & M University	Creativity Studies	Minor	Hybrid
Texas A & M University	Cognition and Creativity	Master	Online
The State University of New York	Creativity and Change Leadership	Certificate	Online & On Campus
The State University of New York[3]	Creative Studies	Minor/Master	Online & On Campus
The University of Massachusetts Boston	Critical and Creative Thinking	Certificate/Master	Hybrid
The University of Houston	Creative Work	Minor	On-Campus
The University of Nebraska Omaha	Critical and Creative Thinking	Master	Online
The University of Southern Maine	Creative Leadership and Global Strategy	Certificate	Hybrid
The University of Southern Maine	Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship	Minor	On-Campus
The University of Texas at Austin	Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship	Certificate	On-Campus
The University of the Virgin Islands	Creative Leadership for Innovation and Change	Ph.D.	Hybrid
Union Institute & University	Creativity Studies	Master	Online
Washington University in St. Louis	Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Creativity	Certificate	On-Campus
Western Connecticut University	Leadership, Compassion and Creativity	Certificate	On-Campus

[1] Drexel University offers both the undergraduate and graduate certificates in Creativity and Innovation.

[2] Syracuse University's University College offers Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) degree in Creative Leadership. The program can be completed online, on-campus, or a combination.

[3] The world's first Master of Science degree program and the first undergraduate minor in Creative Studies is offered by Buffalo State College, State University of New York. The State University of New York offers on-campus minor program in 'Creative Studies', and offers separate distance and on-campus programs in 'Creativity and Change Leadership' and 'Creative Studies'.

Table 7. Program Overview (N = 45)

	% (*n*)
Award type	
Certificate	26.7 (12)
Degree (bachelor's, master's, M.B.A., Ph.D., postgraduate diploma)	53.3 (24)
Other/award	20 (9)
Instruction type[4]	
Online	21.3 (10)
On-Campus	51.1 (24)
Hybrid	27.6 (13)
Country	
Australia	2.2 (1)
Canada	4.4 (2)
Finland	2.2 (1)
Germany	2.2 (1)
Malta	2.2 (1)
United Kingdom	22.2 (10)
United States	64.4 (29)

Drawing on a critical discourse analysis of degree bearing programs in creativity, this research examines how universities conceptualize and institutionalize creativity programs and the implications the institutionalization of different approaches to creativity have for the field of education. To do this, the study included: (1) content analysis of mission statements and curricula of creativity degree programs; (2) analysis of course syllabi; and (3) semi structured in-depth interviews with key stakeholders.

Program descriptions/mission statements

---

[4] The State University of New York offers separate distance and on-campus programs in 'Creativity and Change Leadership' and 'Creative Studies'. Therefore, N for instruction type is 47.

First, the program mission statement of each degree program was identified via university websites. Program descriptions/mission statements play an important role in understanding how academic programs self-identify and represent themselves to the public audience. Since program descriptions/mission statements reflect different approaches and meanings attributed to creativity, they were analyzed to understand better how each program conceptualized creativity as an academic discipline.

Curriculum

In addition to program descriptions/mission statements, the next step was the curriculum analysis of each degree program. Curriculum was identified through university websites or through contacting program faculty. In this regard, special attention was given to the analysis of courses offered, disciplinary foci, as well as instruction type (on-campus versus online).

Course syllabi

I was able to gather eighteen course syllabi from program directors and faculty members from 12 universities. Most of the syllabi were for introductory level creativity courses in each department. However, I was also able to include some advanced level creativity course syllabi in the sample. Syllabi are important learning tools that cover course descriptions, required readings, and assignments. In this regard, the main aim of the course syllabi analysis was to explore concepts taught and readings assigned in creativity-related courses.

Table 8. List of Course Syllabi

University Name	Course Name	Instruction
Aalto University	Creative Sustainability 0024 – Systems Thinking	On-Campus
Aalto University	Creative Sustainability 0025 – Systems Thinking	On-Campus
Berry College	CRT101: Introduction to Prototyping	On-Campus

Brandeis University	CAST 150: Introduction to Creativity, the Arts, and Social Transformation	On-Campus
Eastern Kentucky University	Intro to Applied Creative Thinking	Online
Union Institute & University	RST 511 Disciplinary Foundations I & II	Online
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Introduction to Critical and Creative Thinking	Online
University of Southern Maine	BUS 386: Creative Strategies for Entrepreneurs	On-Campus
Pacifica Graduate Institute	Creativity, Vocation, and Alchemical Work	Hybrid
Syracuse University	Introduction to Creative Leadership	Online
Syracuse University	Professional Issues in Creative Leadership	Online
Syracuse University	Creative and Design Thinking for Professional Studies	Online
Texas A & M University	Creative Thinking	Online
The State University of New York	Principles in Creative Problem Solving	On-Campus
The State University of New York	Facilitation of Group Problem Solving	On-Campus
The University of Massachusetts Boston	Inside the Creative Process: Exploring Blocks and Finding Creative Ground	Online
The University of Massachusetts Boston	Creative Thinking, Collaboration, and Organizational Change	Online
The University of Massachusetts Boston	Creative Thinking	Hybrid

Interviews

In addition to conducting a CDA of program materials (i.e., mission statements, curriculum, and course syllabi), another data source for this research came from semi-structured interviews with program directors and faculty members of the creativity-related degree programs in the sample to get a more in-depth information about the history, structure, organization, and content of the programs.

The purposeful sampling technique was used in identifying the numbers of possible interviewees. Interviewees were chosen based on their expertise in creativity, their institutions' approach to creativity (e.g., economic versus holistic), and their willingness to participate. In particular, special attention was given to program directors and faculty who teach introductory courses in creativity. Additionally, I interviewed academics, experts, and researchers who have an interest in creativity and innovation research, but are not necessarily affiliated with any of the

programs in the sample. Interviews with these experts allowed an examination of the broader field of creativity and innovation research within which academic programs emerge and become institutionalized.

Interviews were conducted via Skype given the fact that face-to-face interviews were not possible because of geographical distance. Interviews lasted approximately one hour and were recorded and transcribed. Prior to conducting interviews, a consent form was provided to participants, which explained goals of the research project and the steps for protecting participants' personal information. In total, 19 semi-structured interviews were conducted. Out of 19 interviewees (see Appendix C for the list of interviewees), only two did not give their consent to list their names and institutional affiliations in reports, publications, or presentations stemming from this research. Therefore, their names were kept anonymous to protect confidentiality. Interview recordings were deleted after the completion of research (see Appendix D for IRB consent form).

Importantly, some of the interviewees asked if I would share with them the findings of my research before publication to ensure that their arguments and opinions were presented accurately. To do this, I used a member check technique (also known as member or response validation), which enabled me to increase the validity of research findings (Sandelowski, 2008). The goal of this technique is to ensure that points made by interviewees are described and interpreted accurately by researchers to increase descriptive and interpretive validity of research (Sandelowski, 2008). However, some 'epistemological and ethical questions' remain concerning the extent to which the technique can help researchers increase the validity of findings. As Sandelowski (2008) points out, some of the questions are: "What data or interpretations are

research participants in a position to validate? What is the right course of action should participants decide researchers got it wrong? Does a member's refusal to validate a researcher's interpretation invalidate it? Is member checking appropriately conceived as a validation enterprise at all?" (p. 2). Thus, while checking results with interviewees, these questions were kept in mind and further discussions were held with interviewees when more clarification concerning interview data was needed.

Data Analysis

Upon collection of program mission statements, curriculum, and course syllabi, texts from these materials were read carefully and critically. Additionally, collected data regarding program mission statements/descriptions were shared with two other colleagues to check program web pages and crosscheck the similarity of collected data. The aim was to increase validity and reliability and ensure that collected program mission statements/descriptions indeed reflect each program's mission adequately.

After careful reading, linguistic analyses of the main sample documents were conducted through micro-, meso-, and macro- perspectives. At the micro-level, analysis included coding words (e.g., adjectives, nouns, and verbs) and conducting a descriptive analysis regarding the occurrences of certain words and word pairs in documents. After removing redundant/irrelevant words, the 10 most frequent words for each theme out of the micro-level analysis were displayed by using NVivo's word cloud feature.

At the meso-level, I focused more on certain themes that emerged out of the data analysis since it is possible that documents in the corpus can rationalize the importance of creativity

54

differently (i.e., creativity for the labor market, creativity for personal development, etc.). In this regard, the meso-level analysis included coding emerging themes out of detailed textual analysis. During the coding of emerging themes, each program description/mission statement was read carefully and repeatedly together with another colleague. After reaching a consensus, themes that emerged out of the meso-level analysis were presented in the order of frequency along with supporting evidence from program curricula, course syllabi, and interview data.

At the macro-level, I interpreted data analysis results more broadly by focusing more on which creativity discourses became more dominant and which ones appeared to be silenced. Data were analyzed using NVivo, which is software that helps researchers conduct qualitative or mixed methods research. In particular, NVivo is very useful in organizing and analyzing unstructured or qualitative data. It is a helpful tool in discovering connections in data, which may not be possible manually. NVivo enables researchers to conduct a systematic analysis by making coding easy and allowing thematic analysis. Within this context, NVivo was used in CDA to gain insight about the general patterns from the data analysis. However, CDA requires a much more rigorous analysis, that is why NVivo analysis was complemented by traditional paper-and-pencil method.

In addition to conducting CDA, semi-structured interviews were conducted and analyzed. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. They were analyzed using NVivo software. Interviews can play a significant role in complementing the textually based data analysis. Interviews also helped to triangulate the data and offered an opportunity to understand better the context within which each program has emerged. After transcribing interview data, the emerging themes were coded and compared with the results of CDA. During the coding of transcripts,

open coding, axial coding, and selective coding was employed consecutively. I started with open

coding, which Strauss and Corbin (1990) explain as below:

> Concepts are the basic building blocks of theory. Open coding in grounded theory
>
> method is the analytic process by which concepts are identified and developed in terms of
>
> their properties and dimensions. The basic analytic procedures by which this is
>
> accomplished are: the asking of questions about the data; and the making of comparisons
>
> for similarities and differences between each incident, event, and other instances of
>
> phenomena. Similar events and incidents are labelled and grouped to form categories. (p.
>
> 74)

During the open coding process, the main goal was to scrutinize creativity phenomena

and explain it through different concepts. By breaking down interview data into various units

through open coding, the aim was to uncover similar and different concepts of creativity and

categorize them. Throughout coding process, I constantly asked myself questions such as "what

is the issue here?, which persons, actors are involved?, which aspects of the phenomenon are

mentioned (or not mentioned)?, when?, how much?, why?, what for?, by which?" (Flick, 2009,

p. 310). Finding answers for these questions also helped categorize data coherently. After

completing open coding and coming up with certain categories, the next step was axial coding to

figure out relations between categories and subcategories (Flick, 2009). Strauss and Corbin

(1990) approach axial coding as:

> Axial coding is the process of relating subcategories to a category. It is a complex process
>
> of inductive and deductive thinking involving several steps. These are accomplished, as
>
> with open coding, by making comparisons and asking questions. However, in axial

coding the use of these procedures is more focused, and geared toward discovering and

relating categories in terms of the paradigm model. (p. 114)

The final step of coding the interview data was selective coding. The main goal was to

establish the core category that can potentially have relations with other categories and is the

most salient phenomena. Selective coding enabled me to explain general overview of the story

that is emerged from the analysis of interview data.

Limitations and researcher reflexivity

While CDA is an appropriate methodology for this study, there are some limitations

which researchers should be aware. One of the questions is whether the public use of research

results can play a role as social engineering (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). "Fairclough sees this

kind of use of the results as a manifestation of the 'technologisation of discourse' (1992b, p.

221f.), whereby discourse research is employed to alter discursive practices and also to train

people to use new forms of discursive practices, for example, to train managers of businesses"

(Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 88). To tackle this challenge, Fairclough advises that researchers

should have critical language awareness. Critical language awareness helps researchers to

question whether their analysis deconstructs unequal power relations and paves the way for more

egalitarian and liberal discourses and enhance democratization, which is indeed one of the main

goals of critical discourse analysis. Along the same lines, researchers in CDA should be aware of

the fact that their use of discourses in discursive practices can lead to a positive change as long as

they adopt a critical approach to the use of language and texts.

Another critical comment for CDA is that "the consequences for empirical research of the

theoretical distinction between the discursive and non-discursive remain unclear. How can one

demonstrate empirically that something is in a dialectical relationship with something else? Where does one locate the line of demarcation between two or more things that are in dialectical interplay? And how can one show exactly *where* and *how* the non-discursive moments influence and change the discursive moment - and vice versa?" (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 89). To overcome these issues, analytical distinction instead of empirical distinction can be adopted to differentiate the discursive from non-discursive (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). To analyze social practices that include both discursive and non-discursive factors, there is a need for social and cultural theory along with discourse analysis (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Without considering certain factors (social, cultural, economic, educational, etc.) in which discursive practices occur, only discourse analysis cannot fully grasp the connection between language use and social practice (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Furthermore, Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state that another weakness of Fairclough's CDA "is a theoretically weak understanding of processes of group formation, the subject and agency, including questions regarding subjectification and subjectivity and how much control people have over their language use" (p. 90). Throughout the data analysis process, I was aware of these weaknesses of CDA and aimed to overcome them by being reflective about interpretation process and considering contexts in which discursive practices occur.

Finally, the sample of this research only includes creativity-related degree programs from the Western world, specifically focusing on programs offered in the English language, which limits the scope for doing comparison between Eastern and Western notions of creativity. Although this research stresses the impact of cultural differences on creativity and examines how degree programs in the sample consider cultural variations in creativity, further research is

needed. It is important to consider extending this research in the future and scrutinize the institutionalization of creativity degree programs beyond the English-speaking and Western world.

Moreover, data sources in this research (i.e., program mission statements, descriptions, curriculum, and course syllabus) are likely to change over time as programs go through certain structural and content changes from time to time. In fact, some programs, which are included in this research, have already undergone certain changes in their mission statements and program descriptions during the course of this research. Similarly, programs currently offered on-campus may go through certain structural changes and include online components as programs develop in the future. Therefore, it should be stressed that text-based data presented in this research, particularly program mission statements and descriptions as well as offered degree types and media of instruction, are likely to evolve as programs continue to develop.

CHAPTER V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

From the mission statements and program descriptions data, some common themes emerged across the creativity-related degree programs in the sample. These themes include the following broad conceptualizations of creativity: (1) creativity as a skillset or mindset; (2) creativity as an inter/multi/trans-disciplinary and holistic approach to education; (3) creativity for meeting the needs of the market; (4) creativity for personal and/or professional development; and (5) creativity for change through leadership. These emerging themes from mission statements and program descriptions were triangulated with the curriculum, course syllabi, and interview data. While discussing each theme in the following sections in the descending order of frequency, evidence from mission statements, curricula, course syllabi, and interview data were merged and presented holistically. In most cases, there were overlapping themes as some programs rationalized the importance of creativity from multiple perspectives. Also, some programs specifically underlined the importance of creativity in terms of globalization, critical thinking, and other themes, which were not commonly recurring themes and therefore will only be briefly discussed in the findings.

Creativity as a Skillset/Mindset

The first (and most frequently mentioned) theme from the content analysis of text-based data highlighted the conceptualization of creativity as a skill-set. Of the 45 degree programs in the analysis, 24 (53.3%) described creativity as an important skillset. Most of the programs referred to creativity as one of the important skill-sets in today's world, highlighting such skills as problem solving, leadership, critical thinking, and others (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Word Query for Creativity as a Skillset Theme

There were varying rationales behind identifying creativity as a very important skillset.

For example, Drexel University's Creativity and Innovation certificate program (2017) states:

Upon completion of a certificate program, students will have formed an in-depth

understanding of creativity, enhanced communication, creative problem solving, and how

these may be applied to practical situations that further their workplace culture.

Participants will use their newly enhanced creative thinking skills to reflect critically on

existing workplace practices and express coherent and cogent ideas and suggestions for

continuous improvement. ("Certificates in Creativity and Innovation" section, para. 2)

Similar to Drexel University's conceptualization, the Bachelor of Creative Intelligence

and Innovation program in the University of Technology Sydney (2017) identifies creativity as

one of the leading-edge capabilities by referring to its importance in the globalized world. The

program states:

The Bachelor of Creative Intelligence and Innovation (BCII) is a unique combined degree

that encompasses high-level critical and creative thinking, invention, complexity,

innovation, future scenario building and entrepreneurship; leading-edge capabilities that are highly valued in the globalised world. By focusing in teams on high-level conceptual thinking and problem-solving practices, students learn to work across and between disciplines, discovering rare skills and mind-sets – and in the process becoming lifelong innovators, entrepreneurs, creative practitioners and change-makers. ("What is Creative Intelligence and Innovation" section, para. 1 & para. 3)

A review of program curricula revealed a range of courses that are more likely to cover the skills-side of creativity, including: 'Creativity, Innovation, and Problem Solving,' 'Principles of Creative Problem Solving,' 'Foresight Techniques for Creativity and Innovation,' and 'Tools and Techniques in Creativity.' The majority of the programs also identified creativity as necessary not only for career advancement but also for personal development. Indeed, this theme was closely connected to another theme highlighting the use of creativity for personal and professional development (see next sections for a more detailed analysis). For example, educational objectives of 'Creative Strategies for Entrepreneurs' course offered by the University of Southern Maine (2017) were stated as follows:

This course explores strategies for innovation and creative problem solving as well as frameworks for entrepreneurial planning. Through experiential activities, readings, and discussions, students learn creative techniques employed by creative makers and thinkers from artists to scientists and entrepreneurs. Students apply what they have learned to generate and assess an entrepreneurial idea. ("School of Business Course Descriptions" section)

Similarly, some of the interviewees drew attention to the importance of creativity for both personal and professional development as one of the twenty-first century skills. During my interview with Gerard Puccio, who is the department chair and professor at the International Center for Studies in Creativity (ICSC) in SUNY, he explained the emphasis on creativity as a skillset in their degree programs:

The rationale was frankly that education did not do much to promote creative thinking. Creative thinking was a skill seem to be essential by Alex Osborn. [Creativity] is a professional skill that promotes success in one's career. That was the rationale. The thing is ironic about that now that is also the reason why you are seeing so many other programs emerged around the world. They now see the same thing that Alex Osborn saw fifty some years ago. [Creativity] is being thought as a twenty-first century skill. The trends are clear that creative thinking and creative problem solving are twenty-first century skills. In order to be successful professionally, you have to master these skills but education does not do very much to promote these skills. The exact same reasons you see today we were fifty years ahead of everybody else. The other reason why and this is something that Sid Parnes, [who was the co-founder of ICSC] shared with me that Alex Osborn recognized that as a new field, it needed to have academic support, it needed to be subjected to research and inquiry. One of the things that you get by focusing at the university level, you have scholars who needed to do research. There was a practical point in terms of establishing a foundation for the field that was actually very crucial part of the strategy.

As mentioned above, a review of the content analysis of text-based data showed that most of the programs in the sample identified creativity as an important skillset. However, it was not clear from the text-based data whether creativity is both skillset and mindset. During the interview process, I directed questions to interviewees to clarify whether they view creativity as a skillset or mindset or both and all interviewees stated that it is not either/or, it is both. For example, Tony Wagner from Harvard University explained:

> There is a set of creative problem solving skills. I am sure you are familiar with design thinking as a methodology. That is a methodology, that is a set of skills, not easily defined as hard skills. It begins with empathy. I also think it [creativity] is a stance in the world, it is a way of being in the world, it is seeing things with fresh way or wanting to express oneself or make meaning, make beauty. So creativity is both [mindset and skillset].

Findings from the content analysis of text-based and interview data align with the literature, which also emphasizes that creativity and innovation are seen as important twenty-first century skills (Piirto, 2011). Education 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action, which is a declaration released after the World Education Forum 2015 organized by UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Bank, UNFPA, UNDP, UN Women and UNHCR, also deems creativity one of the most important skills demanded by the labor market. UNESCO declaration (2015) states:

> … a narrow focus on work-specific skills reduces graduates' abilities to adapt to the fast-changing demands of the labour market. Therefore, beyond mastering work-specific skills, emphasis must be placed on developing high-level cognitive and non-cognitive/transferable skills (OECD, 2013), such as problem solving, critical thinking,

creativity, teamwork, communication skills and conflict resolution, which can be used across a range of occupational fields. (p. 17)

As the data analysis and the literature showed, the increasing attention given to creativity as one of the twenty-first century skills is one of the underlying reasons behind the emergence of these creativity degree programs. One can also argue that presenting creativity as a skillset rather than as a mindset makes the concept easy to validate, which can potentially attract more students to participate in such creativity-related programs.

Moreover, *creativity as a skillset/mindset* theme can be linked to the discussions about the market. Although a content analysis of '*creativity as a skillset/mindset*' theme did not explicitly connect creativity skills to labor market demands, it can still be argued that there might be an implicit connection between skills and the business world. Within this context, reducing creativity only to the skills concept and linking it to the business world has the potential to commodify the concept of creativity. As Tony Wagner stated, creativity is a stance in the world and that is why it is important to approach creativity more holistically rather than perceiving it as skillset that can be utilized only for certain purposes. With a creative mindset and skillset, it is more likely that students can develop into more self-transformed and well-rounded individuals ready to face challenges in both their personal and professional lives.

Creativity as an Inter/Multi/Trans-Disciplinary and Holistic Approach to Education

The content analysis of program descriptions and mission statements revealed that of the 45 degree programs examined, 21 (46.7%) stressed the importance of adopting an inter-, multi-, and sometimes transdisciplinary approach to education in order to develop their students into versatile graduates upon the completion of their studies. In this regard, most of the programs in

the sample emphasized that their students should explore a wide range of different disciplines and perspectives during their study. The most frequently used words in this theme are 'skills,' 'business,' 'interdisciplinarity,' 'leadership,' and 'thinking' (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Word Query for Interdisciplinarity Theme

While some of the programs drew attention to the importance of bridging different disciplines, some of them drew attention only to the importance of studying in multidisciplinary teams. For example, Union Institute & University's Creativity Studies program (2017) stated,

> Union's Creativity Studies builds on the fields of philosophy, psychology, education, the arts, and religion. Using various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and modes of inquiry, you will be able to discover what creativity is, how it occurs, and how we can increase our own creativity. Just as creativity is not only limited to the arts, Union's Creativity Studies is valuable in a variety of fields including business, education, cultural studies, and the sciences. ("Founded on Interdisciplinary Learning" section, para. 1)

Furthermore, the University of Malta's Creativity and Innovation program (2017) stated,

This is an interdisciplinary programme designed to assist participants to expand their

perception, employ creative skills, develop ideas individually and within teams, sustain a

creative climate and manage innovation. It offers methods and processes which help to

identify opportunities and cultivate appropriate skills and attitudes. It promotes

imaginative, flexible and practical thought and action and improves the ability to respond

practically and creatively to problems and opportunities. This programme attracts

professionals from a broad base of disciplines from the local and international scene.

("Overview Description" section, para. 1)

The impact of an interdisciplinary approach to creativity can also be seen in students'

profiles in the programs. Since the programs adopt an inter/multi/trans-disciplinary approach to

creativity, students in these programs also come from a wide range of different fields. Oftentimes

what most of the programs have in common is that participants of these programs are mid-career

professionals seeking personal and professional development in their careers and have an

interdisciplinary interest in education. For example, when discussing student profiles with

Jeremy Szteiter from the University of Massachusetts' 'Critical and Creative Thinking' program,

he explained,

There is no typical student. Students come from so many different fields and disciplines.

Maybe there are something that they have in common most students are what we called

mid-career professionals. They have been working for a little while, most students are not

right out of undergraduate. They have some career experience. Most of our students

continue working during their study, the majority are not full-time, the majority are part-

time. They take one or two courses at a time and they finish in two or two and a half

years. Sometimes more. Students are international and they are local and they are from across the U.S. I think in a lot of cases students have explored what I called maybe more traditional degrees so they looked into an MBA, what they looked into Master's of education degrees and they said I do not really want to do that. I need to do something different. They also have an interdisciplinary interest. There is no degree that is called that thing so critical and creative thinking degree is the closest that they found to allowing them bring together interdisciplinary interests.

The importance of being a versatile graduate able to function in a wide range of different, contexts was also stated explicitly in the program mission statements and descriptions. For example, in referring to fast change and increasing complexity in the world, Saybrook University's Creativity Studies program (2017) stated that "A complex and fast-changing world demands new, creative approaches to everything from corporate strategies to household chores. The importance of understanding and encouraging creativity has been widely recognized in many fields including education, business, healthcare, government, the arts, and science. There is a vital role for creativity studies in making the most of our self-awareness and furthering our human potential" ("Description" section, para. 1). Aligning with Saybrook's statement, Drexel University's Creativity and Innovation program (2017) stated:

Innovation is the spirit of solving real world problems through new ideas and critical thinking. Drexel University's accredited Online Master's degree in Creativity and Innovation develops students' ability to solve these problems through challenging and practical coursework that fosters professional excellence for tomorrow's leaders. Students will acquire the skills to conduct methodical analysis of problematic situations in a

variety of settings, whether corporate, educational or military, and devise and implement the best possible solutions. This degree is ideal for burgeoning professionals looking to develop themselves and the organizations they work for. ("Overview" section, para. 1)

In an interview with Susan Rowland from Pacifica Graduate Institute, I asked a question related to students' expectations from participating in 'Engaged Humanities and the Creative Life' program. Referring to fast changes in the world and the uncertainty surrounding employees and recent graduates, she argued that creativity might be an important survival skill. She explained:

In many ways students are preparing themselves for the twenty-first century, where to be creative might just be an important survival skill, given that long-term jobs, long-term careers seem to be rapidly fading away. Seeing that with an era of rapidly changing technology, employers are wanting people who can learn and who can react very quickly to changing circumstances. People need to be creative, so they can generate new products. But I think for our program, it is more a question that we are teaching survival skills creativity, so you learn how to deal with a world in which you do not have a safe place and you have to be able to adapt psychologically and have a great deal of strength because things outside change in unexpected ways. So a lot of what the students are getting from the program is the sense of being prepared for an uncertain future in which creativity is going to be essential to them dealing with a changing economic world. Having said that, we have students who go into marketing, who go into various forms of communications. We had a student who came in as a poet and was working on this novel for much of time that he was with us, on leaving the program he got a very good job,

writing copy for a health insurance company. So there are real practicalities in having this sense of collective energies that is innate to the program.

After reviewing course syllabi in the sample, I identified courses that explicitly underlined the importance of interdisciplinarity. Among these courses, the University of Nebraska at Omaha's Introduction to Critical and Creative Thinking (CCT) describes the content and purpose of the course as follows:

> Successful organizations recognize that critical thinking and creative solutions enhance one's problem-solving capabilities, results, and potential. In this course, students will prepare for the MA [Master of Arts] CCT program, focusing on the development of their skills as critical thinkers and creative problem solvers while cultivating their capacity to recognize and leverage tools, resources, and ideas towards finding solutions to everyday problems. This course serves as an introduction to interdisciplinarity and the broad range of theories, ideas, methods, and resources that responsible interdisciplinarity demands. Encouraging students to respond critically and creatively to the material it covers, it will provide an overview of basic research practices used across the disciplines as well as sound writing conventions expected of graduate level work. Students will be introduced to critical and creative thinking within an interdisciplinary context, structured conceptually within area concentrations, as they address complex issues and topics. Additionally, the course will offer students the opportunity to begin developing skills and techniques for pursuing evidence based arguments and/or interventions through writing and/or project development.

Similar to the arguments made in the University of Nebraska at Omaha's Introduction to Critical and Creative Thinking (CCT) course syllabus, Andrew Penaluna from the University of Wales Trinity Saint David drew attention to how it will be more beneficial when convergent and divergent thinking is supported through teamwork. He argued:

My own view goes back to what you and I might call divergent and convergent thinking. To be someone who is an innovator, you need to have either both skills or you need to be in a partnership where both skills are expressed. There are some things often missed from the literature. That is because we have always seemed to be trying to teach the perfect person, the person who has got everything. There are authors called Bill Bolton and John Thompson who have written a book *The Entirepreneur: The All-In-One Entrepreneur-Leader-Manager*. The reason they wrote it is because they found so few people that had all the attributes you are looking for, so they kind of focus on these few people they found. And one of the triggers that let us to start thinking really why we always look at the individual, why don't we look at team work? Analytical thinking is really the critical side and insightful thinking perhaps is the creative side. So putting those two together is extremely powerful. To my mind creative and critical thinking do go together, not necessarily in one individual wholly, but maybe through partnerships and teams.

Arguably, the emergence of creativity degree programs and a strong emphasis on inter-, multi-, and trans-disciplinarity can stem from the narrative, which presents creativity as omnipresent and impossible to be reduced to only a few disciplines such as the arts. Since creativity cannot be reduced to the arts only, adopting an inter-, multi-, or trans-disciplinary approach to education by integrating different disciplines together can further creativity. As

opposed to early views, which saw creativity coming from a divine power or muse, the

naturalized view of creativity suggests that creativity can take place anywhere and at any time,

thus putting strong emphasis on everyday experiences (Mansilla, 2010). Since the naturalized

view of creativity does not limit creativity to certain disciplines, it is likely that creativity can

flourish in interdisciplinary thought (Mansilla, 2010). As Sill (1996, p. 133) argues,

> There are both direct and indirect connections between integrative thought and creativity,
>
> with a general equating of integrative and creative thought throughout the
>
> interdisciplinarity literature. Objectives for interdisciplinary studies such as the
>
> integration of knowledge, freedom of inquiry, innovation (Kavalovski, 1979), and
>
> synthetic thinking (Hursh et al., 1983; Newell & Green, 1982) involve aspects of creative
>
> thinking skills. Integrative thought consists of taking disconnected material or ideas and
>
> synthesizing them into something new, a task that is certainly a form of creativity.

The naturalized view of creativity suggests that everybody is born creative, everybody

has creative potential and environment plays an important role in whether an individual's

creativity can be fostered or hampered. Notions of change and complexity in today's world,

which are emphasized in most of the degree programs in this research, entail adopting a holistic

approach to problems through multidisciplinary teams (Basadur, 2004). Basadur (2004) argues

that "the ability to work within interdisciplinary teams becomes increasingly necessary as

problem solving becomes even more complex and as the time available for solving those

problems continues to shrink" (p. 120). Sternberg (2009) states that increasing expertise in

certain fields may have the potential to hamper creative thinking as experts start approaching

things from a fixed standpoint. This does not mean that there is no need for expertise in fields. Sternberg (2009) rather argues that there is need to be educated both deeply and broadly to foster creative thinking. From the data analysis above, it seems that most of the programs in the sample are well aware of the importance of adopting a multi-, inter-, or trans-disciplinary approach to foster creativity and therefore expose their students to a wide variety of different disciplines and bringing people from different disciplinary backgrounds together.

Creativity for Marketing Higher Education versus Creativity for Meeting the Needs of Market

A review of program mission statements and descriptions showed that the rationale behind the need for creativity was strongly driven by economic discourses. Out of 45 degree programs, one third (16 programs or 35.6%) emphasized the importance of creativity for the business world and workplace. In some cases, programs addressed the demands of the business world explicitly while rationalizing the need for creative graduates. In other cases, programs used only business terminology to attract more students, which implicitly indicated the connection of their programs to the business world, but not necessarily argued that the rationale behind initiating these programs is solely driven by business world demand.

In this context, *meeting the needs and addressing the demands of industries and businesses* was often stressed. For example, Cranfield University's Innovation and Creativity in Industry program (2017) stated that "In today's competitive world, business success depends increasingly on the ability to innovate. Business leaders are already recognising the importance of how creative practice and process can improve product and service development and design thinking in shaping business strategy" ("Overview" section, para. 1). The Cranfield course

brochure (2016) also stated that "Industry and government recognise that modern business leaders need to be able to exploit creativity to improve products and services and contribute to organisational success" (p. 5). Likewise, Newcastle University's Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship program[5] (2017) argued that "This course meets the needs of knowledge-based, entrepreneurial and innovation driven economies. It explores the strategies and business processes that promote innovation and creativity in organisations. This includes the fundamentals enterprise development and entrepreneurship." ("Profile" section, para. 1)

While the above program descriptions emphasized the importance of creativity to meet the demands of industries and business, there were also programs rationalizing creativity by often using business terminology such as "necessity of creativity for competitiveness, entrepreneurship, and innovation." For example, the Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Creativity Program at Washington University in St. Louis (2017) stated that "The Certificate in Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Creativity offers an innovative approach to the increasingly complex and changing business environment. [One] major element of the program is multiple and interdisciplinary perspectives for examining creativity, leadership and innovation as important elements of entrepreneurial thinking and behavior" ("Certificate in Entrepreneurship, Leadership, and Creativity" section, para. 1, major element added).

In a few cases, the importance of creativity for the labor market was discussed in terms of globalization and being globally competitive. The importance of creativity was usually attributed to complexity, competitiveness, and fast-paced change, which are usually associated with the

---

[5] Original description of Newcastle University's Innovation, Creativity, and Entrepreneurship program was downloaded in November, 2016. And yet, the description was slightly changed as I was writing the dissertation, although it still reflects the same principles.

globalization concept. Creativity was presented as one of the most important skills necessary to effectively address complexities introduced by globalization. For example, Drexel University's Creativity and Innovation certificate program (2017) stated that "The undergraduate and graduate certificates in Creativity and Innovation are designed to meet the needs of today's working professionals across many fields. Creativity is integral to competitive advantage in today's fast-paced, dynamic working environment. Organizations that harness and nurture the creative potential of their human resources are leaders in their respective fields. These certificates provide, in a concentrated format, the most contemporary knowledge and skills needed in this important area" ("Certificates in Creativity and Innovation" section, para. 1).

Furthermore, the word-frequency query performed in NVivo showed that most frequently used ten words with minimum four characters in length under the theme '*Creativity for Marketing Higher Education versus Creativity for Meeting the Needs of Market'* were mostly about business-related terminology such as business, innovation, entrepreneurship, leadership, and skills (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Word Query for the Labor Market and Business World Theme

A review of program curricula revealed a range of courses that are more likely to cover the economic side of creativity, including 'Consumer Trends for Innovation and Creativity in Industry,' 'Integrating Creativity and Innovation in Marketing Concepts,' 'Creative Strategies for Entrepreneurs,' and 'Creativity in the Workplace.' When triangulating the findings from program descriptions and mission statements with the interview data, Sean McNabney from Sheridan College stressed the importance of creativity and creative problem solving in today's workplace by referring to a well-known study titled 'Capitalizing on Complexity: Insights from the Global Chief Executive Officer Study' (2010). This study was conducted by the IBM Institute for Business Value and IBM Strategy & Change based on face-to-face conversations with more than 1,500 chief executive officers and found out that creativity is the most important leadership quality according to CEOs (p. 8). In this context, Sean McNabney stated:

> There was a convergence of different things such as Sheridan's mission and values but we recognized that creative problem solving skills as well as creative and critical thinking competencies are increasingly celebrated as top ranked or essential proficiencies in this competitive workplace of the twenty-first century and certainly we are well aware of a number of different studies that have been done. For example, I.B.M. did a global chief executive officer survey as well as the Conference Board of Canada, they ran an innovation skills profile 2.0. a number of years ago. The global chief executive officer study, which is called Capitalizing on Complexity, recognized creativity as the most important leadership quality. There is another study put out by the Conference Board of Canada Center for Business Innovation, which notes that creative problem solving and continuous improvement skills comprised the top category of skills required which

76

contribute to innovation performance, so these are just some of the research that we are aware of. We felt that this is a real opportunity to provide our students some outstanding training in a very highly structured and rigorous creative problem solving process that will allow them to meet the market demand for creativity and then further enhance Canada's creative and innovative capacity.

Similar to Sean McNabney's comment, Laura Pappano, a contributor to *the New York Times Education Life* section, addressed the same IBM research in her article titled 'Learning to Think Outside the Box: Creativity Becomes an Academic Discipline.' Pappano (2014) wrote that "in 2010 creativity was the factor of the most crucial success found in an I.B.M. survey of 1,500 chief executives in 33 industries. These days creative is the most used buzzword in LinkedIn profiles two years running." Furthermore, the same IBM research was also referenced by some other program descriptions in the sample such as Drexel University and Eastern Kentucky University.

As noted before and also to some extent reflected in the content analysis of program descriptions and mission statements, the type of creativity that most policymakers desire in students today seems to be "a domesticated form of creativity, linked tightly and directly to economic productivity" and framed narrowly by neoliberal economic discourses about the creative economy (Larsen, 2013, p. 1.). Likewise, as the evidence from the content analysis above showed, some programs in the sample are aware of the demands of the business world and aim to address these demands in their programs. In an interview with Graham Brown-Martin about such domesticated/utilitarian/instrumental approach to creativity, he drew an analogy

between recent calls for creativity and STEM education and pointed to the need for more critical reflection while encouraging creativity and STEM education:

> It is a market model reform of creativity. Similar to STEM, which is another one. I gave this talk at the U.N. General Assembly a couple of years ago, and it was all STEM, STEM, STEM, and a demand for STEM graduates, which was all based on market economics. And I said no, it is not about getting more engineers selling advertising for Google; it is about the billions of people who are going to be affected by climate change, antibiotic resistance or population growth.

Graham Brown-Martin's comments with regard to STEM education and drawing an analogy between mainstream discourses about STEM education and creativity were timely and accurate. It is very important for educators, policymakers, and researchers alike to be cognizant of what kind of discourses they are constructing. Reflecting on how such utilitarian/instrumental focus on creativity framed within economic discourses is detrimental to the concept of creativity, Gerard Puccio from the State University of New York College at Buffalo stated:

> I think it has some advantages in that it is advancing the conversation. When I began thirty years ago, I talked to audiences about creativity, they thought that was for arts or for scientists. So while there is an economic push for it, on the positive side you have more industries interested in it and as a positive consequence, more people now understand the value of creativity. If you pin it strictly to the economics side, then you missed some of the early work in humanistic psychology that aligns creativity to self-actualization and achieving your own human potential. I think it is not an "either/or," it has to be a "yes/and." In order to leverage creativity from an economic standpoint, yes

there is the risk of making it a commodity, however, once you begin to have the conversation about creativity, it opens up the possibility of saying that it is like leadership, you have to be able to lead yourself first before you can lead others. If you are going to be creative to help drive the economy, it is important also to embrace everyday creativity because you should not be just turning it on or off when you go on to the workplace. So there has to be a balance between doing and being. The economic side argues for the doing side of creativity but you do not get the doing unless you can also be creative as well. So we balance doing and being in the work that we do here.

Susan Rowland also raised very important points concerning how a utilitarian/domesticated approach to creativity might be self-defeating as it carries risk of glossing over many other issues surrounding the planet and thus calling for wild creativity:

If you think of creativity in market terms, then you are so limiting creativity that it stops being creativity quite soon. I love the idea of domesticating creativity. Courses should be doing wild creativity which include nature as well as culture. So creativity is not just economy, it is not even just human culture, it also needs to stretch what we think of beyond humans. For example, the biggest problem that the world is facing in the next thirty years is going to be climate change. If we are going to do anything about it, there will be thousands of jobs in climate change. That is the optimistic view. The pessimistic view is that if we ignore it, things get worse and worse and worse. We have to be creative about it because we do not know how to deal with it at the moment, not enough. And it is not just about creative science. It is about being creative with people. How do we tackle climate change while making it something that people want to do? And how do we

imagine society where we are not exploiting the planet? And you cannot do that unless you stop exploiting people and you are going to have to be really creative about that. So I would hope for the biggest possible reach of creativity even if a program cannot do all of that. If creativity is limited to how you can design new cars, then you are going to miss the fact that people might not want to buy cars so much in ten years' time unless the cars themselves change to not be so disruptive to the environment. But if you are including the bigger picture that creativity seems to be inherent in evolution as well as in the human mind, if you are cognizant of nature, then you are likely to build a better car because you will be more in tune with the bigger picture.

While Gerard Puccio and Susan Rowland drew attention to everyday creativity and transforming oneself and seeing creativity holistically rather than perceiving it as something that is only necessary in the working context, Keri Facer put emphasis on whether the emergence of creativity-related degree programs paved the way for collective creativity. She pointed out:

How do we collectively work together to address critical problems and issues? This is where the critical differences between a sort of empowering creativity and a creativity that is actually going to help you survive the future and the sort of individualized modes of creativity being taught in universities. If your idea of creativity is how I myself on my own come up with something that allows me to survive in the job market, that is going to cause real problems because survival, community, and thriving is dependent on recognizing your interdependence with other people. So the question should not be how I am creative, but how we are creative, how do we collectively harness our skills, our resources, our capabilities of various sorts and how we reconfigure those in the world that

we are living in in order to create a better world? That requires vulnerability, taking risks, and connecting with people you did not know before. That is one of the things that universities struggle to do is to allow people to not know and allow them to be vulnerable and allow them to connect with other people because we consistently assess everybody on individual results. We produce a culture of competition and I am far from convinced that culture of competition is the right environment to be in if you really want to develop the sorts of creativity that we are going to need to thrive and survive. I do not want to let the word creativity be owned by an economic model, be owned by instrumental accounts. Creativity is a human practice. It risks ending up meaning nothing if you are not careful. We have to look to other everyday creativity and our collective creativity and see how those work together.

Keri Facer was quite right to question whether the emergence of such creativity degree programs in higher education institutions has the potential to be creative collectively rather than reducing creativity to an individual level only and validating it by means of providing awards, certificates, or degrees. Indeed, one of the themes from the data analysis in this research was about *'Creativity for personal or professional development,'* which will be thoroughly discussed later in this research. Aligning with Keri Facer's comments, an interview with Karl Jeffries also raised a question about 'what is education for?' Being more interested in emancipatory aspect of education, he made an important point regarding students' expectations from creativity courses and education in general and dilemmas academics may face while teaching creativity. He stated:

There are many ways of seeing what education is about and there are some people who see education as a means to get a job or establishing a career. And that is totally fine. If

you want to be a graphic designer, then do a degree in graphic design and you will possibly get an opportunity to work for a particular agency that you would not have if you had not received a degree. So their role is how I help people over three years to get in such a position such that someone wants to employ them. That is fine. There is another view of education; that is what we call emancipatory education and in that sense true education that can help you transform yourself and overcome all change and things that life seems to have given you from your own education. So there is an idea that you can question and challenge ways that you viewed the world through education. And creativity is an interesting vehicle for that.

Karl Jeffries' opinions regarding students with varying approaches to education were echoed by some other interviewees and raised the question about the possibility of creativity in higher education. Since it is likely that students in higher education institutions come from a very standardized K-12 education system and grow up in an environment that much likely encourages competition and consumer driven approach to education, there is a danger that fostering creativity in higher education may be already too late. I will return to this topic later in this research.

To conclude, as evidence from discourse analysis above shows, it seems that the emergence of creativity degree programs in higher education institutions is influenced by creative and knowledge-based economy discourses to some extent. Michael Peters (2009) called the emergence of the creative economy discourse as a new form of educational capitalism, which results in putting strong emphasis on entrepreneurial subjects, encouraging consumer citizens, self-presentation and self-promotion (p. 126, see also Peters, 2004, 2005; Peters & Besley,

82

2006). In fact, self-presentation and self-promotion arguments are also related to the next theme in this research, which is '*Creativity for Personal and/or Professional Development'*. Moreover, Peters (2009) warns us to be careful while defining creativity by giving an example from Howard Gibson's comments (2005, p. 156) as "Creativity is the application of knowledge and skills in new ways to achieve a valued goal" (p. 135). Peters (2009, p. 135) particularly draws attention to valued goals by stating that

> ….in the absence of any sustained epistemological or ethical discussion of what are valued goals, creativity appears supine to the needs of the economy with education policy at heel: '....to boost competitiveness in the knowledge economy, we must make radical changes to the educational system.

Peters' critique regarding instrumental rationality towards creativity has also been reflected by Keri Facer:

> We need ethical people, we need people who are collective, who are able to work in solidarity in community with other people. We need people who are able to take responsibility for those choices and that action. I mean the word creativity if it is just that on its own, then this is not the future we want. But what we might want to do is add other words to it to give it to some depth to stop it being potentially dangerous because the word creative on its own is not necessarily anything in it. It could cause all sorts of harm rather than any sorts of goods. We need to work out how do you connect these other ways, what else do we need as well as creativity? Creativity will not on its own solve the world's problems. You need ethical people, who are dependent and recognize their dependency on others on the planet frankly.

83

As Michael Peters and Keri Facer suggest, it is important for these creativity degree programs, particularly the ones leaning towards more the instrumentalized notion of creativity, to consider the extent to which their programs encourage intrinsic notion of creativity in addition to instrumental values while they continue developing their programs. Otherwise, these degree programs may cause a reduction in the notion of creativity to only instrumental values, which may not help participants tap into creativity to the fullest extent.

Furthermore, there is also another need to thoroughly investigate what the business world really means when calling for creativity and innovation. Weiner (2000) argues that "even though managers generally view creativity as "useful," and corporations frequently speak about "innovation" in their advertising and annual reports and must in fact innovate to stay competitive, "creativity ….. has not always been seen as playing an important role in the design and structure of organizations" (Mumford & Simonton, 1997, p. 1). In fact, corporate bureaucracies often become rigidly formal and may greatly inhibit creativity" (p. 217). Creativity requires the risk, which may or may not end up with failure, and yet failing seems to run counter to global neoliberal culture including education (Halberstam, 2011 as cited in Harris, 2014). Laura Carmichael, who is a corporate trainer in creativity and innovation, pointed out that companies still play it safe and may not celebrate failures even if their discourses revolve around brining creativity and innovation back to their organizations. She stated:

When you are in creative mindset, there is a stage that is inherently not goal oriented. It is about being curious and paying attention to things, observing things, making associations that are not goal oriented. I work as a trainer and facilitator in an innovation program, a company comes in, they want to train their people to be more innovative which is

basically using creative processes for a specific business application. I feel like people still really play it safe depending on larger culture. I see especially among middle management people, [there is] a huge fear running to take a chance to fail because these people have succeeded to a certain amount.

It is further argued that since corporate bureaucracies are likely to hamper creativity, the topic "How to Manage Creative People" is one of the most investigated subjects in business research (Cochrane, 1984 as cited in Weiner, 2000). During an interview with Graham Brown-Martin, he also made similar arguments by stating that,

> The issue for companies is that actually look at themselves and ask themselves why they are not creative. It is like the idea that you can just hire someone who has creativity degree and plug them in and suddenly metastasize to the whole organization, it is quite simply bizarre because creativity has to be cultural.

As evidence from this research shows, there is a mismatch between theory and practice regarding the development of creativity in organizations, particularly in the business world. On the one hand, creativity is encouraged by the business world, at least rhetorically. On the other hand, their hierarchical structures run against opening up possibilities for encouraging creativity. Furthermore, the concept of creativity the business world desires seems to be domesticated and narrowly defined, and driven by only instrumental values. As the institutionalization of creativity-related degree programs is still in process, it is important for the business world and these degree programs alike to collaborate on paving the way for creative environments in which nurturing creative mindsets can organically occur.

Creativity for Personal and/or Professional Development

   The fourth theme that emerged from the mission statement/program description analysis was about *creativity for personal and/or professional development*. Of the 45 programs in this research, 13 (28.9%) linked creativity to either personal or professional development. The theme was closely interrelated to creativity as a skillset/mindset theme as many of the programs rationalized the importance of creativity for personal and/or professional development by referring to creativity as an important skillset/mindset participants should have. The most frequently used words in this theme are 'thinking,' 'knowledge,' 'innovation,' 'skills,' 'professionals,' 'personal,' and others (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Word Query for Creativity for Personal and/or Professional Development Theme

   For example, the Innovation, Creativity and Leadership program in City, the University of London (2017) states:

> This dynamic course focuses on developing practical skills that will enable you to lead change in your organisation, develop skills as an entrepreneur and deliver innovation. The MICL is more than about learning how to be creative. On the course you will: Develop tools and leadership skills you need to successfully manage innovation projects and programmes and to fast-track your own career. Acquire practical skills in a wide

range of creativity and innovation processes and techniques that you can use in your professional and personal life to deliver breakthrough solutions. Gain knowledge and skills for entrepreneurship so that you can harness the creativity of your colleagues, stakeholders and clients within and outside your organisation. ("Why you should take the MICL" section, para. 1)

Additionally, the Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship program in the University of Texas Austin made similar arguments regarding the importance of creativity on participants' personal and professional development. The program webpage (2017) stated:

The Innovation, Creativity & Entrepreneurship BDP [Bridging Disciplines Program] teaches students about the entrepreneurial process and the history of innovation in the United States and around the world. Through an interdisciplinary program that combines courses from business, communication, fine arts, and liberal arts, students will learn how ideas, inventions, talents, and skills are developed and transformed into commercial and social ventures. At the same time, the program asks students to learn about creativity and the creative process within their own disciplines or fields.

With its focus on creativity in all fields, from the sciences to classical music to chemical engineering, this BDP can complement a range of majors, teaching students about the business and entrepreneurial skills needed to turn ideas and talents into ventures, and providing them with social and historical perspectives on innovation and its impact on economies, cultures, and societies. ("Innovation, Creativity & Entrepreneurship" section, para. 1 & para. 2)

Finally, while not explicitly referring to creativity for professional development, Falmouth University's Creative Education program and the University of Central Lancashire's Creative Thinking program requires close examination at this point. In particular, Falmouth University's Creative Education program was not coded under creativity for personal/professional development and seems that it is a stand-alone program that puts explicit emphasis on creativity for teaching. However, it can still be argued that the program has the potential to lead to participants' professional development in their teaching. In communications with the program director, it was noted that the program has been going through some changes and looking to develop the program further. Therefore, one can expect that there can be some conceptual and/or structural changes in the program in near future. And yet, the program's current website (2017) states:

> The MA in Creative Education recognises that teaching is an inherently creative activity and draws on the current contexts within which design, media, art and performance education operate. You'll be encouraged to reflect on the innovation and creativity of your subject area to inform your approaches to teaching and learning. Acknowledging that the best teachers are also learners, you'll be taking a scholarly look at teaching and reflecting on the literature, practices and contexts of the creative curriculum. This course also addresses a need to develop informed professionalism to support the teaching and learning of an increasingly diverse student group. ("Creative Education" section)

As seen from the program mission statement, the program aims to enhance educators' creativity in their subject area by adopting a more holistic approach to education. While Falmouth University's Creative Education program explicitly states that the program is more

about training educators to help them be more creative in their subject areas, Pacifica Graduate Institute's Engaged Humanities and Creative Life and the University of Massachusetts' Critical and Creative Thinking programs have special emphasis on helping educators capitalize on creativity in their teaching. For example, Jeremy Szteiter from the University of Massachusetts stated:

> The critical and creative thinking in the University of Massachusetts was developed to bring the psychological and philosophical connection to thinking into the teaching of students. A lot of these students in the program were themselves teachers. They were school leaders who are looking to change their school and curriculum. That was the beginning of the program and it is really expanded beyond that since then.

Similar arguments also seem to be valid for the University of Central Lancashire's Creative Thinking program. The program is one of the few programs that is more about researching creativity as the Creative Research Network is already initiated in the University of Central Lancashire. The program website (2017) states:

> Have you ever wondered: Why are some people more creative than others? What influences encourage creativity? Is it possible to teach creativity? This type of questioning drives the curiosity behind the MA in Creative Thinking. The course is intended for aspiring researchers who want to develop a specialised interest in Creative Thinking without the necessity of on-campus attendance. Ultimately, the MA is about creating postgraduates who can interrogate, and eventually add to, research on Creative Thinking (we're particularly interested in research related to the Creative Industries). ("Why study this programme?" section)

Although not explicitly attributing creativity to professional development, the program appears to particularly serve researchers to improve their skills in creativity. The program director Karl Jeffries explained:

> We have my course, which is on creativity. That is looking at the research into creativity. But this is a MA [Master of Arts]. The rest of the school and department is teaching people generally to be creative as a designer. We have a graphic design course, we have a product design course, we have a textiles design and a lot of those courses are about getting people to get jobs in the industry that they are in. You do a graphic design degree to become a graphic designer. But if you want to work in an award winning design agency, you have to be really creative. We are teaching those students to get a job in a particular agency. Whereas what I am doing is I am standing back from that practice and I am trying to ask how does that work? If we are training people to be more creative, does that work? How do we know that? What techniques do we use? The whole school is teaching people to be creative in a particular area but my course is about researching into how do they teach that?

Triangulation of the text-based data with interview data also showed similar results. When asked 'What are your students' motivations in choosing your program to study?,' most of the program directors stated that their students are more interested in their personal and professional development and transforming themselves. For example, Gerard Puccio stated that obtaining a certificate or master's degree in these programs might validate one's creativity and make them more competitive in professional working environments. And yet, similar to his arguments in the previous section regarding creativity as a skillset and mindset theme, Gerard

90

Puccio also drew attention to the fact that while participation seems to be more professional development oriented, it also leads to personal development as students' experiences are usually transformative. He commented on the expectations and aspirations of students:

> Many of them are looking for professional development. They are looking to use the certificate or master's degree to make themselves more competitive, to advance themselves in their organizations or to market themselves to other organizations. At the same time, it is not an either or. We tend to look at things as a yes and, not an either or situation. While they are looking to develop themselves professionally, many of them say that the experience that they have studying with us is transformative in that they grow tremendously as individuals in terms of their own creativity, which naturally helps them to be more effective as professionals. So it is really both. They are looking for both.

Aligning with Gerard Puccio's comments, Terri Goslin-Jones from Saybrook University made a similar statement with regard to how participants in her program see creativity as necessary for both personal and professional development. Terri Goslin-Jones explained:

> Our students are working professionals who are returning to school for their masters or doctorate in creativity studies. Saybrook students come to us with a passion in creativity and their aspiration is to apply creativity to their careers in order to transform lives. They receive a degree in psychology with a specialization in creativity studies. There is a requirement that their thesis or dissertation involves creativity research. Our students represent many different professions including business, health/wellness, law, occupational therapists, theatre, musicians, poets, and scientists. Some students study the healing nature of the creative process and use creativity and expressive arts in their field

of psychology, therapy, wellness and integrative health. Other students are business professionals and are studying creativity to expand their business roles or to use creativity in their consulting or private practice. Our students conduct research and publish their thesis and dissertations on a wide variety of topics in creativity and expressive arts.

Additionally, Steven Pritzker from Saybrook University made a very important point with regard to the importance of creativity, not only for personal and professional growth, but also societal growth. He stated:

Many people in this country [referring to the U.S.] and around the world are very unhappy. They are unfulfilled, they do not feel good about themselves, and they do not feel they are contributing to the world. Creativity is a way of understanding that they can make their own lives be better, find ways, so they are not hopeless. They have a sense of power and that is part of the humanistic tradition. We have power to change the world. I see it [creativity] as a vehicle for personal growth, for societal growth as well as solving problems.

The distinction between societal growth versus personal and professional growth requires close examination because if only personal and professional growth forms the backbone of such programs, they may not necessarily lead to creativity as a public good. However, the analysis showed that there was not much emphasis on the importance of creativity for the societal growth. There is a need to better understand whether and how this personal and professional growth of participants creates possibilities for societal growth. Particularly, if benefits of creativity for professional development are seen to outweigh benefits of creativity for personal and societal growth, this may lead to the commodification of the concept of creativity and might carry the

risk of reducing the concept to only instrumental values as noted before. When reflecting on the possible risks of reducing creativity to individual growth alone, David Slocum made similar arguments by stating that,

> Just to give you reference point, my PhD dissertation director had a profound influence on me in this regard. Part of what Richard Sennett talked about in his work on the public sphere was precisely that the emphasis on individual selves, the emphasis on individual expression or authenticity, what today we would call self-love or self-care, that really comes with a price. It seems to me that in terms of individual creativity we are precisely finding ourselves at this moment where individuals are constantly encouraged to express themselves to find their own creative voices. But how exactly that sits in a larger community or society is not only left undefined but any attempt to define it is rebuffed because it is seen some sort of infringement on the individual. It does seem to me these two interwoven tracks or streams, one of the individual and excessive sense of authenticity or self-love or self-care and then the way that creativity and ultimately culture had been made, much more functional and finally economic at societal or certainly collective level. Those two interwoven streams have placed in a very challenging position and I am not sure exactly how to come out of that.

In regard to societal growth versus personal/professional growth, Brandeis University's 'Creativity, the Arts and Social Transformation' program (CAST) stands out as a unique program in the sample because it explicitly emphasizes the importance of creativity for societal change. Viewing creativity as an important vehicle for societal change, the program puts equal emphasis on sustainability and ethics required for societal change. To some extent, this aligns

with some of the previous comments made by interviewees as well as the literature, suggesting

that we need ethical, collective, and creative people. The program mission statement (2017)

states:

> The undergraduate minor in creativity, the arts, and social transformation (CAST) offers
>
> a coherent academic sequence through which students can explore theory and practice at
>
> the nexus of the arts (i.e., music, literature, theater, visual arts, storytelling, digital art and
>
> broadcast media, architecture, conceptual art and folk expressions of all kinds);
>
> creativity; and social change. The minor challenges students to engage in, and reflect on,
>
> various modes of knowledge creation, including aesthetic, interpretive and analytical, as
>
> well as different modes of presentation, including creative, written, oral, and
>
> performative. CAST introduces them to a range of creative social change practices and
>
> the theories of change that are implicit in them, and encourages them to grapple with the
>
> ethical dilemmas inherent in the field. The minor supports students to imagine careers
>
> and vocations that link their talents and interests in the creative arts and social change
>
> with the needs of communities and issues of social justice. Students will learn how artists,
>
> cultural workers and other change agents support communities to cultivate, restore and
>
> strengthen the capacities required to live creatively, sustainably, non-violently and
>
> ethically. ("Objectives" section)

Furthermore, an examination of the syllabus for CAST's introductory level course,

called, 'Creativity, the Arts, and Social Transformation,' seems to clearly reflect the goals of the

program. In particular, course goals in the syllabus were stated as "Prepare for, conduct, analyze,

and creatively synthesize an oral history interview of someone different from themselves in ways

that might create challenges; participate actively in preparing for, conducting, and synthesizing

learning from an urban design lab, to collaboratively envision creative approaches to preventing

urban violence; and read about theory and practice, witness a variety of art forms and approaches

to social transformation, and write about their learning in weekly reflections." Referring to

Schiller, Weiner (2000) acknowledges that transformation at both collective and individual levels

can help make a better world. And yet, as discussed previously, if the creativity concept is seen

as an important skill only for career advancement and perceived as an individual possession

rather than leading to collective development, the recent calls for more creativity in any sphere

are likely to be a failed attempt.

Creativity for Change through Leadership

The fifth theme from the data analysis was creativity for change through leadership.

There were also some programs that rationalized the importance of creativity only through

change or leadership perspectives respectively. Indeed, it is very natural to come across a change

concept while examining creativity discourses as creativity is usually defined as "Imaginative

activity fashioned so as to produce outcomes that are original and of value" (NACCCE, 1999, p.

20, as cited in Craft, 2005). Since the concepts of originality and novelty are often reflected in

the definitions of creativity, the change concept seems to already constitute the essence of the

definition of creativity. Therefore, all programs in the sample imply a change concept to some

extent. However, the programs under the *change through leadership* theme explicitly referred to

change in their mission statements or program descriptions. The most frequently used words in

this theme are 'change,' 'leadership,' 'skills,' 'innovation,' and others (see Figure 5).

Figure 5. Word Query for Creativity for Change through Leadership Theme

Of the 45 programs in the sample, 9 (20%) connected creativity to change through

leadership. For example, the Creativity and Change Leadership Program in the State University

of New York (2017) states: "The ability to think creatively is an essential leadership skill. Often,

a leader must act as a catalyst for change and when we engage in creative thinking our goal is to

bring about change, i.e., to bring about an idea, solution or concept that helps us to meet an

important goal or to address a complex challenge. Thus, it is imperative for leaders to learn how

to facilitate their own creative thinking, as well as those they work with, to bring about

productive change (i.e., new products, services, resolution to problems, opportunities, etc.)."

("About the Program" section, para. 2). A review of the program mission statements and

descriptions revealed that the term "change" was usually linked to leadership and used frequently

in creative leadership programs. Some formats of how *change* is used either as adjective, adverb,

noun, or verb included, but not limited to 'innovative change,' 'productive change,' 'catalyst for

change,' and 'leading change.' For example, the 'Leading Change' course offered by the Berlin

School of Creative Leadership (2017) described:

Recognizing and leading change creatively, decisively and systematically is crucial in organizations facing increasingly dynamic industry, market and economic forces. This course opens with an examination of decision-making processes and how they can be adapted to particular situations and people, before moving on to diagnose change processes in organizations and address how change projects can be effectively designed, led and managed. Participants learn how to implement facets like information, consultation, participation and delegation, leading/steering a change process/project, and how to cope effectively with transitions and resistance to change. ("Leading Change" section, para. 1).

The relationship between change and creativity is likely due to the digital revolution and rapid technological advancements in the twenty-first century. During the interview with Graham Brown-Martin, he touched on the relationship between creativity and digital revolution by stating that,

The catalyst for this demand for creativity is obviously the digital revolution in some respects. As the technological costs come down, the barriers to entry reduces and allows completely new entrance. UBER or Airbnb are good examples. Companies want to be creative because they want to be able to respond to those changes. But the problem of course is that they do not have biodiversity within their culture. The reason why biodiversity works so well is that it gives you multiple solutions to a threat. The problem is that companies can think about that one problem so they only have one solution. That is where they are and that is how you get companies like Kodak. Kodak's story is always an old story, but I mean they actually had the digital camera before anyone else. The guy

who brought it was laughed at the office like this is a very nice toy because Kodak thought that they were in the film processing business and all their profit was made from film processing and film sales.

Graham Brown-Martin made important points with regard to the rapid technological changes in the twenty-first century and how these rapid changes force companies and individuals to think more creatively and innovatively to be more competitive. His points were also reflected in some course syllabi in this research. For example, the description of 'Creativity, Vocation, and Alchemical Work' course offered by Pacifica Graduate Institute was as follows:

> Given the rapid technological and cultural changes of the twenty-first century, a program that prepares students for the creativity of soul in the world needs a space to develop ideas, theories and practices of vocation. To what are we "called" in our deepest selves? What is evoked within us that guides us to a life's work; the work of a life that is both an inner direction and an outer calling? Alchemy has long been regarded as the art of psychic, artistic, spiritual and social transformation. This course uses alchemy to orient the student to the depths of one's life work. The course will combine the study of alchemy as practical transformation and creativity, with imaginal knowing that opens a way into vocation, calling, and creativity that is applied to work in its economic, social, cultural and spiritual dimensions.

In referring to accelerating changes in technology and organizational structures, 'Creative and Design Thinking for Professional Studies' course offered by Syracuse University also touched on similar points:

Exploration of accelerating changes in technology and organizational ecosystems over next decade as it influences professional career strategies. Students challenged to "think in new boxes" as they apply global, business and personal foresight. Creative Thinking and Entrepreneurial Design for Professional Studies is designed for students with little or no background in creativity principles and techniques, or design thinking as it is applied in business and professional environments. Students will be required to think in new ways, to exercise imagination, intuition, creativity, and ingenuity. An introductory examination of tools and techniques used by creative thinkers, both modern and historical, applying methods that will require foresight, insight, and principles of design thinking.

Arguments made by interviewees and ideas expressed in program mission statements and course syllabi under a change through leadership theme also align with the literature. Oftentimes, the importance of creativity in the twenty-first century is connected to rapid change introduced by globalization and technological revolution and thus forces countries to be more creative in order not to lag behind. John Dewey (1990) once stated that "Domestic life, political institutions, international relations, and personal contracts are shifting with kaleidoscopic rapidity before our eyes. We cannot appreciate and weigh the changes: they occur too swiftly" (pp. 413-14). Weiner (2000) argues that Dewey's arguments regarding rapid change seem to be embraced more widely these days, as creativity has become our hope to overcome challenges introduced by factors such as globalization and the digital revolution. He further states that this is why "the next frontier," "innovative solutions," and "high-tech" rhetoric are often raised by science and business community as 'making the *new*' discourse acquires a growing importance in today's world.

Weiner's (2000) arguments regarding creativity as our hope are also reflected by international organizations such as UNESCO. In 2001, the Director-General of UNESCO stated:

> At a time when family and social structures are changing, with often adverse effects on children and adolescents, the school of the twenty first century must be able anticipate the new needs by according a special place to the teaching of artistic values and subjects in order to encourage creativity, which is a distinctive attribute of the human species. Creativity is our hope. (p. 40, emphasis added, see Burnard & White, 2008)

Weiner (2000) also argues that "every definition of creativity implies some recognition of going beyond the given. The 'creative' is not the average, the routine, the normal, the habitual. This is true even when we accept a broad, democratic perspective about the 'creative attitude' or a traditional culture's relatively circumscribed approach: even a slight change of nuance or reinterpretation, if viewed as creative, is a 'going beyond'" (p. 253). While creativity and change are conceptualized as complementing each other, Weiner (2000) argues that there is a paradox questioning to what extent our cultures, schools, universities, and the world are ready to embrace and welcome not being the average and not being normal. As is often the case, those who are marginalized or outsiders are the "creative ones" (Weiner, 2000). It is clear that there is call for more creativity worldwide and yet what is beyond creativity is left undefined by policymakers (Weiner, 2000). When it comes to practice, it is still questionable whether business leaders and politicians would welcome those who do not follow mainstream trends, who challenge the status quo, think and act more critically and creatively, and accommodate themselves to rapid changes. Or do those business leaders and politicians just pay lip service to creativity without really

knowing what creativity involves? Therefore, it is important to further examine how the creativity concept is embraced and internalized by leaders.

With regard to the leadership connection to *change* concept, oftentimes it is stated that change and leadership go hand in hand. Some formats of how a leadership concept is used with a change concept includes but is not limited to 'change leaders,' 'lead organisations through innovative change,' and 'lead change.*'* For example, the Creativity and Change Leadership program in the State University of New York (2017) stated:

> Ongoing development of leadership models during the last century has drawn a close connection between creativity and leadership. At the core of many current leadership models is the concept of change—how to foster and manage it. This concept is clearly reflected in the language used to describe the essence of leadership today. For instance, many leadership theories focus on visionary, transformational, and change leadership. In addition, the view that leadership consists of a set of specific attributes that one has or does not have has shifted to a view that leadership skills can be learned and developed. The purpose of the State University of New York graduate certificate program in creativity and change leadership is to provide students with the knowledge and skills that can put them in a better position to operate as change leaders. Leadership is a process. This certificate program teaches students how to better manage this process. ("About the Program" section, para.1 & para. 3)

Likewise, the executive MBA program in the Berlin School of Creative Leadership (2017) stated:

The Executive MBA in Creative Leadership is a Master's degree for professionals in areas of business and industry where creativity sets the standards. The program is designed for those with significant professional experience looking to develop further as leaders and carry through purposeful and imaginative change in their fields. Throughout the intensive module residencies and thesis preparation, degree candidates work together with veteran international faculty members as well as industry thought leaders committed to fostering creativity in business. ("The Executive MBA Program - Tailored to the Creative Industries" section)

In an interview with Sean McNabney from Sheridan College, he explained how the 'Creativity Leadership and Problem Solving' course offered by the program connects creativity to leadership:

It really is about getting the students in a space where they are able to model creative leadership behaviors and being adaptable to global context. What it really is utilizing creative problem solving facilitation skills as a means by which to foster leadership in either sort of a personal or organizational or global kind of context. It really is about leadership abilities, characteristics whether they be psychological or cultural that can impact not only sort of environment but then also your own capacity as a creative leader.

In addition to the analysis of the program mission statements and descriptions as well as interview data, the course syllabi sample in the research was reviewed and relevant courses in creative leadership were identified. For example, 'Introduction to Creative Leadership Course' offered by Syracuse University rationalized the need for a creative approach to leadership as follows:

This course is an introduction to the concepts and practices of creative leadership. In today's world, current issues and challenges require an innovative approach to leadership. Effective leadership is far more reaching than just managing processes and exhibiting traditional management approaches when interacting with and managing others. The well-being and success of any organization requires leadership to be developed at every level. Students will explore the concept of deliberate creativity – what it means and how to apply it in their professional life.

As noted at the beginning of the section, most of the programs linked creativity to change and leadership together. As a side note, there are still some programs that emphasized the importance of creativity either in terms of change or leadership. For example, the 'Leadership, Compassion, and Creativity' in Western Connecticut University, the 'Creative Leadership and Global Strategy' program in the University of Southern Maine or the 'Critical and Creative Thinking' program in the University of Nebraska Omaha rationalized creativity only in terms of leadership. By the same token, the 'Creative Intelligence and Innovation' program in the University of Technology Sydney and the 'Critical and Creative Thinking' program in the University of Massachusetts rationalized creativity only in terms of change. There are also some programs like Drexel University and Sheridan College that did not fall under a *change through leadership* theme, however, they still offer some courses about creative leadership. And yet, the argument is that creative leadership will bring about change, which can only be driven by effective leaders. The literature also argues that most of the time change and leadership go hand in hand because a leader should be the one who is the vanguard of innovation, who is able to respond to complexities introduced by rapid change in his/her

organization, and who can encourage others to do so. Puccio et al. (2010) explains the
relationship between change and leadership as follows:

> It is natural for change and leadership to be linked because leadership efforts are often the
> catalyst for change, and it is effective leadership that helps teams, organizations, and
> communities to respond to change. Change originates in creative thought, and the ability
> to engage in creative thinking or foster it in others is a skill that separates those who lead
> from those who follow. (pp. xii-xiv)

Turnbull (2012) argues that due to an increasing complexity and accelerating change,
expectations from leaders are greater than before. As the findings of this research show,
creativity-related degree programs under leadership theme correspond to these expectations. It is
expected that leaders should be ready for unexpected changes in their fields and orient
themselves and their teams to adapt to those changes. While it is important for leaders to equip
themselves with skills, which potentially help them lead change in their organizations, as stated
by some of the interviewees, it is also necessary for these creativity-related degree programs to
be cognizant of the importance of diversity in order to overcome increasing complexity and rapid
change and foster creativity in organizations. What is missing from program descriptions and
mission statements is that there is less focus on the potential role of diversity in dealing with
increasing complexity and rapid change, and in fostering creativity. It is not enough for leaders
only to equip themselves with creativity skills in order to overcome unexpected changes. Leaders
need to pave the way for diverse team settings and be aware of how to handle cross-cultural
issues that potentially take place in their organizations. It is important for these degree programs,
which approach creativity from a *change through leadership* perspective, to consider the

relationship between diversity, creativity, and leadership and reorganize their curriculum accordingly.

Secondary Level Analysis of Data

Thus far, the themes that emerged from the analysis of the program mission statements and descriptions were explained and triangulated with supporting data coming from either curriculum, course syllabi, or semi-structured interviews when possible. In addition to identifying the different approaches to institutionalizing creativity in higher education programs, a secondary level analysis of data (both document analysis and semi-structured interviews) also revealed important issues such as creativity assessment, culture, and institutional contexts within which these programs are being institutionalized. In particular, these themes address such questions as: (1) How can creativity be assessed?; (2) What is the role of culture in creativity?; and (3) Is it possible to foster creativity in higher education institutions that increasingly operate in the New Public Management (NPM) context?

Outcomes versus Process Driven Assessment of Creativity

The analysis of program curricula and interviews with program directors reveals that most of the programs embrace process and transformation oriented assessment. In particular, the majority of the program directors explained that they are more interested in the process of exploring and learning more about creativity rather than assessing students' creativity based on an end product only. Elden Golden from Union Institute & University explained:

> I don't even make a try to assess their creativity. I see the degree program as exploring and learning about creativity that can be assessed easily. But I don't assess their individual creativity. Are they three points more creative than when they started? No, I

don't do that. My questions about that and my assessment is almost entirely asking them questions why did you make this choice? Why did you do this way rather than that way? What was your thinking and doing this? And those are the things that I am far more interested in than the actual finished product, the artwork or whatever it is they created. And it is those questions what I want to see is that they are thinking about what they are doing and they are making choices with their eyes open and they are thinking about other possibilities. That is what I assess.

Karl Jeffries also underlined the importance of innovative and novel approaches in assessing students' creativity. Similar to Elden Golden's points, he was interested in the process of how students' experiences are transformative rather than assessing one's creativity based on an end product. Karl Jeffries stated:

We are not necessarily assessing their creativity, we are assessing their ability to do a research project on an aspect of creativity depending on how innovative and novel it is. We will look for rigor and method. How novel it is and how well it is done is a measure of creativity in that particular task. If you do an auto ethnography on creative blocks, how well did you do it? The area is novel but how well did you do it? So finding the problem and the questions are quite a big thing in the first place. We mark that. And then we also look into how well did they do it and what did they contribute?

In fact, the theme of assessment - process versus product oriented assessment - was also addressed in most of the course syllabi examined in this research. In general, market driven creativity-related programs had product-pitch related assignments as part of their assessment of creativity. For example, it appears that courses in the sample offered by Berry College, Eastern

Kentucky University, and the University of Southern Maine require product design oriented innovation, product pitch, or a business canvas model as part of learning assessment. However, although students are required to submit final products, transformation of participants and the process are also considered while assessing students' creativity. Most of the course syllabi (11 out of 18) required a journal or diary assignment, which is intended for tracing an ongoing reflection of creative thinking among students. For example, Aalto University's *Systems Thinking* courses require learning diary writings as well as team work & individual essays as part of assignments. Eastern Kentucky University's *Intro to Applied Creative Thinking* course requires creativity ePortfolio as part of assignments. Likewise, Texas A & M University's *Creative Thinking* course requires '*Creativity Life Map'* as part of an assignment. The assignment is described as "Create a life map of your past, present and future creativity. The purpose of this project is to represent the circumstances, people, and experiences, etc. in your life that have contributed and will contribute to your creative growth and development."

By the same token, some course syllabi (7 out of 18) require assignments concerning practical applications of acquired knowledge over the period of study. Through practical applications, the goal is to encourage participants to demonstrate their creative growth. For example, *Principles in Creative Problem Solving* and *Facilitation of Group Problem Solving* courses offered by Buffalo State - the State University of New York require participants *Tool Report* assignment in which students are expected to apply creative problem solving (CPS) tools to their personal and professional challenges. The assignment is described as follows:

> Tool Practice and Learning: One of the major goals of this course is the application
> of the CPS process to various challenges that you encounter in your personal or
> professional settings. To assist you in accomplishing those goals or dealing

effectively with challenges, you will need to use four divergent tools (in *addition* to

brainstorming) and at least four convergent tools (one will be PPCo). A key learning

report of your personal or professional application will be required. Use the

Innovation Station worksheets as the basis for your work. Complete the worksheets

and come to class prepared to de-brief the experience.

Moreover, Pacifica Graduate Institute's *Creativity, Vocation, and Alchemical Work*

course requires participants to create a piece of art in any media that illustrates their vocational

path. Texas A & M's *Creative Thinking* course requires students to come up with *Personal*

Creative Outlets and students are expected to "develop an understanding of personal creative

development as evidenced by the oral and written summary of their efforts to strengthen creative

outlets across the course of the semester."

Furthermore, most of the course syllabi (14 out of 18) examined in this research require

essays/papers as part of course assignments, which indicates that personal expression is valued

more than exams. And yet, out of four course syllabi that do not require essays/papers as a part

of course assignments, three seem to be more business oriented. With regard to the types of

assignments, for example, Union Institute & University's Disciplinary Foundation I & II course

requires students to submit four essay assignments in addition to course discussions.

Expectations for the semester paper is explained as follows:

The semester paper should be 10-12 pages on a topic of your choice from the issues

discussed over the course of the semester. This is your opportunity to tackle a larger

issue with more developed argument and a larger number of sources and to demonstrate

the breadth and depth of your knowledge in the subject. This paper may be a detailed

account of an instance of your own creativity placing it in the appropriate theoretical framework, provide a theoretical foundation or critical analysis of someone else's creativity based on a published account (i.e., memoir, interview, novel, film, etc.), offer a new theory of creativity or suggest ways in which existing theories may be applied in novel ways, or suggest a new avenue or subject of research in creativity studies. One of the short essays written earlier in the semester may be expanded or an issue that arose from the readings may serve as the basis for the final paper.

Introduction to Critical and Creative Thinking (CCT) course in the University of Nebraska at Omaha requires critical analysis papers of texts or current/global events in addition to reflection papers and problem-solving assignments. *The Intro to Applied Creative Thinking course* in Eastern Kentucky University and *Disciplinary Foundation I & II* course in Union Institute & University also draw particular emphasis on informing students about 4Ps of creativity (person, process, product, and place/environment). Out of 18 course syllabi, three explicitly aim to teach students foundations of 4Ps and two of course syllabi refer to 3Ps (person, process, and product). On the other hand, the University of Massachusetts' *Creative Thinking* course puts a special emphasis on theoretical and empirical approaches to creative thinking by considering impacts of socio-cultural factors on creative products. Also, it seems that the course encourages participants to study personality traits of creative people. The course objectives are as below:

1) describe three theoretical or empirical approaches to the study of creative thinking; identify the socio-cultural factors that influence the identification of creative products and events;

2) use the Creative Education Foundation problem-solving model to redefine a personal problem, other practical problems, and, working in a team, generate an invention;

3) demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of one creative individual by presenting an empathic role- taking presentation, by writing a five page paper, and by responding to three peer presentations with comments written in role;

4) demonstrate metacognitive skill by writing two reflective essays in which the student assesses his/her knowledge about creativity, skill in creative problem solving, and competence with presented creative problem-solving strategies and activities;

5) demonstrate competence using at least three of the creative problem solving techniques presented: brainstorming, The Creative Education Foundation problem definition/problem solving model, and SCAMPER transformation techniques in presented tasks; and

6) demonstrate the application of acquired course knowledge and skill and newly researched knowledge to a topic or area of endeavor by developing and presenting a Virtual Museum Exhibit and by writing a five page paper describing the project's evolution and connection to course concepts.

As evidence from course syllabi and interview excerpts indicates, programs that approach the concept of creativity more holistically focus on the creativity process/growth when assessing participants. On the other hand, programs driven by instrumental values seem to be more product-oriented. And yet, the majority of programs still require some kind of final assignments to be submitted, which is intended to trace creative growth of participants over the coursework regardless of whether their assignments or applications are breakthrough. This also aligns with

little C/big C creativity argument in the literature. Distinction between little C creativity and big C creativity or some name this as psychological/personal creativity (P-creativity) and historical creativity (H-creativity) is that big C creativity is more about breakthrough achievements that might have broader impact while little C creativity is arguably more about ordinary creative process, which impact might likely be at a smaller scale (Runco, 2016). However, Runco (2016) also warns us to avoid big C and little C dichotomy by stating that:

> … the big C/little C dichotomy be avoided precisely because it separates the widely-distributed creative capacity from wide-impact creative achievement. The dichotomy is especially problematic if the intent is to support and encourage creativity such that creative potential be fulfilled and personal creativity be engaged such that it is directed towards macro problems. (p. 69)

Runco's arguments regarding creative capacity are important to consider when aiming to foster creativity in education. Everybody has a creative capacity and an ideal education system, which has the potential to help students to achieve their creative potential at the fullest extent, can help deal with macro problems we are facing today (Runco, 2016). One possible reason why those degree programs consider process more important than end-product while assessing creativity is that creativity is based on interdisciplinarity and multicultural exchange and thus it is very difficult to assess and evaluate creativity (Weiner, 2000). As Amabile (1983) commented, "ultimately, it is not possible to articulate objective criteria for identifying products as creative" (p. 31). Aligning with Amabile's comment, Weiner (2000, pp. 265-266) argues that "after decades of administering creativity tests to students and military personnel, psychologists have come to accept the fact that there is no direct correlation between high creativity ratings on the tests and real-life creativity" (see also Guilford, 1962, p. 158; Barron & Harrington, 1981;

Mackinnon, 1968, p. 438). As evidence from interview data show that the developers of those creativity degree programs are cognizant of previous research done in the creativity field and therefore they put a stronger emphasis on personal development, process, and self-transformation rather than set up objective criteria while aiming to assess creativity.

Creativity and Culture

As pointed out in the literature review, creativity has become a buzzword, suggesting that 'everybody can be creative.' For example, according to the social media site LinkedIn, the most used word LinkedIn members preferred to distinguish themselves was 'creative' by late 2011 (Florida, 2014). While the creativity concept seems to be already embraced by many people to define themselves in professional settings, it is still unclear what is meant by creativity. As Craft (2005) pointed out, 'How does the universalized notion of creativity reflect difference in socio-economic context, and in political context, experienced by individuals and communities?' (p. 85).

Importantly, the current global discourse on creativity seems to be primarily Western oriented. Creativity from a Western perspective focuses more on coming up with innovative products (Weiner, 2000), which arguably cater to creativity needs for the business world and constructed from a more pragmatic perspective. Lubart (1999, p. 339) also argues that "creativity from a Western perspective can be defined as the ability to produce work that is novel and appropriate" (see also Barron, 1988; Jackson & Messick, 1967; Lubart, 1994; MacKinnon, 1962; Ochse, 1990; Stein, 1953). On the other hand, the literature shows that rather than urging for innovative products as the Western conception of creativity does, the Eastern conception of creativity puts more emphasis on personal development (Lubart, 1999). One can also argue that

creativity from an Eastern perspective shows similarities with humanistic psychology's conception of creativity because it seems that more emphasis is put on self-actualization (Sarnoff & Cole, 1983 as cited in Lubart, 1999). The Western perspective of creativity seems to be adopted by most of the programs in this research as all of the programs in the sample are from the Western world and their definitions of creativity are more aligned with the Western perspective of creativity. However, there are still few programs in the sample that adopted humanistic psychology's conception of creativity like Saybrook University's "Creativity Studies" program. Likewise, with a framework of Jungian psychology, Pacifica Graduate Institute's "Engaged Humanities and the Creative Life" program does not place primary emphasis on the pragmatist nature of creativity. Instead of rationalizing creativity only in terms of meeting the demands of the 21st century's complex and rapidly changing work environment, the program urges an approach to creativity from a more holistic perspective. Susan Rowland from Pacifica Graduate Institute stated that "Creativity is not just economy, it is not even just human culture, it is also needs to stretching to what we think of beyond humans." Pacifica Graduate Institute's website (2017) states

> With a framework of Jungian psychology, this online Masters in Humanities fosters *creativity* in a uniquely effective way by drawing upon those aspects of the human psyche neglected by the constructs of post-industrial western modernity. The 21st century needs far more than the highly rationalized and mechanistic thinking perfected in the industries and sciences of the twentieth. It also needs the imagination, capacity for the new, intuitive insight into other cultures and what is not yet fully known, the ability to dream and especially the ability to engage in deep and free flowing creative collaboration.

Expanding creativity is the core of the degree by offering a Masters in Humanities that is oriented to the creative imagination, meaning the talent for making new, for re-thinking traditional structures, for deep listening to what is said and unsaid, for generating images for the not yet known or conceived, for the ability to work so intensely with others that shared visioning and collaborative worlds are made and re-made. This Masters in Creativity is for those who want to be artists, and artists of their own lives. It is above all for those who want to be artists of our future world. ("Creative Life" section, para. 1 & para. 2)

Similarly, the 'Inside the Creative Process: Exploring Blocks and Finding Creative Ground' course offered by the Critical and Creative Thinking program at the University of Massachusetts (2014) seems to put more emphasis on the creative process while acknowledging that a fruitful creative process would lead to creative products. The course description was stated as:

The creative process is a journey through your inner world, where sights along the way are channeled into a product and eventually are shared with the outer world. Because it is a process that relies on self-perceptions, self-truths, beliefs and values, it implies that a system be in place in order to acquire, express and ultimately share this self-knowledge. The personal nature of this process can give rise to creative works, yet at the same time, it can become the weight that causes a fracture in the process.

While analyzing program mission statements and descriptions, it was still unclear how these degree programs take cultural variations into account in their programs. The potential role of culture in creativity is not explicitly articulated in program descriptions and mission

statements. However, various courses offered by these programs seem to address the issues of creativity and culture, including the role of cultural context in creativity. Additionally, interviews with the program directors, faculty members, as well as experts working in the area of creativity research provided a great opportunity to understand how the concept of creativity is constructed in these degree programs, how they take cultural difference into account while teaching creativity, and what can/should be done further to make the concept of creativity contextually relevant.

Starting with 'everybody is creative' rhetoric, Elden Golden from Union Institute & University raised the following points concerning the possible implications of such rhetoric:

> I will concede everyone has creative potential. But what does that mean? I think that is the bigger question. Certainly we are not all going to be Michelangelo and Beethoven. And I worry that the notion that everyone is creative will dilute the magnitude of what some of the incredibly creative people have done. Maybe you are creative, maybe you have potential to be creative, but you have not shown that you are on the same creative level of Einstein or whomever. I worry about equalizing everybody with that notion. And also, it ignores the influence or effect of culture and socio-economics. Even in the same culture over time, it changes. If you look at the United States, if you go back a hundred years and ask someone what it means to be creative, they are going to give you a very different explanation than someone today. Socioeconomic place and society have to be taken into account.

Elden Golden's points aligned with the "little C/big C" argument in the literature. He also referred to the socially constructed nature of creativity, which is the conceptual framework

adopted in this research. Additionally, Jeremy Szteiter from the University of Massachusetts provided detailed information relating to how his program 'Critical and Creative Thinking' approaches and teaches cultural variations in creativity throughout coursework. He said:

> We do not give a dogma on creativity but in our courses, like in the introductory creative thinking course, students study creativity definitions across Western and Eastern cultures and different aspects. Students need to define creativity for themselves in their context. We make students develop a creativity definition specific to context and then put it into practice and use it, test it, and see it if it works. In our course, we might study the creativity of Picasso. However, we do not think that is the definition of creativity that our students should automatically adapt because Picasso was not really a very nice person. Maybe he was a creative artist in a specific way, but he was not good at engaging people, he was not good at treating people fairly so we do not want our students to say that is the only way. It is important that students learn about how some of the experts define as creativity, but also we want our students to reject those definitions and develop their own and think about it over time, think about how to define creativity and make it concrete and applicable, and be willing to change their mind later if they need to.

Finally, Susan Rowland provided important insights about the current discussion around the universality of the concept of creativity. When discussing whether creativity is a universal concept and how the universalized notion of creativity takes into account differences in socioeconomic context and political context experienced by individuals and communities, Rowland stated:

The question about whether anything about human beings is universal is a big question. And it is clearly something that philosophers have been going about for centuries. In the last fifty years, it has been vigorously debated in humanities and social sciences. And there has been a big swing against the idea of universals usually on postcolonial grounds. What fifty years and a hundred years ago were considered to be universals turned out in fact to be Western constructs that we were applying to the rest of the world and this was one of the reasons that colonialism was so effective and so devastating to other cultures. There has been a big swing away from universals and postmodernism was part of that. Throughout the time of postmodernism, there have been attempts to row back, some people/some theorists will have a sort of universal relativity; creativity is relevant to each specific culture. That tends to go along with a post-Marxist, sometimes called cultural materialist paradigm, which basically says that culture might be flexible, it might be creative, but ultimately it is determining who we are. The Jungian position is a little different and I tend to go with the Jungian position myself and it is certainly the position the program goes with. The Jungian position is that there are universals, but there are no universal truths and there are no universal forms, there are universal potentials. The psyche is inherently imaginative and it contains potentials for images and meaning. It is very similar to Chomsky's idea that we are born with a capacity for language, but we are not born with a capacity for any particular language. That is true for all human beings. Jung's archetypes are not forms, they are not patterns, they are not ideas, they are not images, they are the potentials for these things. He would suggest that every human being is born with a creative psyche, but the culture itself will structure the ways in which that creativity is educated and expressed. There are universals but these universals are highly

educated within particular cultural frameworks. There is no one universal form of creativity. We can certainly see that from the history of Western culture. Before the Reformation, creativity was not a good thing. Obeying the lord and the priest was good because creativity was liable to take you away from the word of God. Even within tradition that brought us the U.S. and U.K., creativity itself has very different meanings and positions.

Similar to Elden Golden's points, Susan Rowland also referred to the socially constructed nature of creativity by pointing out how the creativity concept is understood differently before and after the reformation. In particular, her points regarding universal potentiality for creativity and the role of culture in structuring the ways in which creativity is educated and expressed are important to consider when examining creativity cross-culturally. Likewise, Rowland's points aligned with the debate about a domesticated versus wild notion of creativity. It is likely that some cultures or organizational structures opt to reap the fruits of creativity for only limited purposes while not welcoming much a total self-transformation.

Findings from interview data showed that some of the programs take cultural variations into account to some extent while teaching and fostering creativity. Furthermore, interview excerpts above implied that some programs approach creativity from a more social constructivist perspective, which is the conceptual framework taken in this research as well. And yet, how the programs take cultural differences into account did not appear much in program descriptions and mission statements. If I did not have the chance to interview program directors, I would not have known that programs in fact pay special attention to those cultural differences. One can argue

that programs opt to present themselves to the public audience in a general manner to appeal to more students. However, an analysis of curriculum materials showed that there are still a few programs that offer courses in historical concepts of and global perspectives on creativity, which may reflect a more culturally sensitive approach to creativity. For example, 'Perspectives in Creativity' offered by Saybrook University, 'Global Perspectives on Creativity,' and 'Historical Concepts of Creativity' offered by Drexel University, and 'Imagination in Culture' offered by Cornerstone University were among the few courses taking cultural variations in account. From course descriptions, it appears that courses approach the creativity concept from a more universal perspective; however, it should also be acknowledged that these courses are loosely described and implementation might be different. For example, the *Global Perspectives on Creativity* course offered by Drexel University (2017) stated that the goal of the course was "to explore theories, research, assessment, and programs for the development of creativity in a wide variety of countries around the world. Motives for the lack of global creativity research are suggested." Likewise, Saybrook University's *Perspectives in Creativity* course (2017) is described as follows:

> This course is designed to deepen their understanding of creativity and utilize newly learned insights to enhance their creative process as well as stimulate the creative process of others. Students develop an awareness of factors that stimulate or inhibit their own creative process and apply what they learn in an area of vital importance to them. Tapping into creativity is increasingly important for both individuals and society. The challenge of living in a world that is complex and changes at an increasing speed challenges all of us to develop our unique abilities. Creativity is defined here as "the

119

production of relevant and effective novelty" (Cropley, 1999). What is effective varies in different fields and circumstances. There is a deep important need for new and effective answers in many different areas of our culture, our work, and everyday life. Our survival as a species will require answers to new and challenging problems involving both individual and international relationships, ecology, education, health, the arts, population growth, and the economy. This course is designed to deepen their understanding of creativity and utilize newly learned insights to enhance their creative process as well as stimulate the creative process of others. Students will develop awareness of factors that stimulate or inhibit their own creative process and apply what students learn in an area of vital importance to students.

The "Creative Leadership" Program in the Berlin School of Creative Leadership included courses about 'Introduction to Shanghai & Chinese Way of Thinking,' 'The Chinese Renaissance and its Global Impact,' 'Strategic Management and Innovation in China,' and 'Japan at the Crossroad.' Course descriptions suggest that these courses indeed seem to be culturally sensitive and take cultural variations into account. The underlying goal of these courses is to better understand how creativity and innovation concepts differ from one culture to another. In doing that, courses aim to give insights to participants concerning how to lead their organizations and doing business in given contexts. For example, the *Introduction to Shanghai & Chinese Way of Thinking* course (2017) is described as follows:

Through a critical summary of major thought patterns rooted in traditional Chinese philosophy, this course introduces essential concepts for understanding the complex history of modern China and Shanghai, and explores how those ways of thinking

continue to shape the country's business world and everyday life in the modern era. Its overview of basic assumptions made about the Chinese worldview gives participants key insights into the ongoing impact that Taoist thought has on strategy and Confucian thought has on leadership in contemporary China.

Similar to *Introduction to Shanghai & Chinese Way of Thinking* course, *Japan at the Crossroad* (2017) is described as,

> This intensive introduction to Japan immerses participants in the country's past, revealing why its success today is based on profound respect for Japanese history and tradition – and conversely, why it's a major aspect of the challenges Japan now faces. Tokyo has been the innovative force in the Japanese economy for centuries. But can the capital continue to play that role in Japan's future? Participants receive a strong general grounding in the major economic and business issues that characterize the country and city today, helping guide their thinking about the unique opportunities and challenges in the Japanese market.

An analysis of course syllabi showed that course competencies, such as understanding the role of culture in fostering creativity, rarely appeared in course syllabi (3 out of 18). It should also be noted that these three course syllabi belong to programs that approach the concept of creativity more holistically. For example, one of the course competencies of 'Disciplinary Foundations I & II' offered by Union Institute and University is "to develop an understanding of the historical progression of ideas about creativity, how those ideas arise and grow in a cultural context, and how the ideas evolve over time into new concepts." Likewise, one of the course objectives of the 'Creative Thinking' course offered by the University of Massachusetts is that

"by the end of each semester, each student will be able to describe three theoretical or empirical approaches to the study of creative thinking; identify the socio-cultural factors that influence the identification of creative products and events." Finally, one of the program learning outcomes of Pacifica Graduate Institute in 'Creativity, Vocation, and Alchemical Work' course syllabus is stated as "Recognize, critically assess, and creatively express the great archetypal patterns and stories that underpin the lives of individuals, groups, cultures, and events." As these examples show, there are some programs, although not many, that put emphasis on the relationship between culture and creativity. However, it appears that these courses seem to approach the creativity concept from a more universal perspective and that is why further research (including classroom observation and student interviews) is necessary to better understand how cultural variations in creativity have been taught in practice.

Consequently, findings of this research show that only a few programs seem to take cultural variations into account. And yet, these programs also approach creativity from a more universal perspective rather than being culturally sensitive. Although program directors stated that their programs in fact are culturally sensitive and take cultural variations into account, oftentimes referring to diverse student profiles in their programs, it is somewhat unclear how they approach different cultural perspectives to creativity concepts in their curriculum and student assessment. In particular, Celik and Lubart (2017) point out that East and West meet each other on a more frequent basis due to globalization and technological advancement, thus being in multicultural settings is more likely in today's world. By referring to other creativity research concerning the possible impact of multiculturalism on creativity, which can lead to 'destabilize routinized knowledge structures,' they argue that learning more about differences of creativity concepts in East and West in fact has the potential to lead to a more fruitful

conversation about creativity research and may lead to a paradigm shift (p. 48, see also Anderson et al., 2014). It is important to tap into differences in creativity among cultures and approach these differences in a more constructive manner rather than perceiving one as superior to another. Therefore, it is still very important to further examine how students who are more familiar with the Eastern perspective of creativity versus students who are more familiar with the Western perspective of creativity, describe the impact of their creativity programs on their personal and professional development. Given the fact that some cultural and political environments, and organizational structures are not open to new ideas and radical innovation at the fullest extent, it is necessary to research how individuals in such environments exercise their creative potential. Likewise, there is a need to examine the impact of creativity programs that approach the creativity concept from a more self-actualization/transformation perspective and compare the impact of these programs with others that more likely cater to the pragmatist nature of creativity. Finally, it is important to scrutinize how cultural differences towards creativity can complement each other as the world becomes increasingly multicultural.

Creativity in the New Public Management Context

Interviews with creativity program directors raised an important question concerning the obstacles of fostering creativity in higher education. First, a heavy emphasis on testing and standardization in K-12 education is likely to impede creativity in schools. Indeed, empirical evidence suggests that education policy reforms, which revolve around standardization, excessive focus on testing and outcome based curriculum, possibly hamper creative and critical thinking (Larsen, 2013). Likewise, Larsen (2013) argues that there is evidence showing that excessive focus on standardized testing has an impact on teaching methodologies, which are

more towards teaching to the test instead of helping teachers to foster creative teaching skills (see also Jones et al., 2003; Klein, Zevenbergen, & Brown, 2006; Nichols & Berliner, 2007). Graham Brown-Martin, who is involved in creativity and innovation in education, but an outsider to these creativity degree programs, drew an analogy between the emergence of the creativity degree programs and the emergency services for people. Arguably, he was right to suggest that creativity degree programs serve as an "emergency service" for young people, reflecting to some extent the failure of the K-12 education system. Equally important to consider is how creativity degree programs are affected by the new public management (NPM) culture in higher education institutions, which is characterized by marketization, privatization, managerialism, performance measurement, and accountability in education.

In the ideal world, one of the most important goals of higher education should be to encourage students to embrace new ways of doing things and help students see the world from multiple, unique, diverse, and fresh perspectives. Ideally, higher education institutions should be the places where creativity and innovation occur organically. Universities should already pave the way for creativity and innovation. Rather than only opening up possibilities for more business and employment opportunities, universities can also create social values that possibly lead to a more equitable, just, and sustainable society. While higher education institutions should be in charge of supporting creative and innovative thinking, the problem is to what extent students and academics alike value creativity. Examining the value of creativity in higher education is an important point to ponder because by and large there is a tendency towards standardization in education that has the potential to hamper creativity. Since many students are exposed to the standard system of education from an early age, which possibly does not leave

much room for creative and innovative thinking, it is questionable whether it will be possible to bring their creativity back once those students begin their college studies. For example, Karl Jeffries commented on this issue in the following way:

> The way I look at higher education is the opportunity to undo the damage that was done in secondary schools. It is the last chance. Some people are going to get to educate themselves in an educational context before they get out there to earn a living for the rest of their lives. Even though they can carry on doing stuff, this higher education process is privilege for some people. And in that time we have an opportunity to get people's creativity back for them. But equally it is possible that too much damage has been done. There is a big question how some people being so fundamentally skewed by the secondary education notion of standardizing. There is a right answer and all these beliefs have been so banged into them that when they come to higher education. They can't take the opportunity and run with it because they can't break out the idea that there is a right answer.

Although there are different definitions of creativity as explained before, having a creative mindset and translating such mindset into a skillset requires looking at things from different perspectives, imagining unimagined solutions for problems, and not worrying about being judged due to one's different and perhaps radical solution offerings to problems. If students in higher education would approach problems with a mindset that there is only one right answer and the only goal is to find the right answer, then it is very unlikely for these students to embrace creative lifestyles.

Concordantly, another problem revolves around the question of what higher education means for students. If students only value higher education as a means for employment rather than aiming to grow both intellectually and professionally, then higher education institutions are likely to be obligated to employment demands. Keri Facer from the University of Bristol raised a very important point regarding the possible relationship between students who perceive themselves as consumers and universities which act as service providers. She pointed out:

> Universities should be places that disrupt those patterns of thinking, but the problem is that students have been thought of as consumers rather than students. There is a real resistance increasingly towards faculty disrupting young people's thinking because if the student is a consumer, they need to get what they want and if what they want is a standardized approach, then we are really in trouble. I mean the critical issue here for me around creativity is creativity involves challenge, it involves disruption, it involves difficulty, it involves opening up different ways of thinking, it involves doing hard thinking. It is actually to really create something. If you have an education system that is premised on a service provider, consumer relationship, then how do teachers really create the conditions of radical openness to challenge students if students want their degrees rather than wanting to be challenged? That is not the case for all of them, not all students do come wanting to learn. Many of them do still have that different attitudes. Again it is not one answer for everything. There are lots of conflicting and multiple perspectives on all of these.

Keri Facer's comments regarding the possibility of fostering creativity in the context of NPM principles were also enlightening. She drew attention to an important point concerning how

126

these principles might be enacted by universities and how there might be multiple politics and discourses traveling in higher education institutions. She explained:

> You cannot assume just because the leadership of universities or policies that surround universities are pushing towards a neoliberal approach. You cannot assume that that is how everybody is acting in the university. There are still hugely important resources within universities that are food for creative practice potentially, but it is oppositional, universities are not just one thing and one politics. There are multiple politics. People are competing with each other to shape what the university is. There are such different sorts of universities. There are universities that are degree factories. There are exam factories. There are hostile environments for teachers and students. And there are other places that are much more amenable to giving space, to creating space for thinking. There are multiple questions here around whether it is universities or outside universities where you can do this work, but also if it is within which sorts of universities. They are not all the same, they are very very different and very different cultures. I am in a really lucky position as a senior academic because I do have some freedom still to invent, to play, and to talk with people and to have interesting conversations. In many ways it is still an amazing job, but that is a very different experience for some people may be who are starting out, who are in more junior positions, who do not have that time, who are being pressured in terms of teachings. Again it is just about nuancing all of this and seeing the different levels but the big question, the bigger question behind all of these is if we want to create educational institutions that we support human capacity to live well in the world, what will they look like? You probably would not start with where we are now,

you might work in a very very different way. And I think what we need to do is to think about the best things of the current system and the best things of the emerging very different modules that also exist.

Keri Facer's comments with regard to these conflicting and multiple perspectives on creativity also align with one of the very recent studies done by Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA). In their research titled 'Overcoming Daemons: The Better Angels of Creativity in Higher Education' (Gilliford, 2015), they surveyed fellows in the higher education sector and delved into what worked and what did not while aiming to enhance creative capabilities in higher education. When it comes to daemons, the research team found out that the key themes were 'rigid structures,' 'the perceived value of creativity,' and 'lack of time, funding and expertise' (Gilliford, 2015). These daemons are also very similar to those NPM principles explained earlier that possibly run against fostering creativity. And yet, the same research revealed that there are still many higher education institutions that are aware of those daemons and aim to overcome them through revising their academic curricula, introducing new methodologies, and making their institutions more suitable places for enhancing creative, entrepreneurial, and innovative activities. Indeed, when program directors were asked whether these NPM principles hamper creativity in their institutions, most of them acknowledged that these principles discourage creative thinking in higher education settings. However, they also recognized that their creativity programs are not likely to be exposed to those NPM principles and have a unique place and much more independence in their universities. For example, in relation to whether it is too late to foster creativity and disrupt conventional thinking in higher education, Gerard Puccio and Leonie Baldacchino talked about

128

their daily experiences in their programs. While acknowledging that creativity ideally should be fostered from a very early age, they also emphasized that they witness everyday how their students' creativity is fostered through coursework and various methodologies implemented in their programs. For example, Gerard Puccio explained:

> In the ideal world, education at the entry level-primary should begin because Bloom's taxonomy which was revised of thinking, which reflects the trend that I talked about earlier 2000s where evaluate has previously been at the highest level of human thought in Bloom's taxonomy, now it is create. Evaluate and critical thinking is the second skill down from the top. Honestly sometimes it is frustrating even for me today because people would quickly reinforce the importance of critical thinking, but not as often will they say yes and it is important to promote creative thinking. You are right it [creativity] should begin at the very point at which student enters into school, but honestly it does not. We have to be careful not to generalize too much because we cannot paint all of educational experiences undermining creativity, but if not widely supported I think that is a fact. Creative thinking is not widely supported. Of course you have individual teachers, you have Montessori schools, and you have other approaches [like] the Waldorf school system. There are other approaches but by and large public education systems do not systematically or strategically support creative thinking. Is it too late to foster creativity by the time they enter into higher education? No, I mean the creative studies project at Buffalo State College demonstrated that it is possible to foster creativity in higher education. These are working with freshman who have gone through an educational system that did not promote creative thinking. Our own research - there is a handbook of

creative problem solving in education now that is just coming out, we have a chapter in there, we have looked at the impact of our undergraduate and graduate program on students and these are skills that can be taught no matter what the age is and no matter what the past experiences been, it is never too late.

Similar to Gerard Puccio's points, Leonie Baldacchino stated:

It is very possible [to foster creativity in higher education] and I see it every day. I see it in our students, our master students, and also some of undergraduate students. They have a very rigid way of thinking, they have come through the education system that promotes and encourages memorization, drill learning, and lack of critical thinking, but as they then experience the different way of teaching and they get over the shock of us telling them listen, forget what you have thought so far that you have to take everything we say as set in stone, we want to hear ideas. It takes time, but by the end of the degree, the way they think and their mindset is completely different but having said that we also work very hard to try and change the system from the primary and secondary level because imagine how much better it would be, how much easier it would be [if] a student is taught to be a critical and creative thinker right from the start rather than having to unlearn and relearn everything when they get to university. Especially bear in your mind that not everybody comes to university and not everybody takes our courses. One positive development in these curriculum at primary and secondary levels is that recently in 2012 there was a reform, there was a restructuring of the curriculum framework in Malta and education for creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship has been introduced as a cross-curricular theme.

As stated in the literature review, there is an urgent call for much more creative education globally. Creativity has become a buzzword, used by politicians, policymakers, and higher education administrators frequently. Even some programs in this research (e.g. Western Connecticut University Leadership, Compassion and Creativity, Berry College Creative Technologies[6], and some few others) oftentimes use 'creativity' in their program descriptions and mission statements and rhetorically sound like creativity-oriented programs when their curriculum offers no evidence of really tapping into the concept of creativity.

Creativity has also been recognized as a positive concept that can meet the demands of the business world. Oftentimes favorable meanings and expectations are attached to the creativity concept; however, it is not clear whether those who urge for more creativity in education are cognizant of what creativity really requires. As evidence from this research shows, there exist a variety of discourses on creativity. For example, some programs focus more on the impact of creativity in the business world, while others perceive creativity as an important skill that one should possess to deal with complexities introduced by globalization and technological advancements in the 21st century. While there is such a positive approach to creativity rhetorically, it is also important for those institutions, which call for more creativity, to create more amenable environments for creativity. In particular, Susan Rowland from Pacifica Graduate Institute commented on the NPM principles in higher education institutions, drawing attention to the point that there might be a mismatch between policy and practice while encouraging creativity:

---

[6] Original description of Berry College's Creative Technologies program was downloaded in November, 2016. And yet, the description was slightly changed as I was writing the dissertation, although it still reflects the same principles.

I think you are right, these pressures [referring to New Public Management Culture] can kill possibilities for creative education. I think that there is a lot of unconsciousness in universities in the sense that lots of people will say yes, let's be creative, let's have creative education, let's have creative programs and then actually not be able to follow through because they are just paying lip service to something without realizing what it really involves. And they are in the grip of powers that are stronger than anything that might kind of facilitate a really creative education. On the other hand, the best education always had some element of creativity in them even if it is been a highly structured creativity and I think elite education will try to grab this potential and foster it. One question ... it is a fact here is technology. Until what extent technology like this one is going to be used to develop or support creativity in education or whether it is going to be used to shut it down. It could go either way. There has always been an education war really and I think you are alluding to this. And various studies of the history of education in the last hundred years have pointed to this. Very broadly the war seems to be between those who want education to control the population and those who want education to enfranchise the population. And basically creativity is about enfranchising, about setting people free. The people who lose instincts and maybe who are political masters wanted to be control of capable of using the language but not following through on the reality.

Additionally, during my interview with Susan Rowland, she urged for more wild creativity rather than domesticated creativity that caters to the pragmatist nature of creativity. She acknowledged that the current push for creativity as a panacea seems to emphasize its role in advancing economic development only. Evidence from this research also shows that 15 (34.1%)

programs in the sample underlined the importance of creativity for the business world and marketplace, addressing demands of the labor market. However, Susan Rowland also pointed out that there are still reasons to be optimistic concerning the current developments in higher education. She explained:

> I think that we have got to be honest and say that a lot of them [creativity-related programs/discourses] are responding to the economic language of creativity. And universities tend to be sensitive to criticism from businesses and business leaders saying you are not producing the kinds of creative people we want. They take off this word "creative" and try to sort of reproduce it. However, I think there is something bigger and more optimistic… there is a changing paradigm. I tend to think and hope that we are into a rethinking of our relationship with nature. Ecology has affected a lot of disciplines including science disciplines. In a sense, universities are rethinking their disciplinary alignments. That is itself a creative process. And there is sort of half-conscious macro-level creativity of change within the disciplinary environment. The third thing could be the impact of technology. Again, technology is changing the way the education is done and delivered. That itself forces people to rethink how they do things and the sense that very few people who do education for living want it to be more mechanistic in the full meaning of that word. So how do we do education if so much of it is mediated through technology? That is kind of forcing an attention to what it is about education we value and that creative spark.

Interview excerpts above raised broad questions to consider while aiming to foster creativity in higher education institutions. In particular, Keri Facer's comments regarding

133

possible consumer/service provider relationship between students and universities requires special attention. Runco (2016) argues that a self-motivated person is more likely to engage with creative thinking and creative achievement as intrinsic motivation is more about the task itself and the process rather than being concerned with the results of work. As Graham Brown-Martin implied during the interview, being so focused on the destination sometimes makes people forget about the journey itself. If intrinsic motivation and journey is much more important for creativity and creative thinking, then it is questionable whether sowing the seeds of creativity in higher education is possible by rationalizing its importance only through external motivations.

Naidoo and Jamieson (2005) hypothesize that "rather than empowering students, consumerism may, perversely, threaten innovation and academic standards and further entrench academic privilege. Attempts to restructure professional cultures to comply with consumerist frameworks may unintentionally deter innovation and promote passive and instrumental attitudes to learning" (p. 279). They further argue that when students see themselves as customers and adopt customer attitudes towards education, then such approaches to higher education are likely to make students be passive learners.

How will it be possible then to encourage creativity under such circumstances if there is not much active learning and if student-teacher relationship is seen through the eyes of a customer-service provider relationship? Undoubtedly, one should be careful not to generalize too much given the existence of multiple competing discourses in higher education institutions. While some institutes are more likely to revamp their policies to better suit the needs of the business world and the labor market, there might be still others that approach education and creativity more holistically. Also, it is possible that some universities may frame their creativity

programs from a more instrumental perspective on program websites (appearing that they respond to business demands), while implementation might be different in practice. Therefore, further research is needed to examine thoroughly the actual implementation of program mission statements and objectives. For example, one of the program directors, whose program approaches creativity from a more instrumental way, explained:

> In the way that we framed the program on the website, we do make the kind of explicit link between the idea that creativity and creative thinking are valued by the market and therefore coming on to this program will improve your aptitude in these areas to make you more employable and more marketable. That is clear, we do state that. But I think in the delivery of modules, in the general way that we approach not only creativity but all of the concepts including innovation which is where I teach more, certainly the framing or the message that I like to give and of course I am not observing every class, I do not know how each lecturer is delivering each module, but we certainly emphasize criticality as being very important whatever the discipline is, whatever the concept is, whatever the theories are. The idea of being a kind of having a critical and analytical approach is very important to us. If you are doing postgraduate degree in this school, this is what we expect of you in all cases and of course that applies to the idea of creativity as well. So we are trying to do two things. We are trying to respond in a more instrumental way to the idea that creativity is more valued by the market place and we want to help graduates to respond to that but at the same time we have one eye firmly on the idea that we should be critical of such concepts and about their place in the market.

It seems that education systems globally encourage convergent thinking more than divergent thinking as there is an excessive focus on standardized testing, and all such approaches to education have the potential to diminish creative thinking. Creativity by definition seems to require developing new and innovative solutions to problems facing the world today. However, students coming from K-12 education are likely to act in a way that there is one right answer to any question and they are more interested in finding the right answer. According to J. P. Guilford, the difference between convergent and divergent thinking is that:

> Convergent thinking emphasizes remembering what is known, being able to learn what exists, and being able to save that information in one's brain, being able to find the correct answer –i.e., converge. Divergent thinking emphasizes the revision of what is already known, of exploring what can be known, and of building new information—i.e., diverge. People who prefer the convergent mode of intellect supposedly tend to do what is expected of them, while those who prefer the divergent mode of intellect supposedly tend to take risks and to speculate." (Piirto, 2011, p. 2). Less focus on fostering divergent thinking abilities and more focus on encouraging students to find the right answers is not likely to help students adapt creative behavior. For example, Ambrose (2016) argues that "David Berliner (2012) coined the term *creaticide* to stand for the systematic killing of creativity in the American education system. The murder of creativity comes from dogmatic adherence to accountability initiatives driven by widespread, high-stakes measurement of superficial, narrow abilities through standardized testing. (p. 33)

Furthermore, Sternberg (2016) states that there are four important abilities necessary to be more holistic and well-rounded individual. These abilities are creative, analytical, practical,

and wisdom. Sternberg (2016) argues that while these four abilities are equally important, our society puts more emphasis on analytical abilities than others. Moreover, he discusses that "analytical abilities increased dramatically during the 20th century (Flynn, 2012). But the increase in analytical abilities was not accompanied by an increase in wisdom, with the result that the analytical abilities often were used for purposes not conducive to species survival, such as the production of ever more sophisticated explosive devices, such as the hydrogen bombs" (p. 260). Likewise, Sternberg (2016) argues that Silicon Valley is a good example of an explosion of creativity and yet he questions that there is still increasing inequality of incomes and so many other problems, which may be due to the lack of wisdom. He challenges people to think more deeply about the real purpose of creativity and encourages for teaching for responsible creativity. Sternberg (2016) emphasizes that there is a perception in our society that 'more is better' and yet he states that the importance of balance is much more important than excellence in one of the abilities to encourage creativity. All these arguments are important not only for these creativity programs in the sample but also for education systems in general to consider while aiming to foster creativity.

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The aim of this research was to trace the emergence of creativity-related degree programs in higher education institutions globally. Through employing a critical discourse analysis of documents and interviews with key stakeholders, the goal was to examine how these programs construct and institutionalize particular concepts of creativity. Since the emergence of degree bearing creativity-related programs is a recent phenomenon in higher education, there has been little research, if any, about the scope, nature, and implications of these programs. In this context, this research identifies a variety of different creativity discourses in higher education, contributes to a better understanding of the complexity of the creativity concept, and gives recommendations for higher education administrators and policymakers about how to tap into creativity to the fullest extent.

As thoroughly discussed before, creativity is a socially constructed concept. It is challenging to define a universal meaning of creativity since its definitions depend on various conditions such as time, culture, and place. It is likely that changes in economy and technology, especially in the context of globalization, have a profound impact on how creativity is defined today. Similarly, what creativity meant to universities a century ago is not the same as how it is understood today in higher education. Most of the programs in this research define creativity as the ability to come up with something new and useful. This definition is more closely aligned with the Western perspective of creativity, emphasizing its instrumental value in the economically driven marketplace. From this perspective, change constitutes the essence of this definition as creativity is seen to be instrumental for dealing with change. While some programs in the sample encourage change for economic development, others pursue change for public

good. There are also programs that have different underlying reasons for encouraging creativity. While proposed rationales behind institutionalizing creativity in higher education vary, all rationales draw close attention to the fact that creativity is necessary to move forward.

To summarize, the findings of this research identified five main themes, which are used to rationalize the institutionalization of creativity degree programs in higher education. They include: (1) creativity as a skillset and mindset; (2) an inter-, multi-, or transdisciplinary and holistic approaches to creativity; (3) creativity for meeting the needs of market; (4) creativity for personal and/or professional development; and (5) creativity for change through leadership. The most frequently mentioned theme is 'creativity as a skillset/mindset.' Oftentimes, creativity is presented as an important and a necessary skill that individuals should possess. In referring to complexities introduced by digital revolution and globalization, it is argued that creativity can help individuals to effectively deal with the ongoing change.

Importantly, most of the themes are also interrelated and complement each other in different ways. For example, creativity has become an important skillset/mindset and therefore its importance has been increasingly noted by business leaders. Oftentimes, the creativity concept is presented as one of the most important qualifications that employees should possess. It is argued that increasing competition and globalization have forced companies to be more innovative and entrepreneurial. To overcome such complexities and continue innovating, business leaders aim to bring more creativity into their organizations. Although what business leaders desire in their organizations and how their organizations are structured runs against creating more amenable environments to foster creativity, rhetorically the business world strives for more creativity. Likewise, the problems the world faces have become much more

complicated due to globalization, digital revolutions, and increasing population, therefore there is a need for more inter-, multi-, or trans-disciplinary approaches to higher education to solve these complex problems and creativity emerges at the center of these solutions. Rhetorically, it is argued that initiating multidisciplinary research groups and adopting more interdisciplinary approaches to complex problems have the potential to address such complex problems. Since creativity research shows that creativity is omnipresent, it is likely that exposing individuals to a wide variety of disciplines can be more fruitful and enable holistic development. Similarly, meanings attached to leadership seem to be constantly evolving and a creative mindset seems to be crucial for effective leadership.

Additionally, as the secondary level analysis reveals, culture and context play an important role in the process of institutionalizing creativity in higher education. Research shows that it is important to examine creativity concepts cross-culturally since most of creativity research is conducted in a limited number of countries, particularly the United States (Raina, 1993 as cited in Lubart, 1999). And yet, it should be stressed that there are only few programs in the sample highlighting cross-cultural variations in creativity. However, findings from semi-structured interviews with program directors show that programs that do not explicitly underline cross-cultural variations in creativity in their program mission statements, descriptions, or curricula, still take those variations in consideration during the implementation process. Oftentimes, directors of programs, which do not stress cultural variations in text-based data, argue that they are quite sensitive to the potential cultural differences in creativity by referring to the fact that they have international students who bring diverse perspectives into their programs.

Likewise, one director stated that regardless of place and time, there are increasingly complex social, economic, political issues, which creativity can help navigate in a thoughtful way.

While acknowledging that culture has an impact on whether creativity is conceptualized in terms of individual or collective benefits, creativity is seen as innate, but expressed differently depending on the context. However, there is still a potential dilemma concerning how to encourage creativity at the societal level if a culture or political environment is not welcoming new ideas, changes, and concepts. This also aligns with literature showing that "political stability indicated by coups d'etat, revolts, and assassinations seemed to assert a negative influence on creativity in science, philosophy, literature, and music in the generation following the stability" (p. 346, Simonton, 1990 as cited in Lubart, 1999). Therefore, further research is needed to carefully scrutinize potential impacts of such cultural, social, and political variations on creativity. Likewise, there are some programs that do not stress cross-cultural variations in teaching creativity in program descriptions, yet may address cross-cultural variations at the classroom level. Therefore, further research is necessary to delve deeper into these programs and find out whether and how they take cultural variations into consideration in practice.

Implications for theory and research

This research contributes to the emerging research on the social construction of creativity by revealing that meanings attached to creativity have been evolving in the context of massive changes brought by globalization and digital revolution. Complexities, contexts, and concepts such as increasing competition, change, environmental issues, and uncertainty have contributed to a growing importance of the creativity concept, leading to the institutionalization of creativity-

related degree programs in higher education institutions. However, although creativity is presented as an important concept in addressing a wide range of problems, business and end-goal oriented creativity degree programs seem to dominate higher education. To put it differently, creativity is driven by instrumental values. Although semi-structured interviews revealed that faculty in these programs may also carry intrinsic notions of creativity, these values are usually not publicly acknowledged, revealing a mismatch between how programs are delivered in practice and how they presented themselves to the outside world rhetorically.

Another contribution of this research is that what the business world desires may run against fostering creativity. While avoiding generalizations and acknowledging that some companies may support employees' creativity, it seems that there is a mismatch between policy and practice. On the one hand, companies call for more creativity and innovation in the business world, while on the other hand, their very structured hierarchies are likely to run against fostering employees' creativity. Likewise, Sternberg (2006) argues that "governments say they want creativity, but their actions belie their words" (p. 2). Moreover, referring to the 'mere-exposure effect,' Sternberg and Lubart (1995) state that although people seem to be open to new ideas rhetorically, they usually lean towards more conventional methods. In one research, Sternberg and his colleagues examined creativity, wisdom, and intelligence notions in a wide range of groups and they found a negative correlation between wisdom and creativity in the business group, which indicates that showing creative attitudes in business organizations might not be seen as very welcoming (Sternberg & Lubart, 1995). On the other hand, as discourse analysis in this research showed, the business world cries out for more creative employees and presents creativity as one of the most desired qualities in the workplace. It is necessary that the

business world and governments consider taking necessary actions to adjust their organizational structures depending on complexities introduced by our globalizing world in addition to calling for more creative employees if they want to encourage true creativity in their organizations.

Finally, findings of this research contribute to the existing creativity research concerning how the creativity concept is domesticated and narrowly framed under neoliberal economic discourses. Similar to previous research (see Larsen, 2013; Hay & Kapitzke, 2009), this study confirms that the creativity concept under neoliberal economic discourses limits the purpose of fostering creativity to economic rationalities. Hay and Kapitzke (2009, p. 158) argue that

> …governance — and the governance of uncertainty in particular — requires the 'calculated supervision, administration and maximization of the forces of each and all,' (Miller & Rose, 1990, 19: 2), then policy must of necessity assert that the capacity to innovate and be creative is the responsibility of all rather than the select few who once were considered extraordinarily talented or gifted. Creativity therefore is no longer framed as an atypical and frequently transgressive phenomenon. Rather, of necessity it must be mainstreamed and domesticated as a mundane attitude and capacity in which individual citizens become self-investing and self-managing subjects through the ethical work of self-discipline and self-surveillance.

Creativity is definitely needed for a healthy and sustainable economy and it plays a crucial role in the emergence of new enterprises, which have the potential to lead more creative and innovative solutions to problems the world faces. And yet, encouraging creativity under neoliberal economic rationalities might be self-defeating because it only reduces the concept to

instrumental values, which run against being truly creative and may not necessarily lead to self-transformation. As some key participants stated during interviews, there should be more encouragement for wild creativity rather than domesticating it, which can open up possibilities for more growth at both personal, professional, collective, and intellectual levels. As the institutionalization of creativity-related degree programs is still in process, it is very important for these degree programs to consider how they present their programs to the outside world, how they construct the concept of creativity, and to what extent they contribute to or perpetuate the construction of narrowly defined notions of creativity. During the course of this research, it appears that some programs already went through few changes in their structures. Moreover, interviewed program directors and faculty members often stated that this research in fact will help them better understand how they present their programs externally to researchers and applicants. Therefore, it is expected that findings of this research will guide programs to critically examine and reframe their programs in a more holistic ways.

Implications for higher education administrators

Notwithstanding the different rationales behind initiating creativity degree programs in universities, it is very promising that creativity has become an important concept for higher education administrators. It is also good news that a more creative approach to education has already been put into practice by programs in the sample. At the same time, it is also necessary to think carefully about what purpose creativity degree programs serve. Is creativity needed just for increasing competition in the business world? Will more creativity in the business world lead to a more consumer culture? What is the relationship between creativity and sustainability in the business world? Will the emergence of creativity degree programs in higher education also lead

to self-transformation, help participants grow both personally, professionally, and intellectually, and address socio-economic and socio-politic questions arising from current and future complexities? Since it is likely that the number of creativity degree programs will increase in the near future, higher education administrators should seriously contemplate these questions.

Higher education administrators should also think about whether and to what extent universities are the right places to foster creativity and how their organizational cultures allow students room to approach problems more creatively and innovatively in their own contexts. Ideally, universities should be places where students are challenged to think outside the box, where both divergent and convergent thinking are supported, and where radical collaboration through inter-, multi-, and trans-disciplinarity are allowed. Considering cross-cultural differences in the conceptualization of creativity, creativity requires taking risks, not being afraid of following new methods, while dealing with complexities and adopting a more holistic approach for solving problems. However, widespread NPM principles in higher education institutions and a possible consumer–service provider relationship between students and universities are likely to run against fostering creativity. While the good news is that there is an increasing number of universities that have put strong emphasis on creativity rhetorically, it is also important for those universities to be cognizant of possible roadblocks they may encounter in practice due to rigid structures of universities. Most of the interviewed program directors stated that their programs have unique positions in their universities and thus are not exposed to NPM principles much. And yet, directors also acknowledged that such principles have the potential to hamper the development of creativity across campus. Therefore, in addition to initiating creativity-related

programs in universities, higher education policymakers should also consider how to create more flexible environments campus-wide to encourage more creative and innovative thinking.

Additionally, if higher education institutions aim to encourage creativity in education, they should find alternative ways to make the creativity concept appealing not only in terms of instrumental incentives, but also in terms of making the concept intrinsically rewarding. Creativity should be seen as a life-style and a mindset. When creativity is seen as a life-style rather than applicable only to certain situations, then this will in fact lead self-actualization. As Weiner (2000, p. 257) explains,

> If creativity were to become a normal feature of our everyday lives and we recognized this in each other, then we would be carrying out the dreams of Franklin, Schiller, Marx, and the Enlightenment ideal of universal individuality. Our multiculturalism would be so transparent that marginalization of any group would seem absurd; the uniqueness of each person would be so prized and obvious that no one would be sheep-like, an average would be synonymous with unique or diverse. Creativity would be our context, change would be our tradition, and we would all be fulfilled. The dialectic of oppression and liberation would be overcome; each would be free to pursue happiness…and each would be able to self-actualized. We would be born again, peace would reign on Earth, and spiritual enlightenment would prevail.

It is also important that higher education institutions encourage creativity not only in their creativity-related degree bearing programs but also campus-wide through embedding it in different disciplines. As stated previously, the debate about generic versus domain specific features of creativity is very contentious; and a much more focused discussion and research is

necessary. And yet, as most of the interviewees stated, creativity should not be treated as either generic or domain specific, it should be both. Although these creativity-related degree programs welcome students from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds, it is still necessary for universities to find alternative ways to encourage creativity within disciplines. For example, encouraging campus-wide initiatives have the potential to act as catalysts of creative and innovative thinking. Universities should also find ways to challenge traditional teaching methodologies, encourage academics to value creativity more, and take necessary actions to provide more expertise and funding to foster creativity throughout campuses. And finally, Penaluna et al. (2014) argue that "it takes around ten years to learn the ideas and skills that one needs to think of creative ideas; thus an overreliance on infrequent brainstorms, unless they become everyday occurrences, may be a misdirected, or at least misunderstood, exercise" (p. 365, see also Simonton, 1999). Therefore, it is important for education policymakers to put strong emphasis on creativity throughout the learning process, starting from early childhood and reaching into K-12 schools and higher education.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity.* New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Amabile, T. (1996). *Creativity in context.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Ambrose, D. (2016). Twenty-first century contextual influences on the life trajectories of creative young people. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Creative intelligence in the 21st century: Grappling with enormous problems and huge opportunities* (pp. 21-48). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1297-1333.

Banaji, S., Burn, A., & Buckingham, D. (2010). *The rhetorics of creativity: A literature review*. London, England: Creativity Culture & Education.

Barron, F. (1988). Putting creativity to work. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives* (pp. 76–98). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Barron, F., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *32*(1), 439-476.

Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 103-121.

Berger P., L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Garden City, NY: First Anchor.

148

Berlin School of Creative Leadership. (2017). *Introduction to Shanghai & Chinese ways of thinking*. Retrieved from https://www.berlin-school.com/introduction-shanghai-chinese-ways-thinking

Berlin School of Creative Leadership. (2017). *Japan at the crossroad*. Retrieved from https://www.berlin-school.com/japan-crossroad

Berlin School of Creative Leadership. (2017). *Leading change*. Retrieved from https://www.berlin-school.com/executive-mba#modules/439/default

Berlin School of Creative Leadership. (2017). *The executive MBA program – tailored to the creative industries*. Retrieved from https://www.berlin-school.com/executive-mba

Berliner, D. C. (2012). Narrowing curriculum, assessments, and conceptions of what it means to be smart in the US schools: Creaticide by design. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *How dogmatic beliefs harm creativity and higher-level thinking* (pp. 79-93). New York, NY: Routledge.

Berry College. (2017). *Creative technology major, B.S.* Retrieved from http://catalog.berry.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=6&poid=583&returnto=168

Brandeis University. (2017). *Creativity, the arts and social transformation program: Objectives*. Retrieved from https://www.brandeis.edu/programs/cast/objectives.html

Brown, R. T. (1989). Creativity: What are we to measure? In J. A. Glover, R. R. Ronning, & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 3-32). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Burnard, P., & White, J. (2008). Creativity and performativity: Counterpoints in British and Australian education. *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(5), 667-682.

Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism.* London, England: Sage.

Bybee, R. W. (2013). *The case for stem education: Challenges and opportunities.* Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Celik, P., & Lubart, T. (2017). When East meets West. In V. P. Glăveanu (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of creativity and culture research* (pp. 37-55). London, GB: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

City University of London. (2017). *Why you should take the MICL*. Retrieved from http://www.cass.city.ac.uk/courses/masters/courses/innovation-creativity-and-leadership

Cochrane, L. R. (1984). How to manage creative people: A review of the literature, *Public Relations Quarterly, 29*(4), 6-14.

Collins, M. A., & Amabile, T. M. (1999). Motivation and creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 297–312). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Craft, A. (2005). *Creativity in schools: Tensions and dilemmas*. London, England: Routledge.

Cranfield University. (2016). *Postgraduate courses in design 2017-2018*. Retrieved from https://www.cranfield.ac.uk/forms/brochure-download-swee-design-courses-form

Cranfield University. (2017). *Study for a master of design at Cranfield: Overview.* Retrieved from https://www.cranfield.ac.uk/courses/taught/innovation-and-creativity-in-industry

Crutchfield, R. (1962). Conformity and creative thinking. In H. Gruber, G. Terrell, & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Contemporary approaches to creative thinking* (pp. 120-140). New York, NY: Atherton.

Csíkszentmihályi, M. (1994). The domain of creativity. In D. H. Feldman, M. Csíkszentmihályi, & H. Gardner (Eds.), *Changing the world: A framework for the study of creativity* (pp. 69-84). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Csíkszentmihályi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.*
New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Csíkszentmihályi, M. (1999). Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. In
R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 313-335). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge
University Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The Quest for certainty: A study of the relation of knowledge and action.*
London, England: Allen & Unwin.

Dewey, J. (1990). Science and society. In L. Hickman (Ed.), *Technology as a human affair.* New
York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Drexel University. (2017). *Certificates in creativity and innovation: Overview.* Retrieved from
http://drexel.edu/soe/academics/certificates/Creativity-Innovation/

Drexel University. (2017). *Global perspectives on creativity*. Retrieved from
http://catalog.drexel.edu/coursedescriptions/quarter/grad/crtv/

Drexel University. (2017). *MS in creativity and innovation: Overview.* Retrieved from
https://online.drexel.edu/online-degrees/business-degrees/ms-creativity-
innovation/index.aspx

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and
hermeneutics.* Sussex, England: The Harvester Press.

Drucker, P. F. (1968). *The age of discontinuity: Guidelines to our changing economy.* New York,
NY: Harper & Row.

Facer, K. (2014). *Keri Facer: Universities as creative spaces to imagine futures*. Retrieved from
http://www.wise-qatar.org/future-education-keri-facer

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Science Research.* London, UK: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Falmouth University. (2017). *Creative Education.* Retrieved from https://www.falmouth.ac.uk/creativeeducationma

Faust, D. G. (2009). The university's crisis of purpose. *New York Times Book Review*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/06/books/review/Faust-t.html

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Florida, R. L. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Florida, R. (2014). *The rise of the creative class--revisited: Revised and expanded*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Flynn, J. R. (2012). *Are we getting smarter? Rising IQ in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1976). *The history of sexuality: An introduction.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980) 'Truth and power', in C. Gordon (ed.) *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972–1977*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: The Continuum International

    Publishing Group Inc.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Creating minds*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Gardner, H. (1994). The creators' patterns. In D. H. Feldman, M. Csíkszentmihályi, & H.

    Gardner (Eds.), *Changing the world: A framework for the study of creativity* (pp. 69-84).

    Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Gibson, H. (2005). What creativity isn't: The presumptions of instrumental and individual

    justifications for creativity in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *53*(2),

    148-167.

Gilliford, T. (2015). Overcoming daemons: The better angels of creativity in higher education.

    Retrieved from https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa

    blogs/2015/03/overcoming-daemons-the-better-angels-of-creativity-in-higher-education

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change.*

    San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Halberstam, J. (2011). *The queer art of failure*. Durham, NC/London: Duke University Press.

Harlow, H. F. (1950). Learning and satiation of response in intrinsically motivated complex

    puzzle performance by monkeys. *Journal of Comparative Physiological Psychology*, *43*,

    289-294.

Harris, A. (2014). *The creative turn: Toward a new aesthetic imaginary*. Rotterdam, The

    Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Hay, S., & Kapitzke, C. (2009). 'Smart state' for a knowledge economy: reconstituting creativity

    through student subjectivity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *30*(2), 151-164.

Hoffmann, A. M., & Bory-Adams, A. (2005). The human capability approach and education for
    sustainable development: Making the abstract real. *Fifth Conference on the Capability
    Approach,* Paris.

Hunt, J. McV. (1965). Intrinsic motivation and its role in psychological development. In D.
    Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 13). Lincoln: University of
    Nebraska Press.

Hursh, B., Haas, P., & Moore, M. (1983). An interdisciplinary model to implement general
    education. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*, 42-59.

IBM Institute for Business Value. (2010). *Capitalizing on complexity: Insights from the Global
    Chief Executive Officer Study*. Retrieved from
    https://public.dhe.ibm.com/common/ssi/ecm/gb/en/gbe03297usen/GBE03297USEN.PDF

Isaksen, S. G., Murdock, M. C., Firestien, R. L., & Treffinger, D. J. (1993). *Understanding and
    recognizing creativity: The emergence of a discipline.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Isaksen, S. G. & Murdock, M. (1993). The emergence of a discipline: Issues and approaches to
    the study of creativity. In S. G. Isaksen, M. C. Murdock, R. L. Firestien, & D. J.
    Treffinger (Eds.), *Understanding and recognizing creativity: The Emergence of a
    Discipline* (pp. 13-47). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Jackson, P. W., & Messick, S. (1967). The person, the product, and the response: Conceptual
    problems in the assessment of creativity. In J. Kagan (Ed.), *Creativity and learning* (pp.
    1-19). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Jäger, S., & Maier, F. (2009). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical

    discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of*

    Critical Discourse Analysis, (pp. 34-61). London, England: Sage.

Jones, G. M., Jones, B. D., & Hargrove, T. (2003). *The unintended consequences of high-stakes*

    testing. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London,

    England: Sage.

Kavaloski, V. (1979). Interdisciplinary education and humanistic aspiration: A critical reflection.

    In J. J. Kockelmans (Ed.), *Interdisciplinarity and higher education*. University Park, PA:

    Pennsylvania State University Press.

King, E., & Rogers, H. (2014). *Intelligence, personality, and creativity: Unleashing the power of*

    intelligence and personality traits to build a creative and innovative economy.

    Washington, DC: World Bank Group. Retrieved from

    http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/319691468340199371/pdf/922120WP0Box3

    80ferenceEdition0Korea.pdf

Klein, A.M., Zevenbergen, A. A., & Brown, A. (2006). Managing standardized testing in today's

    schools, *The Journal of Educational Thought*, *40*(2): 145-157.

Krishnan, A. (2009). *What are academic disciplines? Some observations on the disciplinarity vs.*

    interdisciplinarity debate. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, NCRM

    Working Paper Series. Retrieved from

    http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/783/1/what_are_academic_disciplines.pdf

Larsen, M. (2013). (Im) possibilities of courageous creativity in comparative and international

    education research. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation Comparée et*

    Internationale, *42*(1), 2.

Lattuca, L. R. (2001). *Creating interdisciplinarity: Interdisciplinary research and teaching*

    among college and university faculty. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Lepper, M., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with

    extrinsic rewards: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and*

    Social Psychology, *28*, 129-137.

Li, J. (1997). Creativity in horizontal and vertical domains. *Creativity Research Journal*, *10*(2-3),

    107-132.

Lubart, T. I. (1994). Creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Thinking and problem solving* (pp. 289–

    332). New York, NY: Academic.

Lubart, T. I. (1999). Creativity across cultures. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity*

    (pp. 339–350). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lubart, T. I. (2010). Cross-cultural perspectives on creativity. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg

    (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (pp. 265-278). New York, NY: Cambridge

    University Press.

Lubart, T., & Guignard, J. (2004). The generality-specificity of creativity: A multivariate

    approach. In R. J. Sternberg & E. L. Grigorenko (Eds.), *Creativity: From potential to*

    realization (pp. 43-56). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

MacKinnon, D. W. (1962). The nature and nurture of creative talent. *American Psychologist*,

    17(7), 484-495.

MacKinnon, D. W. (1968). Creativity: Psychological aspects. In D. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences, Vol. 3* (pp. 435-442). New York, NY: Macmillan Co. and The Free Press.

MacLaren, I. (2012). The contradictions of policy and practice: Creativity in higher education. *London Review of Education*, *10*(2), 159-172.

Magyari-Beck, I. (1993). Creatology: A potential paradigm for an emerging discipline. In S. G. Isaksen, M. C. Murdock, R. L. Firestien, & D. J. Treffinger (Eds.), *Understanding and recognizing creativity: The emergence of a discipline* (pp. 48-82). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Mansilla, V.B. (2010). Learning to synthesize: the development of interdisciplinary understanding. In: R. Frodeman, K. J. Thompson, C. Mitcham (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 288-306). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Marginson, S. (2008). Academic creativity under new public management: Foundations for an investigation. *Educational Theory. 58*(3): 269-287.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and Society*, *19*(1), 1-31.

Morris, M. W., & Leung, K. (2010). Creativity east and west: Perspectives and parallels. *Management and Organization Review*, *6*(3), 313-327.

Mumford, M. D., & Simonton, D. K. (1997). Creativity in the workplace: People, problems, and structures. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *31*(1), 1-6.

Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Empowering participants or corroding learning? Towards a

    research agenda on the impact of student consumerism in higher education. *Journal of*

    Education Policy, *20*(3), 267-281.

National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education. (1999). *All our futures:*

    Creativity, culture and education. London, England: DfEE.

Newcastle University. (2017). *Innovation, Creativity and Entrepreneurship MSc: Profile*.

    Retrieved from http://www.ncl.ac.uk/postgraduate/courses/degrees/innovation-creativity-

    entrepreneurship-msc/#profile

Newell, W. H., & Green, W. J. (1982). Defining and teaching interdisciplinary studies.

    Improving College and University Teaching, 30(1), 22-30.

New Jersey Education Association. (2014). Pasi Sahlberg calls equity key to student

    achievement. Retrieved from https://www.cpe.rutgers.edu/NJDCF2015/docs/10c-NJEA-

    Review-Dec2014.pdf

Ng, A. K. (2003). A cultural model of creative and conforming behavior. *Creativity Research*

    Journal, *15*(2-3), 223-233.

Nichols**,** S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts*

    America's schools. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Niu, W., & Sternberg, R. (2002). Contemporary studies on the concept of creativity: The East

    and the West. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *36*(4), 269-288.

Niu, W., & Sternberg, R. J. (2006). The philosophical roots of Western and Eastern conceptions

    of creativity. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *26*(1-2), 18.

Nolan, V. (2004). Creativity: The antidote to the argument culture. In M. Fryer (Ed.), *Creativity and cultural diversity* (pp. 45–51). Leeds, UK: The Creativity Centre Educational Trust.

Nussbaum, M.C. (2000). *Women and human development. The capabilities approach*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist Economics*, *9*(2-3), 33-59.

Nussbaum, M. (2010). *Cultivating the imagination. The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2010/10/17/do-colleges-need-french departments/cultivating-the-imagination

Nussbaum, M.C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2012). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ochse, R. (1990). *Before the gates of excellence: The determinants of creative genius.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2013). *OECD skills outlook 2013: First results from the survey of adult skills, Chapter 1*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264204256-en

Pacifica Graduate Institute. (2017). *The creative life.* Retrieved from http://www.pacifica.edu/degree-programs/ma-engaged-humanities-creative-life

Pappano, L. (2014). *Learning to think outside the box. Creativity becomes an academic discipline. The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/09/education/edlife/creativity-becomes-an-academic discipline.html?_r=1

Penaluna, A., Penaluna, K., & Diego, I. (2014). The role of education in enterprising creativity. In R. Sternberg & G. Krauss (Eds.), *Handbook of research on entrepreneurship and creativity*, (pp. 360-397). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Peters, M. A. (2004). Citizen-consumers, social markets and the reform of public services. *Policy Futures in Education*, *2*(3-4), 621-632.

Peters, M. A. (2005). The new prudentialism in education: Actuarial rationality and the entrepreneurial self. *Educational Theory*, *55*(2), 123-137.

Peters, M.A. (2009). Education, creativity and the economy of the passions. In M.A. Peters, S. Marginson. & P. Murphy (Eds.), *Creativity and the global knowledge economy* (pp. 125-147). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Petrie, H. G. (1992). Interdisciplinary education: Are we faced with insurmountable opportunities?. *Review of research in education*, *18,* 299-333.

Piirto, J. (2011). *Creativity for 21st century skills: How to embed creativity into the curriculum.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Plucker, J. A., & Beghetto, R. A. (2004). Why creativity is domain general, why it looks domain specific, and why the distinction doesn't matter. In R. J. Sternberg, E. L. Grigorenko, & J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity: From potential to realization* (pp. 153–168). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Puccio, G. J., Mance, M., & Murdock, M. C. (2010). *Creative leadership: Skills that drive change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Raina, M. K. (1993). Ethnocentric confines in creativity research. In S. G. Isaksen, M. C. Murdock, R. L. Firestein, & D. J. Treffinger (Eds.), *Understanding and recognizing creativity: The emergence of a discipline* (pp. 435-453). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Reuter, M. E. (2015). *Creativity: A Sociological Approach*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Robinson, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Robinson, K. (2013). *How to escape education's death valley* [Video file]. Retrieved from *https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_how_to_escape_education_s_death_valley?language=en*

Runco, M. A. (1987). The generality of creative performance in gifted and nongifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *31*(3), 121-125.

Runco, M. A. (2016). We Must Prepare for the Unforeseeable Future. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Creative intelligence in the 21st Century: Grappling with enormous problems and huge opportunities* (pp. 65-73). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Sandelowski, M. (2008). Member check. In: Given, L. M. (ed.), *The sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 501-502)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sarnoff, D. P., & Cole, H. P. (1983). Creativity and personal growth. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *17*(2), 95-102.

Saybrook University. (2017). *Creativity studies certificate: Description.* Retrieved from http://catalog.saybrook.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=68&poid=1211

Saybrook University. (2017). *Perspectives in creativity*. Retrieved from http://catalog.saybrook.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=68&poid=1201

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Human wealth and economic growth. In A. E. Kuenzli (Ed.),

    Reconstruction in religion: A symposium (pp. 193). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Seltzer, K., & Bentley, T. (1999). *The creative age: Knowledge and skills for the new economy*.

    London, UK: Demos.

Sen, A.K. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Sen, A.K. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheridan College. (2017). *Sheridan board undergraduate certificate in creativity and creative*

    problem solving. Retrieved from

    https://www.sheridancollege.ca/academics/faculties/humanities-and-social-

    sciences/degree-breadth/board-undergraduate-certificate-in-creativity.aspx

Sill, D. J. (1996). Integrative thinking, synthesis, and creativity in interdisciplinary studies. *The*

    Journal of General Education, *45*(2), 129-151.

Simonton, D. K. (1990). Political pathology and societal creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*,

    3(2), 85-99.

Simonton, D. K. (1999). *Origins of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity*. New York,

    NY: Oxford University Press.

Simonton, D. K. (1999). Talent and its development: An emergenic and epigenetic model.

    Psychological Review, 106 (3), 435– 457.

Stein, M. I. (1953). Creativity and culture. *The Journal of Psychology*, *36*(2), 311-322.

Sternberg, R. J. (2006). Introduction. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The*

    international handbook of creativity (pp. 1-9). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University

    Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (2009). Domain-generality versus domain-specificity of creativity. In P. Meusburger, J. Funke & E. Wunder (Eds.), *Milieus of creativity: An interdisciplinary approach to spatiality of creativity* (pp. 25–38). New York, NY: Springer.

Sternberg, R. J. (2016). What's wrong and how to fix it: Balance of abilities matters more than levels. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Creative Intelligence in the 21st Century: Grappling with enormous problems and huge opportunities* (pp. 257-262). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 3–15). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research* (Vol. 15). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tan, A. G., & Law, L. C. (2000). Teaching creativity: Singapore's experiences. *The International Journal of Creativity & Problem Solving*, *10*(1), 79-96.

Taylor, D. W. (1960). Toward an information processing theory of motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 1960. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

The Free Dictionary. (1979). *Creativity*. Retrieved from http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/creativity.

The State University of New York. (2017). *Creativity and change leadership: About the program.* Retrieved from http://suny.buffalostate.edu/programs?bpid=237

The University of Central Lancashire. (2017). *Why study this programme.* Retrieved from

http://www.uclan.ac.uk/courses/ma_creative_thinking.php

The University of Malta. (2017). *Overview description.* Retrieved from

http://www.um.edu.mt/create/overview/PMCAIPDT8-2016-7-O

The University of Massachusetts Boston. (2017). *Critical & creative thinking, MA*. Retrieved

from https://www.umb.edu/academics/caps/degree/creative-thinking

The University of Nebraska at Omaha. (2017). *Academic options & concentrations*. Retrieved

from https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-arts-and-sciences/master-of-arts-in-critical-

and-creative-thinking/academics/index.php

The University of Southern Maine. (2017). *Certificate of graduate study in creative leadership

and global strategy.* Retrieved from https://usm.maine.edu/leadership/certificate-

graduate-study-creative-leadership-and-global-strategy-0

The University of Southern Maine. (2017). *School of business: Course descriptions.* Retrieved

from https://usm.maine.edu/school-of-business/course-descriptions

The University of Technology Sydney. (2017). *What is creative intelligence and innovation.*

Retrieved from https://www.uts.edu.au/future-students/creative-intelligence-and

innovation/what-creative-intelligence-and-innovation/what

The University of Texas at Austin. (2017). *Innovation, creativity & entrepreneurship.* Retrieved

from https://ugs.utexas.edu/bdp/programs/ice

Tikly, L. (2013). Reconceptualizing TVET and development: A human capability and social

justice approach. In *Revisiting global trends in TVET: Reflections on theory and practice*,

ed. UNESCO-UNEVOC International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training. Bonn: UNESCO-UNEVOC.

Turnbull, J. (2012). *Creative educational leadership: A practical guide to leadership as creativity*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.

UNESCO. (2001). *Cultural heritage, creativity and education for all.* Paris, Division of the Arts and Cultural Enterprises, Sector of Culture, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

UNESCO. (2002). Ensuring sustainable development through cultural diversity. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpURL_ID=1219&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTI ON=201.html

UNESCO (2015). Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action. Retrieved from http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/incheon-framework-for-action-en.pdf

Union Institute & University. (2017). *Founded on interdisciplinary learning.* Retrieved from https://myunion.edu/academics/masters/creativity-studies/

Van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News in the Press.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Washington University in St. Louis. (2017). *Certificate in entrepreneurship, leadership, and creativity.* Retrieved from

https://ucollege.wustl.edu/programs/certificates/entrepreneurship

Weiner, R. P. (2000). *Creativity and beyond: Cultures, values, and change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Western Connecticut University. (2017). *Leadership, compassion and creativity certificate.* Retrieved from http://www.wcsu.edu/leadership/

WISE. (2014). *Beyond degrees: Education cannot sort all our problems*. Retrieved from http://www.wise-qatar.org/program/2014-wise-summit-program/session/debate-beyond-degrees

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-33)*.* London, UK: Sage.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Questions that Asked Program Directors/Faculty Members via e-Mail

1. What is the mission statement of your program?

2. Which degrees do you offer? Are they online, on campus, or both?

3. How long does it take to complete your program as a full-time student?

4. In which college is your program housed?

5. Can you please share with me the curriculum of your program (i.e. a sequence of courses students need to take to complete program requirements) and an introductory course syllabus? Alternatively, it would be great if you can direct me to someone in your department who would be willing to help me with this.

Appendix B
Interview Guideline Questions

Interview Guideline Questions for Program Directors and Faculty

1. What is your position in the department?

2. Can you please provide a brief overview of your academic background and your experience in the program?

3. When was the department initiated and under what circumstances?

4. Can you please give me detailed information on the history of your program?

5. What was the main impetus for creating this program at your university?

6. Can you please talk about courses taught in your department?

7. How do you assess your students?

8. How is your program unique compared to other programs in creativity? Why and how did you choose this program focus?

9. What is a typical student profile in your program?

10. What are your students' motivations in choosing the program to study?

11. What are their expectations upon graduation?

12. Is there anything you would like to add?

Interview Guideline Questions for Experts in the Field

1. What emphasis is placed on creativity in higher education institutions?

2. What are your thoughts about inclusion of creativity as a separate program in higher education institutions?

3. In your opinion, how should creativity be fostered? Please tell me your thoughts about creativity.

4. How will specific programs on creativity influence the field of creativity?

Appendix C
Name and Institutional Affiliations of Interviewees

1. Andrew Penaluna - Research Director, Centre for Creative Entrepreneurship, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, U.K.

2. David Slocum - Faculty Director of the Executive MBA in Creative Leadership, Berlin School of Creative Leadership, (Steinbeis University), Germany.

3. Elden Golden - Program Director of Creativity Studies, Union Institute & University, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.

4. Gerard Puccio - Department Chair and Professor, International Center for Studies in Creativity, Buffalo State, Buffalo, New York, U.S.

5. Graham Brown-Martin - author of Learning {Re}imagined and founder of Learning Without Frontiers (LWF), a global think tank bringing together renowned educators, technologists and creatives to share provocative and challenging ideas about the future of learning, U.K.

6. Jeremy Szteiter - Assistant Director of Critical and Creative Thinking Program, College of Advancing and Professional Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston, U.S.

7. Jo Yudess – Instructor, International Center for Studies in Creativity, Buffalo State, Buffalo, New York, U.S.

8. Karl Jeffries - Senior Lecturer, Design at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan), and Course Leader for the newly developed MA Creative Thinking (Distance Learning) at UCLan, U.K.

9. Keri Facer - Professor of Educational and Social Futures, University of Bristol, Graduate School of Education, U.K.

10. Laura Carmichael - Innovation facilitator, corporate trainer in areas of creativity, presence, diversity & team dynamics, THNK School for Creative Leadership & Innovation, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

11. Leonie Baldacchino - Director of The Edward de Bono Institute, Design and Development of Thinking, University of Malta, Malta.

12. Mikko Jalas - Programme Director of Creative Sustainability at Aalto University, Finland.

13. Sean McNabney - Acting Associate Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sheridan College, Canada.

14. Steven Pritzker - Faculty Member in Creativity Studies, Saybrook University, Oakland, California, U.S.

15. Susan Rowland - Chair of Engaged Humanities & the Creative Life, Pacifica Graduate Institute, Carpinteria, California, U.S.

16. Terri Goslin-Jones - the Creativity Studies Specialization Lead faculty at Saybrook University, Oakland, California, U.S.

17. Tony Wagner - Expert In Residence, Harvard University's new Innovation Lab and Senior Research Fellow at the Learning Policy Institute, Palo Alto, California, U.S.

LEHIGH
U N I V E R S I T Y®

CONSENT FORM

The Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline in Higher Education Institutions

You are invited to be in a research study of "The Emergence of Creativity as an Academic Discipline in Higher Education Institutions." You were selected as a possible participant because of your expertise in the field of creativity. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Fatih Aktas, Lehigh University, under the direction of Jill Sperandio, Ph.D., Lehigh University, and Iveta Silova, Ph.D., Arizona State University.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is:

The purpose of this research is to examine the emergence of creativity-related degree programs in higher education institutions. In particular, this research will explore the following questions:

1- Which universities provide degree bearing programs in creativity? What kinds of degrees do they offer? What was the main impetus for creating this program at your university? More specifically, in which departments are these programs housed?

2- How do universities conceptualize creativity degree programs? Which notions of creativity dominate? How are these conceptualizations reflected in program mission statements, degree descriptions, and curricula?

3- What implications do these degree programs have for higher education and the field of education more broadly?

Given the complexity of the context and the multiplicity of meanings attributed to creativity as an emerging discipline, it is important to examine which creativity discourses are more likely to be adopted

172

in higher education, how creativity is institutionalized in higher education programs, and how different programs conceptualize creativity in their curricula.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, I will request to schedule a semi-structured interview at a day/time convenient to you. The interview will last about an hour. Depending on your geographical location, a face to face format or Google Hangout/Skype will be used. The interview will be recorded and transcribed. The content of interview will be kept confidential in a password secure computer. Audio recording will be secured in a locked cabinet. All audio and visual contents will be deleted upon completion of the research study.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

The study has several risks:

There is minimum risk involved as part of the interview process. To minimize discomfort, interviewees will be provided with interview questions prior to the scheduled time.

The benefits to participation are:

Interviewees will learn more about the field of creativity and how it is being used in other higher education institutions.

Compensation

There will be no compensation for participation in the study.

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept confidential and any information collected through this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without your separate consent, except as specifically required by law. **Please indicate by signing at the bottom of the form if interested in having your name and your institutions name recognized in the research**. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary:

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the Lehigh University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions

The researchers conducting this study are:

Jill Sperandio, Ph.D., Iveta Silova, Ph.D., and Fatih Aktas. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact them at 484-340-7887, faa211@lehigh.edu, and Jill Sperandio, Ph.D., 610-758-3392, jis204@lehigh.edu.

Questions or Concerns:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact Naomi Coll of Lehigh University's Office of Research Integrity at (610) 758-3021 or inors@lehigh.edu. All reports or correspondence will be kept confidential.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have my questions answered. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature:_____   Date: _____

Signature of Investigator:_____   Date: _____

Statement of Consent

I give my consent: _____ for my name and my institution's name to be listed in products such as reports, publications, or presentations.

 I do not give my consent: _____ for my name and my institution's name to be listed in products such as reports, publications, or presentations.