

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

TITLE: Creativity and Dance Education Research

SUMMARY

Research into Creativity and Dance Education is increasingly in the spotlight as, internationally, the community of dance education researchers is growing. In recent years, the field has blossomed to include new cultural perspectives, voices and styles and a consistently expanding range of definitions, epistemologies and methodologies for researching the inter-relationship between ‘dance’, ‘education’ and ‘creativity’. In this chapter, we build on existing scholarship by first offering a historical perspective, moving to critically and thematically consider recent developments, and then to look ahead. This includes exploring definitions of creativity which focus on cognition through to socio-cultural perspectives and the post-human turn. The chapter also critically considers how facilitation of creativity has been researched, including performativity and creativity pedagogic tensions, incorporation of technology and inclusion within teacher training, alongside a shift towards articulating creative and cultural dance practices themselves as key to understanding and developing creative pedagogy in dance. The chapter then considers the range of methodologies that have been employed to research creativity in dance education and future possibilities in this area. Next steps in research conclude the chapter with a focus on future influences from the ever-developing field of dance studies and its articulations of choreography and practice; from research into cultural and indigenous dance and emerging new multicultural ideas about creativity; from applications of advances in psychology and technological methods within Dance Science; and from the Post-Human turn in educational research shifting us towards more emergent re-organisations of how we think about and practice creativity in dance education.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

KEYWORDS: creativity, dance education, research, creative pedagogy,

INTRODUCTION

Research into Creativity and Dance Education is increasingly in the spotlight as, internationally, the community of dance researchers and dance education researchers is growing. Even since Press & Warburton's, (2007) seminal narrative and review, *Creativity Research in Dance*, the field has blossomed to include new cultural perspectives, voices from different genres and styles and a consistently expanding range of definitions, epistemologies and methodologies for researching the inter-relationship between “dance”, “education” and “creativity”. In this chapter, we aim to build on Press & Warburton's (2007) review to critically and thematically consider recent developments in the field, and then to look ahead to articulate what the next steps might be.

For the purposes of this Encyclopaedia article we have maintained an open-minded approach to defining our three key terms: dance, creativity and education. Press & Warburton (2007, p. 1273) defined **dance** as: “an embodied sensory experience expressive of personal, historical, and cultural meanings”. We have added to this to include a developed postmodern, and even posthuman understanding of dance, that in fact dance can be almost any kind of movement executed by humans and with other-than-human (e.g. Hunter, 2015); and that while meaning may be made by audience or observer, in the name of dance, it becomes so by default of how it is critically appreciated and regarded (Redfern, 2010).

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

In defining **creativity**, we are very aware that researchers' perspectives on this differ dependent on epistemology and their own disciplinary history. Indeed (Banaji *et al*, 2010) earmark at least nine separate rhetorics of creativity within western educational research. So, for example, we might find psychology researchers investigating creativity in dance education defining creativity using means of approaching knowledge and language from their discipline which are quite different from a sociologist, dance practice-as-researcher or anthropologist approaching the same subject through their lenses, and by default asking very different research questions. Whilst, it might be argued that all definitions of creativity share some notion of “newness” and “value” and engage with “imagination” in some kind of interaction, in preparing the themes and critiques for this Encyclopaedia article we have worked to be sensitive to these epistemological and disciplinary definitional differences and to represent them as clearly as possible.

In relation to our third concept, **education**, we aim to cover international formal education from the early years to secondary level, stretching also into research into creativity in tertiary level and vocational dance education settings. We found it impossible to also cover all informal and community contexts due to volume of material, but have made connections to this realm where they arose and were relevant. As the article is included in a volume fore-fronting education we have also not included research into creativity in professional dance practice per se, but have included professional dance practice research that has connections to tertiary level dance education.

We have also been careful to limit our scope to cover writing on recent research and accompanying practice into creativity in dance education that is predominantly peer-reviewed. Where we have

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

included non-peer reviewed sources this is because research programmes were particularly noteworthy but had either not yet reached publication stage or were of interest because of their systematicity and potential contribution but were, for various reasons, not presented within peer-reviewed arenas. In the same vein as Press & Warburton (2007) we have included reference to historical investigations into creativity in dance education which are also not peer-reviewed as such peer-verification was not common practice at that time.

In order to support the writing of this article we therefore reviewed English language peer-reviewed articles, chapters and project websites where research was not yet complete, all of which aimed to build on Press & Warburton's (2007) work, and Chappell's unpublished review of creativity in dance education from her PhD. The review was conducted following the procedure described by Gough (2012); Stage 1 involved planning the review, identifying the need and developing the review protocol. During stage 2, we identified the search engines (BEI, ERIC, JSTOR) and key publications (including Research in Dance Education, Journal of Dance Education, International Journal of Education & the Arts), then the search was conducted using the key terms: creativ*¹, dance, education; with search boundaries of 2007-2017. We also approached experts in the field of Dance Education (thanked in the acknowledgements) and consulted them for further recommendations of publications and research projects known to them in their specific fields.

¹ Truncation / Stemming: database searching technique

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

From these searches, studies were first selected based on their title, key terms and abstract, then they were critically analysed and appraised. To ensure accountability and to be explicit in our procedures, records were annotated with justifications as to selection or rejection. Material was then sorted and synthesized to create a systematic map of themes as presented in this article. Because of the criteria of publication in the English language and our own Euro-centric positioning we must acknowledge an inevitable European western skew, but we have also endeavoured to explicitly include US, Eastern, broader European, Australasian and African research.

Overall, our aim is to map and critique creativity in dance education research and to present a thematic perspective on it. Through this presentation, we aim to synthesise and draw out how creativity in dance education has been and is being discussed, and to articulate the methods and questions which have been used to generate these discussions. Finally, we suggest what the next steps are likely to be at the intersection between dance, education, creativity and research.

APPROACHES UP UNTIL THE 21ST CENTURY

Historical Overview

As Press & Warburton (2007) state, at the turn of the twentieth century in America, dance was situated within physical education, as was the case within the UK. It was not until the 1930's that notions of creativity began to seep into dance education in both places. Drawing on Isadora Duncan's work, a shift in UK schools' practice occurred from physical drills and folk dances towards dance which portrayed feeling through movement, encouraged self-expression and creativity (Adshead, 1981; Haynes, 1987). Press & Warburton map a similar development of "aesthetic dancing" (Kraus & Chapman, 1981); and similarly derived from Duncan's practice,

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

‘natural dance’ in America. They credit Margaret H’Doubler’s contribution as she encouraged students to create their own movement, and argued that dance promoted creativity through personal growth and understanding of the moving body, emphasising creativity as an integration of the subjective and objective (e.g. H’Doubler, 1940). By the 1940’s creativity as a means of self-expression and growth was seen as a valid part of dance education practice on both sides of the Atlantic.

Following the upheaval of the second world war, ideas about creativity in dance education in the UK were strongly influenced by Rudolf Laban who had arrived as a refugee. He introduced his aim to generate a new ‘movement consciousness’ and secure wider recognition of movement as an activating force of life (Haynes, 1987). His arrival coincided with the push for more progressive approaches to education, and Modern Educational Dance (MED) was conceptualised. MED’s focus was on the process of dancing and its affective contribution to the development of a moving / feeling being and personality (Smith-Autard, 2002). In a similar vein to H’Doubler’s work in America, creative activity was thought to be beneficial to the participants’ personality through both expressive (aiding creative expression through free creative activity) and impressive activity (stimulating the activities of the mind).

MED was adopted post war within the UK school system, but from the 1970’s, its value was questioned. The main critiques included that it lacked evaluative possibilities and links to dance as a theatre art, it did not develop accompanying skills, nor acknowledge knowing dance works through both feeling and cognition (Preston-Dunlop, 1980). Simultaneously, American modern dance was impacting on dance in education in both the UK (Haynes, 1987) and America (Press &

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Warburton, 2007) and this led to the development in both places of models of dance education and pedagogy which positioned creativity at the inter-section between creating, performing and appreciating (Smith, 1976; Adshead, 1981). In the UK this led to Smith-Autard, (1994)) development of the 'Midway Model', emphasising creativity, imagination and individuality balanced with knowledge of public artistic conventions, and in America Gilbert's, (1992) model placing equal emphasis on dance problem-solving and training. In the UK especially, Betty Redfern's influence was strongly felt in terms of her articulation of 'creative imagination' connected to Laban's suggestion of the existence of 'movement imagination'. She is clear that this is not a special mental process, but a reference to imagination which deals exclusively with kinetic ideas, and which is important in relation to performing and appreciating as well as creating. Drawing on Dewey (1934), she argues that children should not be limited to perceive in one way, but should be encouraged to exercise their imagination to see differently.

Hanstein's (1986) work is also worthy of note when discussing how dance education perceives creativity. Working in America, Hanstein (1986, referenced in Popat, 2002; 1990) explicitly articulates and inter-relates the processes that she perceives to be at the heart of the creative process in dance: idea finding and shaping, problem finding and solving and idea transforming. At the heart of these she emphasises the artistic process skills of thinking, perceiving and forming. Here Hanstein takes the spotlight off creating, performing and appreciating per se and puts the emphasis for creativity on what she calls 'Artistic Process Skills' at the heart of her model.

Post 1980s, Press & Warburton (2007) also remind us that notation has been debated as another means to develop creativity. They cite Ofer (2001) and Warburton (2000)'s work who both studied

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

the application of systems of notation. Ofer (2001) hypothesised links between the Eshkol-Wachman Movement Notation System and the development of creative ability and Warburton (2000) found that there was a strong association between the effects of notation-use and improvements in creative expressions.

So across the 20th century, whilst creativity in dance education was not always systematically researched in the same way that it is in the 21st century, there were a wealth of conceptions of creativity in theory and practice which form a strong foundation for the research which now ensues.

The next section highlights some of the key thematic debates that shaped the rhetorics at the turn of the 21st century.

Creativity, Expression and Form

The debate between expression and form was alive and well at the turn of the 21st century and can be seen culminating in and extending past Smith-Autard's, (2002) work in the UK and as a thread running through practice and developing research into creativity in dance education in America too. This long-ranging debate in dance education can be traced back through the work of philosophers like Best, (1982, 1992), dance educationalists like Redfern (1982) and in writing on pedagogy in dance education, for example Lavender & Predock-Linnell (2010).

In its purest form, the expressionist position sees works of art as products of feelings publicly expressed, and capable of evoking the same feelings in others (Cooper, 1999). A formalist view sees aesthetic experience as the education of the perception of formal, structural and relational

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

qualities which can be discerned through sense perception and in symbolic expressions. Awareness of these formal features within the artwork are used as grounds for judging value and originality related to creativity (Cooper, 1999).

In America, Press & Warburton (2007) track this expression and form debate through the views of eminent artists Horst, Nikolais and Erdman (Coleman, 1949, 1950, 1952), all of whom were influencing conceptions of creativity in American dance education later in the century. For Horst, form was primary, whereas Nikolais saw form as a means to manifest the idea and Erdman argued that dance came from a seed of an idea not the application of external form. Later this debate was developed in America by Lavendar (1996, cited in Press & Warburton, 2007) who positioned the inter-relationship of the aesthetic and creativity as central to responding to the expression/form dilemma. Lavendar pushed beyond a simple relationship between choreography and creativity and argued that the discipline needs “critical discourse to enhance aesthetic evaluation” (Press & Warburton, 2007, p. 1279).

In the UK, Smith-Autard (2002) perhaps brings the debate together most concretely in her Midway Model which, similar to Lavendar (1996), focused on aesthetic and artistic outcomes. Here she argues for an equal balance between blending process and product, subjective and objective, creativity and knowledge, thought and feeling, to generate a theoretical framework within which creativity can take place, and which is still a strong underpinning for the nurturing of creativity at least within the UK formal education curriculum.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Bannon & Sanderson (2000) have also noted the import of the aesthetic which they argued required greater attention within dance education. One result of their analysis is that they argue for greater weight to be given to improvisation as a creative and performance outcome in its own right. This suggested shift in weighting highlights the fact that the dominant emphasis within the Midway Model is on the production of a composed dance piece, with improvisation seen as a means to that end rather than a creative end itself. Bannon & Sanderson (2000) argue that “traditional notions of choreography are challenged by the structuring of work in the continual interplay of artistic exploration, and aesthetic sensitivity found in improvisation” (p. 17).

This connects to developments within the Teaching of Choreography and its relationship to creativity discussed in the next section.

Creativity and Teaching / Researching Choreography

Various dance authors have written on teaching choreography with creativity issues intertwined within their critiques. Two that have been prominent in England’s formal education are Smith-Autard, (2000, 2002) and Blom & Chaplin, (1988). Both sources offer practical approaches to teaching choreography using task structures that thread together aspects of expression and form. The central concern of Smith-Autard’s (2000) work is the achievement of form in dance composition and to this end the book focuses almost exclusively on traditional formal approaches. However, Smith-Autard (2000) also emphasises the “study [of] a range of new ideas and processes as an antithesis to established practice” and to this end includes some analysis of “alternative and experimental approaches in dance composition” (p. 7).

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Blom & Chaplin (1989) might be said to give the role of improvisation, “where learning results from experience...[and] the student acquires tacit knowledge” and “intuition” (p. 5), a more foundational role within their practical guide, whilst also acknowledging the importance of learning through teachers’ descriptions. This connects to the use of critical evaluative discussions advocated by Lavender & Predock-Linnell (2001), who emphasise critical consciousness within improvisation. They argue that craft knowledge should be taught in order to inform the critical consciousness which is applied to the outcomes of the students’ inner creative process during improvisation.

In the UK, Butterworth's (2004) work has been influential at the tertiary level through her delineation of the ‘process continuum model’ in which she characterises different working relationships through which students can be taken by choreography teachers, which offer them different opportunities for creative contributions to the dance work in hand. Understandings of creativity from professional practice are also highly influential within tertiary level dance education (for example take perspectives on improvisation and varied approaches to choreography: Tufnell & Crickmay, 2014; Burrows, 2010; Midgellow, in press).

Within the American secondary and tertiary sector the writings of Doris Humphrey were also highly influential. As Press & Warburton (2007) state she felt that creativity could not be taught and therefore placed her emphasis on craft and form via four basic elements of choreography “design, dynamics, rhythm and motivation” (p. 46, cited in Press & Warburton, 2007). Of equal import is the work of Alma Hawkins who used pedagogy that promoted creative exploration and

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

the integration of mind and body (Press & Warburton, 2007). While this chapter is not focused on creativity within professional dance practice per se, it is also important to heed Press & Warburton's reminder that as professional creative practice developed into more nonliteral forms for example the work of Merce Cunningham, this was reflected in the way that choreography was taught and therefore how creativity was considered within dance classes and education. They remind us that dance research practice is also influential in education, for example Fraleigh (1987). This can also be seen in the UK where innovative research centres such as ResCen at the University of Middlesex took new approaches to practice-as-research at the turn of the 21st century, which through their dissemination activities have influenced approaches to facilitating creativity especially within the UK tertiary sector (<http://www.rescen.net>)

Creativity and Self

Whilst in the UK there has perhaps been a playing down of the relationship between creativity and self because of the arguments surrounding the ousting of MED in the 1980's, in America there has been more active consideration of this relationship. This has developed in two main veins: one which emphasises self-development rooted in kinaesthetic intelligence (Schwartz, 1993), and one which develops an embodied conception of self from critical pedagogy and feminist literature (Green, 1993; Stinson, 1998; Shapiro, 1998).

Key to Schwartz's (1993) discussion of creativity are Gardner (1982), Maletic (1989) and Nachmanovitch (1990). She cites Maletic (1989) as having explored kinaesthetic intelligence and referring to the dancer's sense of self as a significant component of dance intelligence, together

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

with highlighting the connection between Rudolf Laban's concept of Effort and Gardner's concept of bodily intelligence. Nachmanovitch's (1990) ideas are also fundamentally important to her via "this whole enterprise of improvisation in life and art, of recovering free play and awakening creativity" (Nachmanovitch, 1990, p.177 quoted in Schwartz, 1993, p. 11). Schwartz therefore stresses the idea of working on the self improvisationally, and being true to the self as vital within the creative process.

Stinson (1998) and Shapiro's (1998) work employs a different conception of the role of the body in the mind developed from feminist and critical pedagogical enquiry. Stinson's (1998) approach is strongly influenced by socialist feminism and critical pedagogy. Citing Ellsworth (1992), Gilligan (1982), Walkerdine (1992), Buber (1955) and Freire (1983), Stinson (1998) clearly stresses teaching for finding one's own voice and inner authority, taking responsibility and being empowered for change. Not only is the emphasis on the self, but on the importance of relationships. The latter particularly relates to the students' level of agency, related not only to the students' ability to recognise problems, but to take responsibility for effecting change in relation to them via the creative process.

Stinson's approach directly influences Shapiro (1998), for whom dance is a means for self and social understanding, with imagination and creativity not as a "narrowly defined...artistic ability", but "in a much broader sense...as the underlying power to re-envision and recreate the world in which we live" (p. 11). For Shapiro (1998), creative power is about allowing for "expressions of who we are and who we want to become" (p. 11).

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Green's (1993) work, which is strongly supportive of these ideas, is based in tertiary level education and investigates the relationships between somatics and creativity. She also adds a slightly different dimension. Rather than defining the creative self as static and "individualistic" (Green, 1993, p. 231), she prefers to conceive of the self as changing and socially inscribed.

Working on a slightly different thread, Press (2002) has considered the relationship between self and creativity through a self psychology lens. In so doing, her work also emphasises the importance of relationality when teaching choreography and nurturing creativity, and argues for creativity via self-psychology as key to transformative education.

Taken together, the work of these dance education researchers from America therefore provides strong articulations of how self might be more actively conceived in relation to creativity.

Creativity and Play

Creativity and play has been researched by Lynch Fraser (1991) in her work on 'Playdancing', developed for children aged three to eight. For Lynch Fraser, self-awareness of internal states and body precedes language and interpersonal skills. It is these three building blocks that she articulates as the components of the creative process. Dramatic play is also important as part of Playdancing because it allows children to expand self-concepts such as self-constancy (self is permanent), self-differentiation (self as potentially different to other), self-identity (self as unique) and self-esteem (self as valued) by developing dance roles and characters. Her work extends the idea of creativity and self to incorporate play as fundamental to self-development as part of the process.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Lindqvist (2001) draws on Vygotsky's (1966) work to argue that play creates meaning and is a dynamic meeting between the child's internal and external activity. She draws on Vygotsky's articulation of the relation between play and drama which includes play themes such as fear / safety and restrictions / freedom often found in children's fairy tales, and suggests that play can be defined as imagination in action, with thought and imagination coming into being through the expressive acts of the body in play.

She uses this definition of play to argue that dance ought to be linked to children's play, having found that dance in Swedish schools is more often based in principles drawn from Laban's emphasis on movements sourced from the everyday. Her work is of interest as it shifts the lens from the common practice of using Laban's framework at times related to notions of self, and emphasises the perhaps more free-flow potential of play to engage children creatively. Neither perspective is 'right' but this demonstrates the variety of ways that creativity has been perceived through research in dance education.

Summary

Across the 20th Century we can therefore see a shift from dance based in physical education to a more conducive definition of dance in terms of the aesthetic, artistic and personal which allowed space for creativity. Models of dance teaching have positioned creativity variously: at the intersection of creating, performing, appreciating; as a problem-solving process in its own right; as connected to notation; as resulting from the interplay between expression and form; woven

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

through articulations of teaching choreography (emphasising form, the aesthetic, product / process, personal artistry and improvisation to varying degrees); as intrinsically related to self; as triggered and fuelled by play; and in close relationship to ideas about creativity manifesting simultaneously in professional dance practice and dance research.

Entering the 21st century all of these varying positions have been used as foundations for increasingly research-driven creativity practice in dance education. The next sections will look thematically at this more recent research including the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of creativity in dance education.

THE WHAT OF CREATIVITY

Within the material reviewed for this article, it was commonplace for researchers to describe **what** creativity meant to them in line with their epistemological positions. Although it is also worth noting that unless researchers were actively studying creativity, its definition could simply be an assumed part of their writing. This section will discuss the ‘what’ of creativity under various themes including creativity and cognition, socio-cultural creativity, youth culture creativity, creativity within dance styles; it will also articulate a theoretical shift from Wise Humanising Creativity to (post-humanising) creativity.

Creativity and Cognition

Hanna (2015, p. xx) suggests that dance is a “powerful tool for feeding the brain its cognition and emotion” and dance can embody cognition and make connections between the “senses, movement, perception and cognition are mutually informative” (Hanna, 2015, p. 19). Press & Warburton

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

(2007) cite various works which explore this concept of creativity and cognition. Kane (1996) analysed the cognitive methodology of teaching choreography and Chen (2001) examined constructivist oriented dance teaching that engages creative thinking. Stevens & McKechnie (2005) investigate theories and methods of cognitive science to describe aspects of choreography and how the actions between creator, performer and audience raise questions about, what they describe, as the “creative systems” observed in the dance studio.

In studying children’s dance, Giguere (2011) cites a definition by Ward *et al* (1999) that “creative cognition emphasizes the idea that creative capacity is an essential property of normative human cognition”. Dance is presented as a tool to *generate* cognitive thinking, in a study by Skoning *et al* (2017) which used dance to explore character traits to develop understanding of vocabulary. Dance is also presented as a tool to *explore* cognitive thinking in Chen & Cone’s (2003) study into the correlations between how teachers scaffold learning and generate creative responses from their pupils.

Giguere (2011) study of children’s perceptions of their creative process generated seven “categories of meaning”, the categories emerged from the data: making movement, organizing movement, knowing it’s good, the group, how it feels, awareness of audience, new experiences. She suggests that these actions allow children to translate thoughts with their body, thus they have a connected role of *exploring* their creative process. Through repetition children select and consider kinaesthetic responses to get to a point where something ‘feels right’, which in turn has been cited as a key part of their cognitive development (Giguere, 2011). Creative cognition in

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

dance has also been defined in terms of higher order thinking and the use of teacher questioning to *generate* motor actions in children's creative dances (Torrents *et al*, 2013; Fleming *et al*, 2016)).

A further sub-theme in this category centres around discussions regarding children's creativity and cognitive processes and whether this affects their intrinsic motivation (Amado *et al*, 2016). Self-determination theory looks for connections between participants' behaviour and levels of motivation to complete tasks. Amado *et al*'s (2016) study investigates two different teaching styles (creative enquiry and direct teacher instruction) within the creative technique of dance to see if there are differences in participants' motivation. Interestingly, whilst acknowledging its limitations, this small-scale study discovered a difference in the results by gender, with boys more attracted to tasks with high cognitive participation.

There is therefore a set of studies which define creativity either in terms of or in relation to cognition, and explore the impact and implications of this on dance teaching and learning.

Socio-Culturally informed Creativity

This section looks at how creativity in education has been considered within the socio-culturally constructed frame. Here we use the term socio-cultural to refer to the awareness or construction of knowledge of conditions surrounding different groups of people and how their behaviour is specifically affected by their local, social and cultural aspects (Sanderson, 2009). This research is not individually or psychologically driven but acknowledges knowledge itself as socially constructed within dance education, as well as fore-fronting culture in its widest sense. This section will touch upon various geographical, stylistic and socio-cultural lenses in the literature including

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

indigenous dance styles, multicultural practices, dance culture and creativity theorising influenced by socio-cultural views.

One argument presented in the literature is around creativity and indigenous dance style; this thread seeks to forefront traditional dance forms where connections are made between creativity, tradition and in some cases religion. Gonye & Moyo (2015, p. 260) draw attention to how traditional dance education in Zimbabwe should be the starting place for pupils and teachers to develop children's culture with an "Afrocentric paradigm that couches events from the African perspective". And that by abiding by this practice in mainstream education the curriculum would reflect the "affirmation of African ways of knowing and provide a means of contesting Eurocentric hegemonies that undermine the indigenous peoples' practices, skills, insights and pride" (Gonye & Moyo, 2015, p. 260).

Others also suggest that a more holistic approach to dance drawn from indigenous dance traditions would be appropriate to overcome the Eurocentric colonisation with its own inherent way of being creative. In New Zealand, Sansom (2009) refers to this indigenous tradition as *Te Whāriki*; in Africa, (Mans, 2000) refers to it as *Ngoma*. These are both concepts that honour the culture of children's lives; pedagogies that are holistic and empowering. Practices often intersect with other art forms and commonly involve family and community to develop rich creative learning experiences.

This view of the practices of indigenous dance styles as diminishing is lamented as a contributor to a growing loss of cultural identity by many others (Tai, 2012; Osunide Stines, 2014; Nii-Yartey,

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

2017), including Harris & Lemon (2012, p. 421) who note that centralising policy and industry are promoting creativity as a thinking skill in schools rather than seeing its potential as an “artistic, creative and cultural expression”. This alienation of creative cultural expression is echoed in interviews with dancers who have moved from their birthplace to study dance in a different culture and the problems they have had to overcome when expressing their own identity whilst engaging with different creative expressions in culture (Martin, 2013; Khoury, *et al*, 2013). Another reason mentioned for this decline of creative indigenous dance expression is cited as the teacher’s skill, confidence and cultural competency to facilitate more traditional dance forms (Banerjee, 2010; Melchior, 2011; Russell-Bowie, 2013; Ashley, 2014).

Other writers embrace even more of a new-found global multiculturalism and seek to integrate different cultures into a new form of creative dance expression (Robinson & Domenici, 2010; Acharya, 2013; Adewole, 2016). Svendler Nielsen & Burrige (2015, p. x) describe how they see dance as a force in “shaping identity, affirming culture and exploring heritage”. They have examined how creative pedagogies are propelling new developments in education and curricular throughout the world as emerging cultures generate new possibilities for dance education. This is echoed by Anttila (2009, p. 200) who advocates that dance educators need to recognise and develop dance for young people that respects their ethnic, gender and cultural identities but with the “spirit of international understanding”, that countries must preserve cultural heritage of all forms of dance whilst increasing opportunities for young people to experience dance both in general and community education.

Youth Culture, Dance Style and Creativity

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Considering Anttila's (2009) comments regarding recognition and development, it is important to consider how dance styles and their creativity are rooted in youth culture. Here we will use Urban Dance to mean the multifaceted styles of Hip Hop, Street Dance, Breakin'.

Mohanalakshmi (2012) describes hip hop dance as a form of unrestricted creative youth expression, a spontaneous creative outlet for frustrated youths. This is echoed by April, 2009 who states how b-boys and b-girls can turn aggression into creative output to battle others in the cypher or as art against the authorities and conventions of society. The cypher, Foley (2016) notes, is a zero or a circle denoting a position or boundary and is the epicentre of breakin' as this is "where b-boys and b-girls exchange and express their creativity and authenticity" when battling other performers (Foley, 2016, p. 65).

To acknowledge and address the different cultures in the classroom, Cheesman (2016) questions how educators could do justice to a dance style in a short amount of time. One way she suggests is through utilising a range of pedagogies in the classroom, she advocates how she "seeks to empower students to communicate in dance: to risk, to journey, and to move beyond what they know" (Cheesman, 2016, p. 12) and hopes that by stretching and expanding their assumptions of what is dance they will be able to acknowledge a place for themselves in the world of dance education.

Relating to the influence of dance culture, Watson, *et al* (2012) examined the facilitation of creativity of dancers on a pre-vocational training scheme. The authors argue that traditional models of dance training have the potential to impede the creativity of the participants because of a strong

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

focus on performance and technique. By contrast in the pre-vocational scheme individuals' creativity, defined here in relation to the concepts of 'little c' through to 'big C' (Craft, 2002) creativity was nurtured. This happened through the development of creative voice, abilities and characteristics via inspirational and motivational relationships and environment fuelled by a communally-minded teaching faculty.

Towards New Conceptualisations

In 2017, Bannon, unconvinced by government and policymakers' dependence on numerical evidence advocated a shift towards a more dialogic engagement with what she called "aesthico-ethics, self-knowledge, and collective creativity" (p. 1). For Bannon this positions dialogue at the core of creative dance practice and research, alongside considering potential ways to identify 'learning to learn' and to actually think through bodily interaction and shared endeavour.

There is also a specific theory of creativity that has been developed within dance education and which is now applied more widely in education. Chappell, *et al* (2012) and Chappell, *et al* (2016) have developed and researched the concept of Wise Humanising Creativity (WHC). The theory argues for the fundamentally humanising process of creativity driven by the inter-relationship of creativity and identity. WHC derives from people engaging in collaborative thinking and joint embodied action to imaginatively develop new ideas which are valuable to them and their community. This means engaging with the ethics of what matters to the community. The WHC authors argue that in the process of making, children are also being made; they go on a journey of becoming (Chappell *et al*, 2016). WHC has been researched within a number of secondary level and early years' dance education settings. WHC aims to overcome some of the issues of more

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

individualised understandings of creativity, whilst allowing for cultural value to play a key role in how creativity is enacted and how it inter-relates with the creators' developing identities.

Moving to the very edge of current creativity theorising, Chappell (2018, in press) has proposed the notion of (post-humanising) creativity. While WHC went some way to countering issues of over-individualisation and cultural value in creativity theorising, Chappell argues it did not go far enough in conceptualising creativity as a means to address the rapid, unpredictable changes inherent in the 21st century. Chappell's (2018, in press) work proposes that (post-humanising) creativity overcomes problems of humanistic creativity conceptualizations as it allows for a full range of 'players' within the creative process (including other-than-human), it incorporates a different, emergent take on ethics and is willing to see the future too as emergent, rather than always 'to-be-designed'. The idea is being further empirically researched in order to articulate a more emergent and responsive definition of creativity for use and development within dance education.

Critical themes within definitions of creativity

This section sought to review and synthesise what creativity means across the available literature, in line with the various epistemological positions. Beginning with Creativity and Cognition, dance was presented as a tool to generate and explore cognitive thinking and has the potential to develop both verbal and physical vocabulary. Socio-Culturally informed Creativity raised questions around different socio-cultural lenses and presented a tension between creativity and indigenous dance styles. A reason suggested for this decline is current teachers' skills and confidence. Within Youth Culture, Dance Style and Creativity, it was considered how traditional models of dance training

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

culture might not be appropriate to develop the creativity of Urban Dance especially. There is evidence presented in the Towards New Conceptualisations section of a growing body of rigorous research that challenges how creativity is conceptualised in policy and curricular, but with awareness that governments and policy makers are more concerned with numerical research which reinforces an economic imperative for education, rather than a creative one.

THE HOW OF CREATIVE PEDAGOGY

Having considered how creativity has been defined within the literature, we now turn to the multiplicity of articles that have been written about how creativity can be nurtured and facilitated. At times this is referred to as teaching for creativity, at others creative pedagogy and in other writing references are made to teaching that develops creative learning in dance. As with the creativity definition writing this is sometimes carefully articulated by authors in relation to their epistemology and at others language is used in a more assumed way. The main themes here are: the pedagogic tensions between performativity and creativity; facilitating creativity in teacher training; technology and creative pedagogy; and culture and creative arts practice as creative pedagogy.

The tension between performativity and creativity

Across the material sourced there are tensions between creative teaching, creative learning and performativity in education (Craft & Jeffery, 2008). Ball (2003) describes performativity as a culture or mode of regulation to incentivise, based on rewards and / or sanctions. Troman, *et al* (2007) looked at key strategies used to implement creative practices in primary schools and the effect this has on the school culture of performativity. Following on from this, Chappell, *et al*

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

(2009) discuss how there is a fine balance within a dance education context between meeting the school's performative needs without stifling the creative outcomes, thoughts echoed by Craft, *et al* (2014)

There is evidence from across the sourced material of clear strategies used in the dance classroom to counter performativity and to develop participants' creativity. This includes that the lesson must have an imaginative starter and be taught in a respectful safe space that reflects the pupil's agency (Cone, 2009; Sansom, 2009). To sustain the focus of the creative experience, there must be an element of collaboration, communication, problem solving and reflection (Fleming, *et al*, 2016; Power & Klopper, 2011). The teacher must play an active role to create a community (Kipling Brown, 2014), they listen and question, they are what McWilliam (2009) coined as a 'meddler in the middle'. Meddler in the middle is how the teacher positions themselves and the student as mutually collaborating in creating a cultural product. Chappell (2007) proposed a spectrum of teaching approaches for creativity, based on empirical research with three expert dance teaching primary specialists, which aims to balance voice and craft, structure and freedom and openness and control.

As is the nature of schools there is discussion around assessment, and the challenge of assessing / evaluating creative expression. Ethical and philosophical debates around whether we should be assessing pupil creativity are raised by Lucas, *et al* (2013). To overcome these issues Petersen (2008) investigated the use of incorporating Rudolf Laban's choreographic language of Space, Time, Weight, Effort and Flow. Kranicke & Pruitt (2012) also investigated the use of language and reflected how dancers are often required to define and communicate their expression into

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

words and evaluative language for others. So, they created a series of “rubrics” to scaffold the participants learning, which they theorised would allow opportunities to open the possibility of pushing the boundaries of the participants’ comfort zones (see also Cheesman, 2016). The rubrics also allowed for effective assessment of learning as it helped move the teacher away from reporting on the undefined intuitive subjectivity of movement to a place where learning could be clearly assessed and recorded. This is a continuous argument; Chappell (2007) calls for further investigation into the balance found between teaching for creativity and assessment and Buck *et al* (2016) state that we need clear and further discussions around creative educational policy and assessment.

There are also further examples of projects that have attempted to find a balance between creative pedagogies, performativity and assessment, for example within dance education partnership practice (Chappell *et al*, 2009); and within Early Years interdisciplinary arts education (Chappell *et al*, 2016).

Teacher Training

Across the literature, questions are raised by various authors about the current ability of teachers, to successfully teach dance as a creative subject. Risner & Barr (2015) are concerned that the current system in the United States is inadequately preparing dance teachers to educate in the increasingly diverse education context, and that this not only raises issues around educational policy but also around the methods used to prepare teachers. Specialist dance teachers are not the only teachers who teach dance (Connell, 2009; Stycke, 2013) in many countries Physical Education teachers teach dance (Byeon, 2012; Kalyn, *et al* 2015), generalist primary teachers teach dance

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

(Chappell, 2007), dance artists are working in schools (Hall, *et al* 2007; Huddy & Stevens, 2011; Risner, 2012; Anderson, *et al* 2013) and in some cases the peers of the pupils were teaching the class (Nurmi & Kokkonen, 2015). Thus, demonstrating the huge challenge currently being faced to prepare all of these difference cohorts to teach and to offer them appropriate ongoing professional development.

Related to this, teachers' confidence to engage in creative dance pedagogies is an increasing and on-going concern as a lack of confidence is impacting on their ability to teach dance effectively (Kaufmann & Ellis, 2007; MacLean, 2007; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Kipling, *et al* 2017;). In particularly in the primary sector, there is concern that generalist primary school teachers especially lack the confidence and skills to teach dance (Alter, *et al* 2009; Power & Klopper, 2011; Russell Bowie, 2013).

There are several reasons why teachers have negative attitudes to teach dance. First, is their lack of experience, participation, belief and practices in dance before training (Lummis *et al* 2014). Secondly, their experience whilst training and lack of opportunities to teach dance on placement (Rolfe, 2001; McArdle, 2012). Third, the expectations placed on them in the workplace, lack of subject knowledge and their identity as a teacher (Melchior, 2017; Renner & Pratt, 2017). To attempt to overcome these issues many authors suggest that we need to address issues around policy and infrastructure (Risner, 2007; Buck & Snook, 2009; Bonbright & McGreevy-Nichols, 2012; Savrami, 2012; Leonard, *et al* 2014; Snook & Buck, 2014).

Technology and Creativity

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Dance teaching and technology have always intertwined in dance classrooms, be it CD players, video recordings or interactive whiteboards with access to the internet (Soot & Viskus, 2014). Bedford Interactive were one of the pioneers of using technology in the classroom. Smith-Autard, (2003, p. 154), the founder, argued that since dance form is “abstract in that it exists only in the memory” teaching concepts that relate to form could “enhanced by the use of technology”. Technology used to specifically enhance creative teaching and learning (Dania *et al*, 2011; Chan *et al*, 2011; Gibbs *et al*, 2017) is an emergent theme. It is argued that technology is an integral way to enhance the creative process, the teaching of technique and as a means of interactive reflection (Nielsen & King, 2008). Via recordings, participants can document and record artefacts they have created to share on online platforms with others for feedback. Being able to watch back performances immediately allows the dancer to critically reflect in the moment and begin to notice details in their compositions, therefore assessing (Bannon & Kirk, 2014; Brooks, 2014; Huddy, 2017) and developing their creative potential (Doughty *et al*, 2008)

WhoLoDancE (Whole-Body Interaction Learning for Dance Education) is a European project investigating the use of technologies on learning in dance. They aim to advance the use of motion capture technologies to transfer movement into digital data developed holograms for dancers to virtually inhabit and explore, Wholodance (<http://www.wholodance.eu/>). In the Dancers Mind is a study into creativity, novelty and the imagination. This investigates the capacity of mental imagery to inspire movement material, by applying the Interacting Cognitive Subsystems model of mental representation with the goal of producing resources that can assist the dancer in developing their creative practice (In The Dancers Mind <http://www.dancersmind.org.uk/>).

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Cultural practice as pedagogy

When considering and researching how to teach for creativity in dance education a variety of researchers have researched and written about approaches where pedagogy is strongly driven by cultural practice. Gonye & Moyo (2015) examined traditional dance pedagogy in Zimbabwean primary schools as a key aspect of postcolonial re-imaginings of education and nation reclamation. They found a general reluctance to utilise indigenous knowledge systems and in turn proposed these knowledge systems and their inherent imaginative capacity *as* pedagogy itself, which they suggest would offer a means to creatively exhibit existing dance techniques and offer new ways to envisage human beings.

Using the notion of culturally responsive pedagogy, Melchior (2011) argues for positioning a Maori World View as the lens for dance educators' professional development in Aotearoa New Zealand. She demonstrates how the world view can enhance teaching and learning that will allow children to explore and express stories through embodied rather than written or spoken means. In her findings, she argues that creativity needs to be present in both the children's learning and in how teachers create environments and contexts for dance and cultural understanding. This surfaces a strong relational thread in relation to creativity and creative pedagogy. Also, working in Australasia, Harris & Lemon (2012) use one example of Samoan cultural dance within a community arts education programme to argue the need for localised, context- and culture-specific arts pedagogies which incorporate diversity in all its expressions. They include facilitating creativity within an argument for an emerging critical race pedagogy; where cultural dance is a 'productive pedagogical portal'. Here we see difference articulated as a key positive source of creativity and dance education practice.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Similarly, Elliott, (2010) has written about how English Folk Dance might itself be used as core to its own pedagogy derived from notions like that of Mary Neal's that there is a power in people "to connect through song and dance, of social exchange and the bursts of creative energy that provide life with its moments of inspiration and re-invention" (p. 10). Elliott writes about this in the context of folk dance as activism, articulating creative pedagogy as a means perhaps for change as well as learning dance per se.

Also in the UK, Glean & Lehan (2005, 2007) write persuasively about their work to position African and Caribbean Dance Forms more centrally within tertiary level dance education through an action research project. As part of this, similarly to Gonye & Moyo (2015) they dealt with teachers' confidence to dance and create themselves within the African and Caribbean dance forms, suggesting that a new generation of dance teachers is needed with the confidence to blend the traditional with the experimental to keep the discipline current and creative.

Creative Practice as Pedagogy

In the same way that the above authors argue for putting cultural dance forms at the heart of creative pedagogy itself, a further group have argued for arts practice per se to be positioned as creative pedagogy. For example, Fitzgerald (2017) argues that socially engaged arts practices can contribute to reconceptualising contemporary dance technique class, bringing with them creativity, alongside reciprocity, collaboration and inclusion in order to promote social change and democracy. Interested in inclusion in a more defined way in relation to mixed ability and physically integrated dance, Morris *et al*, (2015) discuss Alito Alessi's Dance Ability International

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

programme which uses contact improvisation methods, and their inherent creativity as a means to pedagogic training in inclusive dance. Huddy & Stevens (2011) put not only the arts practice at the heart of creative pedagogy, but the artist themselves, in their teaching artist model. Teacher trainee participants researched social and artistic dance histories and practices across local Australian towns. Their created dance works became the pedagogic core of their dance classes; here creativity and its associate pedagogy is placed at the intersection between artist and teacher. Hall *et al* (2007) also considered some of the issues within this kind of practice, bringing the arts directly into classroom pedagogy, within partnership settings in the UK.

Recent years have also seen a reinvigoration of ballet pedagogy which increasingly now aims to “move beyond the oppression present within the mind–body dualism required in ballet’s traditional authoritarian training method to develop autonomous, creative, and empowered dancers” (Berg, 2015, p. 147). Varying approaches are now being taken to make this move beyond an acceptance of a balletic training model which can include accepting suffering alongside positive elements (Pickard, 2012) and to imbue ballet teaching with creative pedagogy which intends to generate creative ballet learners. To this end, Berg, (2015) researched and evidenced the application of somatic techniques to generate balletic creativity. Jackson (2006) has challenged the notion of existing images of ballet pedagogy as obedient repetition by arguing that ballet pedagogues need to be themselves and to teach creatively from their own experiences, and Johnston (2006) argues for private speech as a means to encouraging higher order thinking (which has been connected to creativity) in ballet students. Scheff’s (2005) work perhaps most actively tackles creativity as part of pedagogy and learning in children’s ballet; she articulates how she incorporates creative process by using problem-solving, narrative and group choreography techniques.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Within tertiary level creative pedagogy, Duffy (2013) writes about curriculum shifts at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, articulating how creative practice has been more centrally positioned within their curriculum as opposed to a narrower, more traditional, didactic approach. This is accompanied by greater collaboration with other artistic disciplines which reflects increasingly common practice in the creative industries professionally, as well as bringing students into the co-construction of curriculum. Here creative pedagogy and teaching for creativity are blended within the arts practice newly positioned at the heart of the conservatoire's curriculum, especially earmarked in one of their curriculum principles: "Foster the creative attitudes and skills needed for collaborative learning in and through practice." (p. 177). In relation to the tertiary level, it is worth noting the synthesising function of networks such as IDOCDE (International Documentation of Contemporary Dance Education, w/s needed, ongoing) which bring together practice in this area and is a useful source of information regarding developing creative practices in this part of the field. (<http://www.idocde.net/>)

Finally, Hickey-Moody, *et al* (2016) have stepped into perhaps the newest territory in their use of new materialist theorising to fuel how they work creatively pedagogically. They argue for the use of diffractive pedagogy working across disciplinary boundaries to enable students and teachers to produce, embody and theorise simultaneously. This connects to Huddy and Steven's (2011) desire to bring the artist into the teacher, as Hickey Moody *et al* (2016) argue that these elements cannot be separated within their students. They see pedagogy as messy and entangled in a positive sense, and argue that "embodied creative processes employed in pedagogical contexts can challenge and extend those engaged in learning", in turn they argue this allows them to move beyond

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

“stereotypical constructions of their identity” (p. 213-4) using the body as a site of learning. This connects to Chappell’s (in press, 2018) work on (post-humanising) creativity which argues for pedagogy as emergent from the interaction of dispersed embodied actants.

Critical themes within Creative Pedagogy

And so, research into creative pedagogy and teaching for creativity for dance education has developed in varied directions since the turn of the century. In some formal European dance education settings there is tension between creativity and performativity which raises questions as to what kind of creativity can be nurtured in dance in accountability-driven school settings– will creativity continue to be nurtured at all within, for example, an English secondary dance curriculum which no longer references creativity (DfE, 2014).

In contrast, the promotion of agency in relation to facilitating creativity in dance education is well-researched and articulated particularly by Scandinavian and American scholars, as well as the idea that challenge, and the role of the group/communality are important when teaching for creativity. Creative pedagogy has also been studied at the intersection between dance education and professional dance partnership practice, which indicates that this may be one way to challenge the creativity/performativity tension within dance education. Attention has also been paid to teacher training to address issues of identity and confidence around creativity.

Outside of very performatively-driven formal settings, there is a clear body of international research which positions cultural and creative practices themselves as central to creative pedagogy, and it is here that there seems to be most space for pedagogic innovation. By researching this

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

positioning, scholars and practitioners are together demonstrating a greater emphasis on relationality rather than a separation of ‘teaching’ and ‘learning’ for creativity. This reflects wider shifts within educational research per se towards relational approaches (e.g. Biesta, 2001). This positioning also demonstrates a capacity to push against more traditional power structures through, for example: theorisations of decolonisation; re-imagining of practice and pedagogy whether in Ballet, Folk, Inclusive, African or European dance; and an invigoration of teachers’ and students’ confidence to critically own their creative dance.

Whilst 21st century dance education creative pedagogy honours difference, there are increasingly common articulations of creative dance aiming for social transformation and democracy. There is also increasing willingness to engage in and to research inter-disciplinary creative pedagogy engaging with both technological and neuropsychological advances. And perhaps, as a result of an increasing emphasis on agency, dance creative pedagogies are increasingly being intellectually framed around notions of co-construction leading to emergent possibilities for the facilitator-participant relationship.

METHODOLOGIES

Across 21st century research into the what and how of creativity in dance education, an increasingly varied array of methodological approaches exists. Research prioritising cognitive and psychological definitions of creativity takes an epistemological stance which leans towards truth-based discovery of causal connections, and which employs more quantitative or mixed methods data collection methods (e.g. Giguere, 2011; Candela *et al*, 2013; Torrents *et al*, 2013; Hanna, 2015; Fleming *et al*, 2016). Regarding developing future methods in this area, the not-yet-

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

published *In the Dancers' Mind* Project has used pre- and post- verbal quantitative creativity tests to evidence progress as part of a mental imagery intervention in tertiary level dance pedagogy. By contrast, the research which defines creativity in more socio-cultural terms has an epistemology which prioritises the social construction of knowledge and multiple perspectives towards it (e.g. Watson *et al*, 2012, Melchior, 2011, Gonye & Moyo, 2015; Svendler Nielsen & Burrige, 2015). There are also now action research based studies into creativity within dance education (e.g. Glean & Lehan, 2007) and critical theory approaches (e.g. Pickard, 2012). Most recently, methodological developments have been influenced by New Materialism, for example, Hickey-Moody *et al* (2016) argue for both a diffractive methodology and pedagogy, and Chappell (in press, 2018) argues for an emergent, posthuman methodological approach to the future study of creativity in dance education.

A number of scholars have written in more detail on methodologies for researching creativity in dance education. Bannon (2004) argues that the research process itself needs to be articulated and experienced as a creative process in its own right and therefore argues for a qualitative, creative research epistemology within her research into aesthetic education. Her warning about purely mechanistic approaches to research which lack philosophical consideration is timely, and by 2017 has developed into a call to arms to the dance education research community to prioritise embodied, aesthetic and ethical knowledge within dance education epistemologies. Chappell & Craft (2011) and Chappell *et al* (2009) articulate a qualitative research methodology which prioritises a dialogic and spatial approach and like Bannon, places an emphasis on researching creativity through embodied knowledge.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

In contrast to this, Stinson (2015) draws our attention to two recent reports into the value of dance and arts education. These both call for more scientifically verifiable, quantitatively-tested evidence as to the value of dance education including creativity, as a response to marketised education policies. Stinson also highlights the argument in one of the reports for research into dance education which methodologically should prove the impact of dance education on other disciplinary areas in order to argue for the value of dance. This latter point especially is in stark contrast to Bannon and Chappell's approaches and arguments.

Overall, therefore there is an increasing array of methodologies employed to study creativity in dance education dependent on whether the research purpose is to demonstrate causal connections, investigate qualitative properties within and for the artform, articulate the value of creativity in dance or advocate for the art form within particularly marketised policy contexts. Stinson's (2015) wisdom is pertinent when she states "it is important to be sure that we choose the right methodologies for the kinds of questions we are asking" (p. 12). It also seems extremely important that the community of dance education creativity researchers remembers why different questions need to be asked and are able to justify variety rather than being themselves colonised by a particular way of seeing and researching the world.

NEXT STEPS

We are now moving forward in a field where creativity in dance education is being researched using a multitude of epistemologies, and features a huge range of voices. Within Dance Studies, O'Shea (2010) notes a fragmentation of the field indicative of its maturation. We would suggest that the field of research in dance education, including creativity, is following this trend as studies

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

currently coalesce around articulating the what and how of creativity, but the field itself feels as though it is on the brink of diversifying. Press & Warburton (2007, p. 1281) argue that they “find increasing need to integrate the various strands of dance creativity research”. Over a decade on, we would argue that the field can now benefit from its difference and diversification, rather than attempting to integrate approaches. O’Shea reminds us that dance studies has moved from an authoritative voice to a multiplicity of voices and that shift is reflected in creativity research in dance education.

There are exciting possible next steps ahead. Within a broad range of educational settings we will see understandings and practices of creativity increasingly influenced by developing articulations of dance itself, and by how choreography is understood. Creativity will be interwoven within multiple understandings of choreography (e.g. Bannon, 2017; Midgelow, in press) which consider choreographic craft, improvisation and new understandings of embodiment and the body itself as text.

There are also profound possibilities for the diversification of our understanding of creativity in dance education from research into cultural and indigenous dance which revisit the notion of dance as intersecting with, if not intrinsic to family, community and the rich learning experiences inherent within these (e.g. Harris & Lemon, 2012). At its most potent, this sub-field draws on post-structural and decolonisation themes to offer opportunities to understand and practice a new kind of creativity that is not simply about artistic ability but engages with notions of identity, power, community and influence by putting 21st century approaches to indigenous dance and multiculturalism at the heart of pedagogy.

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Perhaps the least well-formed, but none-the-less equally important next step is the potential connection between advances in cognitive and neuropsychology and technological methods being developed and applied in Dance Science. The latter field is currently only really stepping a toe into the water in terms of investigating creativity and is currently grappling with how to employ mixed methodologies to appropriately research creativity (e.g. *In the Dancers Mind*). But we might envisage a time when more cognitive articulations of creativity can be segued with embodied and aesthetic understandings within studies of dance education, in order to offer greater insight into how pedagogy which facilitates creativity can be pursued.

We will also see understandings and practices of creativity shaped by wider debates about the purpose of education and how it should be researched. The crisis of representation within the social sciences where educational research sits has manifested in the Post-Human turn and New Materialism. These unseat notions of knowledge which come before and present a case for emergent epistemologies and ethics as we acknowledge our interactions with ‘other-than-humans’ in all their technological and natural forms. Hickey-Moody *et al* (2016) and Chappell (2018, in press) are amongst those arguing for creativity and creative pedagogy in dance education to be practiced and researched in a more transdisciplinary way which acknowledges co-construction by all players. Such ideas offer far-reaching challenges to how we organise and practice creative pedagogy in dance education.

So, this diversifying field has inherent within it the potential for transformation and change which offer exciting prospects for the children and young people experiencing dance education

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

internationally, and who will develop into the next generation of practitioners and researchers. As the dance education creativity research field matures it needs to remain aware of its own vulnerabilities for colonisation by other disciplines, and to continue to carve out its niche characterised by a celebration of the strength of its diversity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are extremely grateful to the following dance education specialists who offered research recommendations in their special fields for inclusion in this chapter: Rachel Elliott, English Folk Dance and Song Society; Yassmin Foster, Director of Movement/Creative Producer; Beverley Glean and Rosie Lehan, IRIE! Dance Theatre; Vicki Igbokwe, Uchenna Dance; Louise Katerega, Choreographer; Dr. Angela Pickard, Canterbury Christchurch University.

And finally to Dr. Miriam Giguere, Drexel University, and Veronica Jobbins, Trinity Laban Conservatoire, for advisory reading of document drafts.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, R. (2013). The Reconstruction of “ Authenticity ” and “ Tradition ” : Practicing Bharata Natyam in Honolulu, Hawaii. *NOFOD/SDHS 2013 Proceedings Dance ACTions — Traditions and Transformations SDHS 36th Annual Conference.*
- Adewole, F. (2016). *Caribbean Dance: British Perspectives and the Choreography of Beverley Glean. Choreography and Corporeality.* London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54653-1_5
- Alter, F., Hays, T., & O’Hara, R. (2009). The challenges of implimenting primary arts education: What our teachers say. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood Current Reviewers*, 34(4), 22–10. Retrieved from
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=022e8370-df00-4414-905a-92f0ef62005b%40sessionmgr4008>
- Amado, D., Del Villar, F., Sánchez-Miguel, P. A., Leo, F. M., & García-Calvo, T. (2016). Analysis of the Impact of Creative Technique on the Motivation of Physical Education

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

- Students in Dance Content: Gender Differences. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 50(1), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.69>
- Anderson, M. E., Risner, D., & Butterworth, M. (2013). The praxis of teaching artists in theatre and dance: International perspectives on preparation, practice and professional identity. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 14(5). Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v14n5/>.
- Anttila, E. (2009). Critical Issues in Pedagogy and Research: Perspectives on Dance Education Theory and Practice. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2049125500001102>
- Ashley, L. (2014). Encountering challenges in teacher education: developing culturally pluralist pedagogy when teaching dance from contextual perspectives in New Zealand. *Research in Dance Education*, 15(3), 254–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2014.910186>
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065>
- Banaji, S., Burn, A., & Buckingham, D. (2010). *The Rhetorics of Creativity: A literature review. Creativity, Culture and Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/the-rhetorics-of-creativity-a-literature-review>
- Banerjee, S. (2010). Designing a dance curriculum for liberal education students: problems and resolutions towards holistic learning. *Research in Dance Education*, 11(1), 35–48.
- Bannon, F. (2015). Moving to Think: Knowledge Generation Through Dance. In *13th World Congress of Dance and the Child International*. Retrieved from <http://ausdance.org.au/uploads/content/publications/daCi-2015/embodiment/Moving-to-Think-Knowledge-Generation-Through-Dance-Fiona-Bannon.pdf>
- Bannon, F., & Kirk, C. (2014). Deepening discipline: digital reflection and choreography. *Research in Dance Education*, 15(3), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2014.910185>
- Bannon, F., & Sanderson, P. (2000). Experience Every Moment: Aesthetically significant dance education. *Research in Dance Education*, 1(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890050006550>
- Berg, T. (2015). The pedagogy of the observed: how does surveillance technology influence dance studio education? *Research in Dance Education*, 16(3), 230–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2015.1019446>
- Best, D. (1982). Can creativity be taught? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(3), 280–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.1982.9973633>
- Blom, L., & Chaplin, L. (1988). *The moment of movement: Dance improvisation*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Bonbright, J., & McGreevy-Nichols, S. (2012). National dance education organization: Building a future for dance education in the arts. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113(4), 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2012.719430>
- Brooks, P. (2014). Performers creators and audience: Co-participants in an interconnected model of performance and creative process. *Research in Dance Education*, 15(2), 120–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2014.891846>
- Brown, A. K., Koff, S., Meiners, J., & Nielsen, C. S. (2015). Shaping future directions for dance education. In *13th World Congress of Dance and the Child International*.
- Buck, R., & Snook, B. (2009). Teaching the arts across the curriculum: Meanings, policy and practice. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 17(29), 1–21. Retrieved from

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

<http://www.ijea.org/v17n29/>

- Burrows, J. (2010). *A choreographer's handbook*. Routledge.
- Butterworth, J. (2004). Teaching choreography in higher education: a process continuum model. *Research in Dance Education*, 5(1), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464789042000190870>
- Byeon, J.-K. (2012). Dance Education in Korea. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 83(1), 27–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598708>
- Chappell, K. (2007). Creativity in primary level dance education: moving beyond assumption. *Research in Dance Education*, 8(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890701272795>
- Chappell, K. (accepted; 2018 publication). From wise humanising creativity to (post-humanising) creativity. In A. Harris, P. Thomson & K. Snepvangers. *Creativity Policy, Partnerships and Practice in Education*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Chappell, K. A., Pender, T., Swinford, E., & Ford, K. (2016). Making and being made: wise humanising creativity in interdisciplinary early years arts education. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 24(3), 254–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2016.1162704>
- Chappell, K., Craft, A., Rolfe, L., & Jobbins, V. (2009). Dance partners for creativity: choreographing space for co-participative research into creativity and partnership in dance education. *Research in Dance Education*, 10(3), 177–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890903324147>
- Chappell, K., Craft, A., Rolfe, L., & Jobbins, V. (2012). Humanizing Creativity: Valuing our Journeys of Becoming. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 13(8), 1–35. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v13n8/>
- Cheesman, S. (2016). Empowerment Through Risk. *Journal of Dance Education*, 16(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2015.1051623>
- Cone, T. P. (2009). Following Their Lead: Supporting Children's Ideas for Creating Dances. *Journal of Dance Education*, 9(3), 81–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2009.10387390>
- Connell, J. (2009). Dance education: an examination of practitioners' perceptions in secondary schools and the necessity for teachers skilled in the pedagogy and content of dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 10(October 2014), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890903019440>
- Cooper, D. E. (David E., Margolis, J., & Sartwell, C. (1999). *A companion to aesthetics*. Blackwell Reference.
- Craft, A. (2002). *Creativity in the early years: A lifewide foundation*. Continuum.
- Craft, A., Cremin, T., Hay, P., & Clack, J. (2014). Creative primary schools: developing and maintaining pedagogy for creativity. *Ethnography and Education*, 9(1), 16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2013.828474>
- Doughty, S., Francksen, K., Huxley, M., & Leach, M. (2008). Technological enhancements in the teaching and learning of reflective and creative practice in dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 9(2), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890802088041>
- Duffy, C. (2013). Negotiating with tradition: Curriculum reform and institutional transition in a conservatoire. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 12(2–3), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022212473527>
- Elliott, R. (2010). The Full English: Unlocking hidden treasures of England's cultural heritage. *Dance Matters*. Retrieved from https://www.efdss.org/images/efdssASSETS/PDFs/efdss_DanceMattersREArticle.pdf
- Fitzgerald, M. (2017). Community to Classroom: Reflections on Community-Centered Pedagogy

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

- in Contemporary Modern Dance Technique. *Journal of Dance Education*, 17(1), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2015.1115866>
- Fleming, J., Gibson, R., Anderson, M., Martin, A. J., & Sudmalis, D. (2016). Cultivating imaginative thinking: teacher strategies used in high-performing arts education classrooms. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4), 435–453.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1064097>
- Garvis, S., & Pendergast, D. (2011). An Investigation of Early Childhood Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs in the Teaching of Arts Education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(9), 1–15. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/>
- Gibbs, B., Quennerstedt, M., & Larsson, H. (2017). Teaching dance in physical education using exergames. *European Physical Education Review*, 23(2), 237–256.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X16645611>
- Giguere, M. (2011). Dancing thoughts: An examination of children’s cognition and creative process in dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(1), 5–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.554975>
- Gilbert, A. (1992). A conceptual approach to studio dance, pre K-12. *JOPERD : Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/conceptual-approach-to-studio-dance-pre-k-12/oclc/77674728>
- Gonye, J., & Moyo, N. (2015). Traditional African dance education as curriculum reimagination in postcolonial Zimbabwe: a rethink of policy and practice of dance education in the primary schools. *Research in Dance Education*, 16(3), 259–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2015.1036020>
- Gough D Thomas J, O. S. (2012). *An Introduction to systematic reviews*, SAGE publications Inc.
- Hall, C., Thomson, P., & Russell, L. (2007). Teaching like an artist: The pedagogic identities and practices of artists in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(5), 605–619.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701505466>
- Harris, A., & Lemon, A. (2012). Bodies that shatter: Creativity, culture and the new pedagogical imaginary. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 20(3), 413–433.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2012.712054>
- Hickey-Moody, A., Palmer, H., & Sayers, E. (2016). Diffractive pedagogies: dancing across new materialist imaginaries. *Gender and Education*, 28(2), 213–229.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1140723>
- Huddy, A., & Stevens, K. (2011). The teaching artist: A model for university dance teacher training. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(2), 157–171.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.579596>
- Johnston, D. (2006). Private speech in ballet. *Research in Dance Education*, 7(1), 3–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14617890600610562>
- Kalyn, B., Campbell, E., McAvoy, A., & Weimer, M. (2015). Dancing on Thin Ice: The Journey of Two Male Teacher Candidates Emerging as Professionals within a Teacher Education Dance Program. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 16(22). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1084315>
- Kaufmann, K., & Ellis, B. (2007). Preparing Pre-Service Generalist Teachers to Use Creative Movement in K-6. *Journal of Dance Education*, 7(1), 7–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2007.10387327>
- Khoury, K., Martin, R., & Rowe, N. (2013). Bursting bubbles between sand and sea: Teaching

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

- dance on the edge of the Mediterranean. *Research in Dance Education*, 14(3), 187–200.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.722616>
- Kipling Brown, A. (2014). A model for dance education: Promoting personal voice and communal learning. *International Journal of Education through Art*, 10(2), 179–188.
https://doi.org/10.1386/eta.10.2.179_1
- Kranicke, M., & Pruitt, L. (2012). Are They Getting It?: Creating Dance Assessments That Honor the Creative Process. *Journal of Dance Education*, 12(3), 113–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2012.701171>
- Lavender, L., & Predock-Linnell, J. (2010). From Improvisation to Choreography: The critical bridge. *Research in Dance Education*, 2(2), 195–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890120100809>
- Leonard, A. E., Hellenbrand, L., & McShane-Hellenbrand, K. (2014). Leading by Design: A Collaborative and Creative Leadership Framework for Dance Integration in P–12 Schools. *Journal of Dance Education*, 14(3), 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2014.922188>
- Lucas, B., Claxton, G., & Spencer, E. (2013). Progression in Student Creativity in School: First Steps Towards New Forms of Formative Assessments. *OECD Education Working Papers*, 86(86), 45. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5k4dp59msdwk-en>
- Lummis, G. W. (Edith C., Morris, J., & Paolino, A. (2014). An Investigation of Western Australian Pre-Service Primary Teachers' Experiences and Self-Efficacy in The Arts. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(5), 50–64.
<https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n5.4>
- MacLean, J. (2007). A longitudinal study to ascertain the factors that impact on the confidence of undergraduate physical education student teachers to teach dance in Scottish schools. *European Physical Education Review*, 13(1), 99–116.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X07073075>
- Mans, M. E. (Author). (2000). Using Namibian music/dance traditions as a basis for reforming arts education: theory and practice. *Collected Work: Ubuntu: Music Education for a Humane society—Conference Proceedings of the 23rd World Conference of the International Society for Music Education*. Published by: Reading: International Society for Music Education (ISME), 1998. ISBN: 978-1-8. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v1n3/index.html>
- Martin, R. (2013). Alienation and transformation: An international education in contemporary dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 14(3), 201–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.732566>
- McArdle, F. (2012). New maps of learning for quality art education: What pre-service teachers should learn and be able to do. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 91–106.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-012-0051-2>
- McWilliam, E. (2009). Teaching for creativity: from sage to guide to meddler. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(3), 281–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790903092787>
- Melchior, E. (2011). Culturally responsive dance pedagogy in the primary classroom. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.575223>
- Melchior, L. (n.d.). Student teachers' developing identities as dance educators: Opportunities and challenges.
- Morris, M. L., Baldeon, M., & Scheuneman, D. (2015). Developing and Sustaining an Inclusive Dance Program: Strategic Tools and Methods. *Journal of Dance Education*, 15(3), 122–

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2015.1056301>
- Nielsen, E., & King, N. (2008). Online Learning in Dance Education. In *Congress on Research in Dance Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 40, pp. 193–196). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2049125500000686>
- Nurmi, A.-M., & Kokkonen, M. (2015). Peers as Teachers in Physical Education Hip Hop Classes in Finnish High School. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(3), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i3.659>
- Petersen, D. (2008). Space, Time, Weight, and Flow: suggestions for enhancing assessment of creative movement†. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 13(2), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980701444726>
- Power, B., & Klopper, C. (2011). The classroom practice of creative arts education in NSW primary school: a descriptive account.
- Press, C., & Warburton, E. (2007). Creativity research in dance. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (1st ed., pp. 1273–1290). Netherlands: Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3052-9>
- Preston-Dunlop, V. (1980). *A handbook for dance in education, 2nd edition*. Macdonald and Evans.
- Redfern, H. B. (1982). *Concepts in modern educational dance*. Dance Books.
- Renner, S., & Pratt, K. (2017). Exploring primary teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs for teaching dance education. *Issues in Educational Research*, 27(1), 115–133. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier27/renner.pdf>
- Risner, D. (2007). Current challenges for k-12 dance education and development: Perspectives from higher education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(4), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.3200/AEPR.108.4.17-24>
- Risner, D. (2012). Hybrid lives of teaching and artistry: A study of teaching artists in dance in the USA. *Research in Dance Education*, 13(2), 175–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.677426>
- Risner, D., & Barr, S. (2015). Troubling Methods-Centric “Teacher Production”: Social Foundations in Dance Education Teacher Preparation. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.944965>
- Robinson, D., & Domenici, E. (2010). From inclusion to integration: Intercultural dialogue and contemporary university dance education. *Research in Dance Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2010.527324>
- Rolfe, L. (2001). The Factors Which Influence Primary Student Teachers’ Confidence to Teach Dance. *European Physical Education Review*, 7(2), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X010072004>
- Russell-Bowie, D. E. (2013). What? Me? Teach dance? Background and confidence of primary preservice teachers in dance education across five countries. *Research in Dance Education*, 14(3), 216–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.722614>
- Sanderson, C. (2009). *Social Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446247198>
- Sansom, A. (2009). Mindful pedagogy in dance: honoring the life of the child. *Research in Dance Education*, 10(3), 161–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647890903324170>
- Savrami, K. (2012). Dance in education: The Greek reality. *Research in Dance Education*, 13(1), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.651117>

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Schloss, J. G. (2009). *Foundation: B-boys, B-girls, And Hip-Hop Culture In New York*. Oxford University Press.

Smith-Autard, J. (2000). *Dance Composition*. Methuen Drama.

Smith-Autard, J. (2003). The Essential Relationship Between Pedagogy and Technology in Enhancing the Teaching of Dance Form. *Research in Dance Education*, 4(2), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464789032000130363>

Smith-Autard, J. M. (1994). *The Art of Dance in Education*. A & C Black.

Smith-Autard, J. M. (Jacqueline M. (2002). *The art of dance in education*. A. & C. Black.

Snook, B., & Buck, R. (2014). Artists in Schools: “Kick Starting” or “Kicking Out” Dance from New Zealand Classrooms. *Journal of Dance Education*, 14(1), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2013.835052>

Stinson, S. W. (2015). Dance Education as the Practice of Living 1. In *13th World Congress of Dance and the Child International*.

Styrke, B. . (2013). Dance teachers: a review of a profession in transition. *Research in Dance Education*, 14(2), 92–103.

Svendler Nielsen, C., & BurrIDGE, S. (2015). *Dance Education Around the world: Perspectives on dance, young people and change*.

Torrents, C., Castañer, M., Dinušová, M., & Anguera, M. T. (2013). Dance divergently in physical education: teaching using open-ended questions, metaphors, and models. *Research in Dance Education*, 14(2), 104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.712100>

Troman, G., Jeffrey, B., & Raggl, A. (2007). Creativity and performativity policies in primary school cultures. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(5), 549–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930701541741>

Tufnell, M., & Crickmay, C. (2014). *Body space image: Notes towards improvisation and performance*. Dance Books. Retrieved from <https://www.dancebooks.co.uk/body-space-image-notes-towards-improvisation-and-performance-p-204.html?sesid=64o5dn6bcg0qbsr16152g2hhpl>

Watson, D. E., Nordin-Bates, S. M., & Chappell, K. A. (2012). Facilitating and nurturing creativity in pre-vocational dancers: Findings from the UK Centres for Advanced Training. *Research in Dance Education*, 13(2), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.694415>

Selected Bibliography

Anttila, E. (2009). Critical Issues in Pedagogy and Research: Perspectives on Dance Education Theory and Practice. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2049125500001102>

Banaji, S., Burn, A., & Buckingham, D. (2010). *The Rhetorics of Creativity: A literature review. Creativity, Culture and Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/the-rhetorics-of-creativity-a-literature-review>

Bannon, F. (2015). Moving to Think: Knowledge Generation Through Dance. In *13th World Congress of Dance and the Child International*. Retrieved from

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

<http://ausdance.org.au/uploads/content/publications/daCi-2015/embodiment/Moving-to-Think-Knowledge-Generation-Through-Dance-Fiona-Bannon.pdf>

Butterworth, J. (2004). Teaching choreography in higher education: a process continuum model. *Research in Dance Education*, 5(1), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464789042000190870>

Chappell, K. (accepted; 2018 publication). From wise humanising creativity to (post- humanising) creativity. In A. Harris, P. Thomson & K. Snepvangers. *Creativity Policy, Partnerships and Practice in Education*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Cheesman, S. (2016). Empowerment Through Risk. *Journal of Dance Education*, 16(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2015.1051623>

Duffy, C. (2013). Negotiating with tradition: Curriculum reform and institutional transition in a conservatoire. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 12(2–3), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022212473527>

Fleming, J., Gibson, R., Anderson, M., Martin, A. J., & Sudmalis, D. (2016). Cultivating imaginative thinking: teacher strategies used in high-performing arts education classrooms. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4), 435–453.

Giguere, M. (2011). Dancing thoughts: An examination of children’s cognition and creative process in dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.554975>

Gonye, J., & Moyo, N. (2015). Traditional African dance education as curriculum reimagination in postcolonial Zimbabwe: a rethink of policy and practice of dance education in the primary schools. *Research in Dance Education*, 16(3), 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2015.1036020>

Hickey-Moody, A., Palmer, H., & Sayers, E. (2016). Diffractive pedagogies: dancing across new materialist imaginaries. *Gender and Education*, 28(2), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1140723>

Harris, A., & Lemon, A. (2012). Bodies that shatter: Creativity, culture and the new pedagogical imaginary. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 20(3), 413–433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2012.712054>

Huddy, A., & Stevens, K. (2011). The teaching artist: A model for university dance teacher training. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(2), 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.579596>

Melchior, E. (2011). Culturally responsive dance pedagogy in the primary classroom. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2011.575223>

Chappell, K. and Hathaway, C. (2018). Creativity and Dance Education Research. In Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education. New York: Oxford University Press. *This is a draft of an article that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education edited by Professor Pat Thomson due for publication in 2018.*

Risner, D., & Barr, S. (2015). Troubling Methods-Centric “Teacher Production”: Social Foundations in Dance Education Teacher Preparation. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.944965>

Smith-Autard, J. (2003). The Essential Relationship Between Pedagogy and Technology in Enhancing the Teaching of Dance Form. *Research in Dance Education*, 4(2), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464789032000130363>

Stinson, S. W. (2015). Dance Education as the Practice of Living 1. In *13th World Congress of Dance and the Child International*.

Svendler Nielsen, C., & Burrige, S. (2015). *Dance Education Around the world: Perspectives on dance, young people and change*. Routledge

Risner, D., & Barr, S. (2015). Troubling Methods-Centric “Teacher Production”: Social Foundations in Dance Education Teacher Preparation. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.944965>

Watson, D. E., Nordin-Bates, S. M., & Chappell, K. A. (2012). Facilitating and nurturing creativity in pre-vocational dancers: Findings from the UK Centres for Advanced Training. *Research in Dance Education*, 13(2), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2012.694415>

Suggested Websites

In the Dancers Mind project: <http://www.dancersmind.org.uk/>

International Documentation of Contemporary Dance Education: <http://www.idocde.net/>

Irie Dance Theatre: <http://www.riedancetheatre.org/>

Urban Bush Women <http://www.urbanbushwomen.org/>

Wholodance: <http://www.wholodance.eu/>

State of Emergency Dance company: <https://www.stateofemergencyltd.com/>

National Resource Centre for Dance: <https://www.surrey.ac.uk/national-resource-centre-dance/projects/contextsculturecreativity>