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This study aims to explore music teachers' perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity in the Cypriot Primary education. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with 10 individuals. The research methodology included a video elicitation technique that assisted the interviews, prompting discussion and establishing the basis for the participants' reflections. Subsequent analyses yielded evidence for the existence of tension between creativity and education, and the inappropriate use and approach of music as a curriculum subject. In particular, there appears to be (1) a lack of teaching time for music; (2) the subject is accorded a relatively poor status; and (3) successful performance in linguistic and mathematical thinking is perceived as intelligence. Nevertheless, the participants' conceptions regarding creativity in music education are in harmony with that expressed in contemporary scientific literature in terms of its development, as well as with the characteristics of the creative teacher and student. The study suggests that activities should include the promotion of the students' self-action and autonomy, and pedagogical initiatives that enable students to come up with original outputs in order to be creative. This understanding, in turn, provided the researcher with access to the teacher participants' perceptions of creativity: a multifaceted concept related to students' autonomy, initiative and the application of imagination and unrestrained thinking to any musical activity. Furthermore, the study suggests the evolutionary nature of participants' perception of creativity and sheds light on the elements influencing their approach to assessing creativity, which include: (1) the nature of the activity; (2) its location; (3) the teacher's instructions; (4) the implementation of other forms of art; which go along with the students' alternative and imaginative thinking and approach.
to the task; (5) the aesthetic pleasure derived from the output; (6) the students' genuine involvement and enjoyment of the activity, and (7) the students' age and musical background. Finally, the study provides implications for potential improvement at an individual level, an institutional level, an academic level and a societal level.
IMPACT STATEMENT

The findings of this study yield evidence for the existence of tension between creativity and education, and the inappropriate use and approach of music as a curriculum subject. There appears to be (1) a lack of teaching time for music; (2) the subject is accorded a relatively poor status; and (3) successful performance in linguistic and mathematical thinking is perceived as intelligence. Nevertheless, the participants’ conceptions regarding creativity in music education are in harmony with that expressed in contemporary scientific literature in terms of its development, as well as with the characteristics of the creative teacher and student. The study suggests, also, that activities should include the promotion of the students’ self-action and autonomy, and pedagogical initiatives that enable students to come up with original outputs in order to be creative. This understanding, in turn, provided the researcher with access to the teacher participants’ perceptions of creativity. Finally, the study suggests the evolutionary nature of participants’ perception of creativity and sheds light on the elements influencing their approach to assessing creativity.

These findings expand the knowledge of music creativity in academia, they generate knowledge applicable to music practitioners, and contribute to the potential progress of human thought and action at institutional and societal levels. In particular, pre- and in-service music practitioners may gain information about the effective activities and practices that their colleagues could apply to their teaching that could yield creative outputs. In addition, they may obtain information about activities that are currently under-adopted, such as improvisation, composition, song-writing and the use of technology, in order to incorporate them in their teaching. Thus the study provides mechanisms for music teachers to bring their wealth of knowledge, creativity and
insight to students. Furthermore, pre-service music teachers, in particular, may learn about the challenges and obstacles currently existing in Cyprus public music education and be prepared to face them accordingly. At an institutional level, the impact of this study may act as a constructive catalyst if policy-makers and school directors take into consideration current bias towards musical events. Changing the highly political or strategic manipulation of the subject of music will have a strong impact on the students and, in the long run, on the overall community. At an academic level, the intersections of this study with the academic world are diverse: it offers a synthesised definition of creativity that is applicable to the educational environment, it generates a theory on the approach to the music teachers’ assessment of creativity and of the elements that an activity needs to contain in order to be considered creative, and it also contributes to the controversy regarding the relationship between: (1) intelligence and creativity; (2) the students’ age and creative performance; and (3) the ability of creative students to ‘transfer’ their creativity. Furthermore, complementary to the interviews, it suggests an appropriate alternative approach to a qualitative research study. Finally, all of the above are indirectly related to this study’s impact on society. Moreover, deconstructing the school system and the misconception of linguistics/literature and mathematics as subjects that are superior to music, and/or as indicators of the students’ intelligence and academic excellence, that ultimately is a source of pressure for students, may contribute to society’s healthy functioning and long-term development.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There is an extensive list of researchers involved in the study of creativity (e.g., Richardson & Saffle, 1983; Magyari-Beck, 1988; Running, 2008; Davies et al., 2013; Bereczki & Kárpáti, 2017). The topic, having been identified as an area for systematic research (Guilford, 1950), has been studied across a wide range of domains (Kaufman, Glăveanu, & Baer, 2017). Furthermore, the important role that creativity plays in children’s cultural, social and emotional development, as well as the fact that “…it leads us to change the way we think about things and is [thus] conceived as the driving force that moves civilization forward” (Jauk, Benedek, Dunst, & Neubauer, 2013, p. 213) has been well recognised (e.g., Cropley, 1997; Hennessey & Amabile, 2010; Rosenstock & Riordan, 2016; Bakhshi, Downing, Osborne and Schneider, 2017; Frey & Osborne, 2017). Nevertheless, it appears that creativity is often a neglected aspect of education (Robinson, 2006; Berliner, 2011) and that there is a struggle with regard to its development in the classroom (Sternberg, 2015).

Obviously, “[t]he successful implementation of creativity in education is largely dependent on teachers' own beliefs about creativity” (Bereczki & Kárpáti, 2017, p. 25). Teachers’ beliefs about creativity, in a variety of subjects and domains, have been investigated extensively (e.g., Cachia & Ferrari, 2010; Karwowski, 2010; Leikin, Subotnik, Pitta-Pantazi, Singer & Pelczer, 2013; Zhou, Shen, Wang, Neber, & Johji, 2013; Chan & Yuen, 2014; Konstantinidou, Gregoriadis, Grammatikopoulos, & Michalopoulou, 2014; Alsahou, 2015; Stone, 2015). Nevertheless, it would seem that qualitative reports on music teachers’ perceptions of, and practices for, nurturing students’ creativity in the Primary education remain a low priority. Exceptions are Snell’s (2013) survey of instrumental music teachers’ perceptions of the National
Standards in New York, Zbainos and Anastasopoulou’s (2012) report on Greek music teachers’ perception of creativity, Fairfield’s (2010) survey of teachers’ creative thinking in Elementary general music, and Odena’s (2003) research on Secondary school music teachers. However, the first three used quantitative methodology, while Odena focused on Secondary education. Besides these, no specific qualitative studies have been conducted recently on music teachers in Primary education, particularly, in Cyprus. This is the key to identifying the research problem.

In the light of the above, it seemed to me that I had a context in which my own findings about creativity could be of value. Unlike much earlier work in the field, and particularly in education, I interviewed 10 music teachers with the assistance of video elicitation technique (VET) (Jewitt, 2012). The participants discussed their experiences in relation to creativity, commenting on video vignettes. We explored their perspectives of the phenomenon in relation to four areas: (1) the ‘person’, that is, the characteristics of the students and the teachers that they consider creative; (2) the ‘process’, that is, the practices and activities that teachers seek to apply in the classroom to nurture creativity, as well as their approaches when assessing students’ creativity; (3) the ‘product/output’, that is, how they define the creative output; and (4) the ‘place/environment’, that is, how the school environment influences the students' and their creativity in music education.

In the following paragraphs I explain the rationale behind this study, the purpose of researching this particular topic, the research questions, the methodology that I adopted, the significance of this study, outlining also the structure of the thesis.

1.1. Background Context and Rationale

The impetus for this study stems from my interest in perceiving and applying creativity in my teaching. Recalling my personal experiences as a Primary school
pupil, I vividly recall the music lessons mainly as preparations for school events, either as a choir-member or a band-member, involving the very few students who already had some instrumental skills because of their private music lessons outside school. I experienced a similar pattern as a student in Secondary education, except that the rehearsals for the school events took place during the breaks – for those interested in participating – and, thus, music lesson time was usually considered for recreation or relaxation. In the meantime, I continued to attend afternoon private music theoretical and instrumental lessons and, much later, as a music undergraduate at Berklee College of Music in the United States, I started realising how much I had missed as a student in public education. Coming back to Cyprus, and started working as a music teacher, I realised that things started changing in Secondary education, mainly because of the public music school reform in 2012; however, little appeared to be happening in Primary education. From that point onwards, I started studying and searching for ways to make my own music teaching more interesting and meaningful by means of a variety of activities, teaching techniques and approaches. Hence, I chose creativity. Having reviewed a substantial body of work, not only on general creativity, but also on creativity in education and, specifically, on music education, I soon realised that there was very little research on Cypriot Primary music education (Teklos, 2011; Forari, 2005) and much less, specifically, on Cypriot music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity. Thus I wished to explore this topic further in a context that satisfied my preference for research as well as for its practical professional value.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to explore music teachers' perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity. Despite the significant amount of research in this field, few
qualitative studies have provided findings regarding this aspect. In fact, we know relatively little about creativity from music teachers’ points of view: there is a need to elucidate how they perceive and approach creativity in practice, how the school environment might influence both themselves and the students, as well as their perception of what a creative student is and what makes the music educator creative.

1.3. Research Questions

On the basis of the above, two primary research questions and a group of subordinate questions were raised at the beginning of this study:

1. How do music teachers perceive creativity in music education?
   1.1. How do they define creativity?
   1.2. How do they define the creative student?
   1.3. How do they define the creative teacher?
   1.4. Does the school environment influence the students’ and the teachers’ creativity in music education?

2. How do music teachers adopt creativity in their teaching?
   2.1. What activities do they consider creative?
   2.2. How they apply these?
   2.3. How do they assess students’ creativity?

1.4. Methodology

Consistent with the purpose of this study, namely, to explore music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity from their own perspectives and experiences, in-depth interviews were conducted with the assistance of a video
elicitation technique (VET) (Jewitt, 2012) in order to prompt discussion and establish a basis for reflection. Colaizzi's (1978) seven-step phenomenological method was adopted to guide the analysis of the emergent data, following also Graneheim and Lundman's (2003) suggestion for qualitative content analysis and generation of themes. Then an exhaustive, thick and rich description of each participant's interview was put together.

1.5. Significance of the Study

One of the innovations of the present study is the application of VET as an interview tool to assist in elucidating music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity. In addition, the specific context of Cyprus had not yet been examined as a site for the production of theory and practice in relation to the phenomenon of creativity and music. Such a qualitative study seeks to contribute to the development of creativity in education by providing insights for policy-makers, curriculum designers, training programme facilitators and practising teachers. Furthermore, with the findings coming from a Cypriot context, Cyprus being a relatively recent former colony of the United Kingdom, the study provides an opportunity for researchers interested in comparative education to contrast and parallel the findings with those emerging from the UK and other former UK colonies, such as Malta, in terms of how their music education systems have developed, what issues they have encountered and what they have done (if anything) to address these. Finally, despite the non-generalisability of the specific findings related to these 10 teachers, the study also provides information for individual, institutional, academic and a societal level improvement.
1.6. Thesis Structure

The thesis is organised as follows: Chapter 1 reviews the literature in the field of creativity; Chapter 2 contextualises the theoretical and methodological orientations of the study; Chapter 3 presents the analysis of the fieldwork data; Chapter 4 provides an account of the findings, connecting them, also, to the research questions; Chapter 5 constitutes a detailed discussion of the findings and how they connect to the research questions; Chapter 6 is a commentary on the implications for policy and practice, as well as a recognition of the study’s limitations, along with suggestions for future research; and, finally, Chapter 7 summarises the main points of evidence.
A large amount of research has been conducted on creativity (e.g., Richardson & Saffle, 1983; Runco & Pritzker, 2011; Sternberg, 1999; Craft, 2001; Running, 2008; Thys et al., 2014). The aim of this chapter is to provide a clear understanding of the major research carried out on the topic of creativity. However, an exhaustive review of such a multifaceted topic is beyond the limits of this chapter; the criteria used in choosing, analysing and comparing the literature included have to do with the relevance to the interest of this study and the importance to the field of general creativity, as well as to the field of music creativity in education.

2.1. Creativity in Education

2.1.1. Benefits of creativity

It has been suggested that the benefits of fostering the students’ creativity are balanced psychological functioning (Rasulzada & Dackert, 2009), higher academic achievement (Gajda, Karwowski & Beghetto, 2017), boost of the students’ creative self-efficacy and, thus, more positive self-beliefs about their academic abilities in all subject areas and higher levels of participation in after-school activities (Beghetto, 2006), to name only a few. Nurturing creativity in education is thus a necessary, if not a primary goal (Fisher, 2005).
2.1.2. Tension between creativity and education

Maley and Kiss (2018), however, describe an uneasy relationship between institutional education and creativity: over-prescriptive as well as centralised approaches to teaching and learning, threaten to extinguish engagement and banish creative activity (Hodges, 2005). This tension is also evident in Larsson and Georgii-Hemming's (2018) recent study on improvisation, an activity described as “…a performance art par excellence” (Burnard, 2012, p. 151). Improvisation is also defined as an instant decision-making process, conditioned by the full complexity of human experience (Hallam, Cross, & Thaut, 2011, p. 410), which is considered “…the most primitive form of musical creativity” (Deliege, Deliege, & Sloboda, 2004, p. 123). Larsson & Georgii-Hemming's (2018) work reveals that improvisation tends to be an overlooked activity in music education. Moreover, IJdens and Haanstra (2018) describe a similar situation with regard to composition, an activity “…usually viewed as requiring the highest levels of creativity” (Adams et al., 2010, p. 106). In particular they report that "[c]omposing is rarely part of the regular music lessons" (IJdens & Haanstra, 2018, p. 16).

2.1.3. Barriers to creativity

Grainger and Barnes (2006), however, warn of the possibility that “…the development of creativity is viewed merely as the latest bandwagon or yet another thing to add to schools' lists of priorities” (p. 209). Consequently, “…creativity in the schools is sometimes seen as a footnote, afterthought, or even as an extra-curricular activity […]. At worst, it can be seen as not relevant or even appropriate to educational practice” (Kaufman, 2009, p. 175). As Cachia, Ferrari, Ala-Mutka, and Punie (2010) conclude, even though there is “…extensive potential for creative
learning and innovative teaching within the European school system [...] education is based on different interlocking structures and, unless changes take place at different levels, it will not produce the desired results” (p. 52). In particular, the barriers to creativity and innovative teaching that have been found are: 1. the curricula (with the vague definitions of creativity and the unclear guidelines as to how to nurture it); 2. the pedagogy and assessment approaches (conventional ‘frontal teaching’ is most often applied and there is a lack of time and curricular freedom, as well as a traditional approach to assessment); 3. teachers' training (teachers need to be prepared to apply diverse and innovative teaching methods, as well as feeling comfortable to take risks or ‘deviating’ from the constraints of traditional education); 4. ICT and digital media (it is necessary for teachers to be able to use tools and content imaginatively); and 5. the educational culture and leadership (there is a need for a change of mentality in the agents that constitute the educational system: policy-makers, head teachers and the students' parents) (Cachia et al., 2010; Wang & Kokotsaki, 2018).

The last barrier mentioned relates, in fact, to the general discourse concerning creativity development, either in education or in an organisation, namely, that all the agents, from top to bottom, need to be constructively and supportively involved (Glăveanu, 2018). Moreover, Berland (2013) reports the devaluation of creativity by the educational system, something that is evident in Kim’s (2011) findings reporting a decline in creativity in the US. Still, even though initiatives for according greater attention to creativity in education have been taken (e.g., NACCCE, 1999; DCMS, 2001; QCA, 2001; and the EU’s declaration of 2009 as the ‘Year of Creativity and Innovation’), Bloom and Dole (2018) warn that “…educational reformers [...] call for transformations in teaching and learning that puts creative and critical thinking at the forefront” (p. 1). The review below looks at creativity concepts
from various angles both in general, as well as in educational and music educational settings, leading to the gap in the literature and underlying the aim of this thesis.

2.2. Creativity as a Generic Concept: ‘Historical and Personal’

Creativity is everywhere in our lives (Prabhu, Sutton, & Sauser, 2008, p. 53); it is an all-pervasive human phenomenon, indispensable for our everyday life (Meusburger, 2009, p. 99; Hallam, Cross, & Thaut, 2011, p. 405). However, some creative outputs carry different values and receive a different level of acceptance: some creative ideas may contribute to the revolution of social networking, interaction, communication and economic growth, others may inaugurate the beginning of new artistic genres or medical eras and others may occasionally make our food taste better. Creative outputs are thus placed in two variously labelled categories: e.g., ‘Historical and Personal’ (Boden, 1990), ‘Big C and Little c’ (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009a) and ‘Traditional and New’ (Elliott, 1971). The two categories are the next to be discussed.

2.2.1. ‘Historical’, ‘Big C’ and ‘Traditional’

The former category includes domain-changing, or even world-changing, creative outputs by rare individuals, commonly tagged as ‘masters’, who have been recognised for their significant contributions to humanity. This category is related to the Western epistemology, which celebrates individuality: the composer, for example, as a talented person who creates unique works of art.
2.2.2. Political dimensions

The singular understanding of creativity has several political dimensions; music and art were for a long-time “…under the control of rulers and religious leaders, powerful personages who served as official patrons” (Richards, 2007b, p. 502). In fact, today, even though religious leaders may not be patrons of artistic creativity, powerful individuals, such as museum and art gallery curators, function as judges who decide what and who deserve to be admired as creative (Henry, 2006, p. 4). Therefore there are political dimensions as to what may be widely recognised as creative.

2.2.3. Mythical concepts

The mythical concept of talent and genius is another extension of the political side of creativity and its attributed label; as Meusburger (2009) comments, “…new, original, and valuable ideas and topics often encounter resistance because they usually threaten continuities and tradition and may destroy existing paradigms, powerful relationships, and self-efficacy” (p. 97). In addition, creativity may challenge established frameworks and notions; rock’n’roll music, for example, has political implications: the 1950s was a decade during which the US was suffering due to racial division; rock’n’roll became an avenue within which young people negotiated racial difference, as black singers appealed to both black and white audiences. Very soon, the new musical style became a movement, a lifestyle and an ideology that offered American youngsters a means of expressing their beliefs. On the other hand, in the modern environment, as Burnard (2012) points out, “…governments and industries are not only telling artists and educators what they should do, but they also prescribe the terms in which they should think and the ideals towards which they should aspire in their creative practices” (p. 7).
Therefore, the singular understanding of creativity enhances the archetype of the artist as a mythical figure and corresponds to “...the romantic view of creativity characterised by irrationality, mystery and unconsciousness” (Odena, 2012, p. 201), as opposed to the systemic understanding according to which creativity is intertwined with effort and persistence. Burnard (2012) regards the singular perspective of creativity as outdated: as she explains, considering creative output as the result of the efforts of a gifted person “…persists as a historically specific ideology, which has [been] translated into a misleading view of the artist and is in no sense representative of artists in other societies and those of earlier centuries in Western society either” (Burnard, 2012, p. 10). As will be discussed later, based on psychological research, creative potential is not a privilege of the few and the highest levels of creativity may not be as mystical as they were once thought to be (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2007, p. 114). In addition, the current real-world practices, at least regarding the music domain, support the concept of multiple creativities (Burnard, 2012).

2.2.4. ‘Personal’, ‘Little c’ and ‘New’

The second category is different from the first in terms of (1) the usually negligible outward impact of the creative product; (2) the emphasis it places on the personal development of the creator; and (3) its everyday application to our lives (Runco, 2004). In fact, ‘personal’ creativity is far less product-oriented (Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Singer, 2004, p. 24). Silvia et al. (2014), who studied people’s creative activities, support the insignificance of outputs, which may “…seem frivolous, amateurish, or weird” (p. 188), underlining, instead, the significance of the activity itself. This supports Richards’s (2010) suggestion that ‘personal’ creativity is a process that “...is not just about what one does, but, also, how” (p. 190) in order to achieve a goal. ‘Personal’ creativity, then, may be defined in terms of personal originality, no matter
whether others have already achieved the same or similar results, and
meaningfulness, not necessarily the immediate usefulness (Richards, 2010, p. 191),
of any activity undertaken (Richards, 2007a, p. 500). Thus, in contrast to 'Big C', the
'personal' or 'new' concept of creativity, "in the sense of being contrasted to the
traditional" (Odena, 2018, p. 8) fits well in educational settings where the activity
output needs to meet originality and meaningfulness on a personal level and in the
situated educational activity (Odena, 2012).

From another point of view, a child’s efforts to make meaning of the world and
adapt to the environment may be considered a kind of 'personal' creativity. Children,
for example, externalise their creative instincts in various musical activities from a
very young age by freely improvising songs (Dowling, 1988; Azzara, 2002), exploring
sounds of, and on, various surfaces (Mialaret, 1994) and gradually moving from the
asymmetrical rhythmic patterns to the steady beat, to the embellished rhythmic
patterns, motivic development and, generally, to greater musical cohesion in their
creative activities as they grow up (Reinhardt, 1990). As Zausner (2007) suggests,
"...every choice we make in life is a decision and that decision has a creative basis"
(76). Therefore every human thought and action may be infused with creativity:
“...the everyday transmission and reception of ideas” for example, “...is in some
sense creative” (Hallam, Cross, & Thaut, 2011, p. 405). It could be argued, then, that
to exist is, in a basic sense, a form of 'personal' creativity. As a matter of fact, though,
the triviality of most of our everyday creative activities very often make 'personal'
creativity pass unnoticed and, thus, unappreciated (Richards, 2007b, p. 502).
Richards (2010), however, calls attention to the role 'personal' creativity may play in
our positive psychological development, as it “...allows people to explore their
identities, form new relationships, cultivate competence and reflect critically on the
world (…) [serving] as sources of strength and resilience” (Silvia et al., 2014, p. 183).
2.3. The Domain Issue: General or Specific?

In addition to ‘Big C’ and ‘Little c’, another two opposing conceptualisations of creativity are related to the issue of the content generality of cognitive abilities. The question of the two competing theories, namely, domain-general or domain-specific, is whether there are cognitive mechanisms, or thinking skills, that make someone creative in all domains or, whether being creative, is bound to a single domain.

2.3.1. Domain generality

Domain transcendence or generality advocates that methods should focus on the individual by using psychometric approaches in their studies, such as divergent thinking tests (e.g., Plucker, 1999; Torrance, 1974). Their position is that a person with particular characteristics, such as divergent thinking, may successfully transfer their creativity to other domain-specific tasks.

2.3.2. Domain specificity

Advocates of domain specificity adopt socio-cultural theories and alternative assessment tests in their studies, such as Amabile’s (1982) consensual assessment technique (CAT) or CAT-like models, focusing on the product (Silvia, Kaufman, & Pretz, 2009, p. 139). According to the domain-specificity theorists, “…the skills, knowledge, aptitudes, or talents underlying creativity in different domains are different and, for this reason, creativity in one domain does not predict creativity in other domains” (Baer, 2016, pp. 5-6). In fact, with respect to music, skills, knowledge and aptitudes may be different, even within genres, as may be the case with music improvisers: expert jazz improvisers, for example, are not automatically expert at rock improvisation; pop/rock songwriters may be fluent when it comes to catchy
melodic lines but that does not mean they are expert at composing a sonata or a fugue. Different skills, knowledge and aptitudes are required for different musical styles. In fact, Plucker and Beghetto (2004) argue that what makes creativity ‘look’ domain-specific is the creative mind interest and commitment, and thus time and effort devoted, in a certain domain.

2.3.3. Polymaths

Domain-specificity theorists support the notion of the existence of polymaths: “...individuals who have shown exceptional creativity in more than one domain” (Baer, 2012). Root-Bernstein and Root-Bernstein (2004) studied the backgrounds of great creative minds (polymaths), concluding that they do indeed transcend domains. Their rarity, however, is seen as the exception that proves the rule: “...if such creative polymaths were commonplace that, indeed, would be the evidence for domain generality” (Baer, 2012, p. 21).

2.3.4. The 10-year rule

Domain-specificity theorists propose the ‘10-year rule’: there is a necessity for an average period of 10 years of practice, preparation, exploration and experimentation to become expert in a specific domain (Bloom, 1985; Ericsson, 1996; Hayes, 1989, Weisberg, 2010); even more years may be necessary “…to rise to the very top of a creative domain” (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2007, p. 116). Therefore human lifespan sets tight limits for reaching high levels of creative accomplishment in several fields (Baer, 2016).
2.3.5. Methodological approaches

Apparently, different methodological approaches give different answers to the domain argument: a focus on the person (which is the case with transcendence supporters) gives different results from a focus on the product (the centre of interest of the specificity supporters), providing supporting evidence on both sides. Naturally, this generates suspicion about whether the competing theories compare apples and oranges. This different frame of analysis may be “…the heart of much of the dispute in this area” (Kaufman & Baer, 2004, p. 6). Therefore Plucker (2004, 2005) suspects that whether creativity is specific or general may have to do with the method used. In support of this conclusion is one of the few studies that have collected data using both psychometric and alternative techniques: “The generality of creative performance in gifted and non-gifted children” (Runco, 1987), in which creative performance questionnaires were scored for quality and quantity in seven performance domains. The results indicated that “…the quality and quantity of creative performance were largely unrelated” (Runco, 1987, p. 121) and that quality and quantity ratings point to specificity and generality, respectively.

2.3.6. Middle-ground position

A middle-ground position hold by theorists of multi-component models of creativity (such as Amabile, 1996; Sternberg & Lubart, 1995 and 1996) suggests that both generality and specificity are aspects of creativity. In particular, they argue that multiple components must converge for creativity to occur, for example, abilities, knowledge, thinking styles, personality, motivation and environment. These components, of which the level may be different and one may compensate for, or counteract, the other(s) in someone, range from domain-general to domain-specific.
Furthermore, according to Plucker and Beghetto’s (2004) hybrid approach, “…creativity is a developmental construct (…) [and] the level of specificity—generality changes according to the social context and as one develops through childhood into adulthood” (pp. 153-155). In addition, a study by Baer and Kaufman (2005) also aligns with the middle-ground approach, concluding that there are general prerequisite factors for creativity in any domain (namely, intelligence, motivation and suitable environments), which, though, need to be coupled with other domain-specific factors that are important for particular (i.e. task-specific) activities. Nevertheless, middle-ground conclusions cannot satisfy everyone; after all, it might be said that the findings of middle-ground theories are part of ‘the apple of discord’ for the controversial issues of domain.

As Plucker (2004) explains, the question of specificity or generality “…holds important implications for education and talent development” (p. 2). Baer (1998) offers a reasonably secure suggestion about domain uncertainty to practitioners promoting creative thinking: domain-specificity practice seems safer than the transcending one, because such creative training will not have any negative results if the assumption about specificity is eventually wrong. This is because creative thinking skills acquired in the course of a particular task will still be transferrable to others. On the other hand, though, taking for granted domain-transcendence practices for creativity development, will result in much wasted time if this strategy is finally proved wrong. Even though Baer’s (1998) strategy seems secure, it has been criticised by hybrid-theory supporters (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004), whose suggestion is “…to expose students to a wide range of contexts in which they can apply their creativity in a search for an optimal interaction of ability and context” (p. 162). In contrast to any of the two extreme positions, such an approach, according to Plucker and Beghetto (2004), will contribute to the development of flexible thinking and will,
also, encourage outside perspectives that may open up testing the possibility of knowledge and creativity within and across domains.

2.3.7. Educational implications

To sum up, after many decades of gathering evidence and debating, it seems that there is no simple answer to the domain question. Nevertheless, this study takes into consideration that the pendulum of the domain question seems to swing according to the methodological and conceptual approaches applied to a study. As Plucker (2004) suggests, though, instead of constantly trying to prove or disprove the nature of the creativity domain, what might be more useful would be “…to determine under which measurement, environmental, ability, and age-related conditions creativity is domain and task specific and under which conditions creativity is generally applied” (p. 9). Such evidence will be significant, as it will contribute to the meaningful development of creativity in educational environments.

2.4. The Creative Person

The big push of interest in the field of creativity also includes ‘the creative personality’ quest. Numerous researchers (e.g., Barron, 1955; Barron & Harrington, 1981; Della & Gaier, 1970; Feist, 1999; Helson, 1999; MacKinnon, 1962; Rimm, Davis, & Bien, 1982; Selby, Shaw, & Houtz, 2005; Vervalin, 1962) attempted to sketch the portrait of creative personalities, including characteristics, personality traits and thinking styles.
2.4.1. Methodological approaches

The methodologies adopted vary; for example, aiming to propose a synthetic model of creativity and personality, Fürst, Ghisletta, and Lubart (2016) distributed questionnaires to undergraduate psychology students. Looking for general features of the creative individual, Helson (1996) used conceptual maps of occupational interests and environments, traits and psychosocial motives. Parloff, Datta, Kleman, and Handlon (1968) examined the personality characteristics of creative adults in independent fields by reanalysing data already obtained. Miller and Sawyers (1989), interested in children’s perspective of the characteristics of the creative personality, used a social validation technique and asked sixth and seventh graders to list, among other things, personality traits common to creative peers. Gough (1979) developed the creative personality scale, a paper-and-pencil test assessing personality characteristics. MacKinnon (1962, 1970, 1978) collected his data through interviews and test scores. Furthermore, other researchers used biographical and self-report methods (Gedo & Gedo, 1992; Wallace & Gruber, 1989).

2.4.2. Common characteristics

Summarising their findings, we can see that openness to experience, independence and self-confidence are some of the most common characteristics they noticed. In fact, openness to experience has been recently reported as the personality factor most strongly related to creativity (Oleynick et al., 2017). McCrae and Costa (1985) break down openness to experience, into curiosity and willingness to explore new ideas and divergent thinking, that is, finding alternative and imaginative solutions to a problem. In a more recent paper, Fürst and Grin (2018) differentiate this personality factor into openness and intellect, with openness encompassing interests in
aestheticism and imagination, and intellect encompassing interest in truth and ideas, as well as intellectual engagement (pp. 85-86). With respect to education, it is important to mention that students perceived by teachers as creative, are often associated with misbehaviour (Kettler, Lamb, Willerson, & Mullet, 2018; Scott, 1999).

Particular characteristics that have been found to be associated with composers of music are introversion, independence and divergent thinking (Garrido, Bernard, & Davidson, 2013; Kemp, 1981; Webster, 1987). As for the characteristics of music students, in particular, Auh (1996) prioritises informal musical experience, in addition to other personality traits, such as independence, self-confidence, curiosity and imagination. Webster (1988) identifies musical experience, conceptual understanding and aesthetic sensitivity as characteristics of creative music students.

2.4.3. Intelligence and creativity

Of great interest, and a subject of much debate, has been the relationship between intelligence and creativity (Plucker & Esping, 2015), which is still not clearly understood (Neubauer & Martskvishvili, 2018). In fact, the debate was initially about the difference between the two or whether creativity depends on intelligence (e.g., Getzels & Jackson, 1962; Wallach & Kogan, 1965). Of course, intelligence needs to be defined when comparing the two concepts. Evidently, the range of definitions of intelligence varies (e.g., Legg & Hutter, 2007) and is beyond the scope of this review. It is important, however, to mention the research conducted regarding the influence of intelligence on creativity and their suggested possible relationship: either one may be seen as a subset of the other, as coincident sets, as independent, yet overlapping, sets, or as completely unrelated, that is, disjoined sets (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008; Sternberg & O’Hara, 1999). Evidence supporting each of these relationships has been demonstrated (Kaufman & Plucker, 2011). In addition,
the notion of a threshold (a minimum level) of intelligence necessary to create has been suggested, yet it is not considered sufficient for a highly creative performance (Guilford, 1967). Research into the threshold hypothesis has generated mixed findings, on the part of those supporting it (e.g., Jauk, Benedek, Dunst, & Neubauer, 2013; Dumas, 2018) as well as of those rejecting it (e.g., Kim, 2005; Preckel, Holling, & Wiese, 2006). For the purpose of this study, creativity is viewed as distinct from creative ability and espouses the belief that “…certain kinds of intelligence are, at certain levels and in particular domains, related to creativity” (Runco, 2014, p. 9).

2.4.4. Different field, different characteristics?

Nevertheless, despite the many studies, the field of creative characteristics “…has not had a commonly agreed upon set of terms” (Martinsen, 2011, p. 186). Possessing any, or any combination of the traits and characteristics mentioned, does not imply that a person may be creative. The search, however, becomes even more complicated since, as Barron and Harrington (1981) note, the picture of the creative person may be different according to the field of activity: characteristics of creative artists are different from those of creative scientists (see Feist, 1999). Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi (1976) even suggest intra-domain research may be necessary in order to find characteristics of creative individuals within their specialties, such as fine artists versus industrial artists; with respect to music, for example, studies revealed that musical performers’ traits vary “…depending on the type of instruments that they play” (Kawase, 2015, p. 2; Chmurzyńska, 2012). With a similar approach, Selby et al. (2005) suggest that the personality characteristics of a person are manifestations of the individual’s creative or problem-solving styles (p. 306), that is, “…the ways people approach problems they encounter in their environments […] [and] how individuals use their creative skills in response to the conditions confronting them” (p. 306). The
creative style may be adapted according to the needs of each situation, occasionally exhibiting traits or characteristics that may be mutually contrary or inconsistent (Selby at el., 2005, p. 307; Henry, 2006, p. 15). This combination of contradictory characteristics relates to McMullen’s (1976) theory of ‘synergistic swings’ and to Bruner’s (1973) ‘connectedness’; for example, creative persons may switch from one contrary characteristic to another, for example from confidence to humility, introversion to extraversion (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). As Henry (2006) explains, creative figures “…operate through the entire spectrum of personality dimensions [and their behaviour is adjusted based on] the demands of the interaction between them and the domain in which they are working” (p. 15).

Furthermore, the findings of Parloff et al.’s (1968) study suggest that personality characteristics, such as impulse control, may positively or negatively influence the creative performance of an individual, depending on their age (p. 550). Another point is Abuhamdeh and Csikszentmihalyi’s (2004) observation that the recognition of creative performance requires the creator to be ‘practically intelligent’, that is, to have “…the ability to promote one’s work and call attention to it in a particular domain” (Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Singer, 2004, p. 199), something that relates to business or communication skills, which may not be widely distributed or, at least, well-developed with respect to everyone.

2.4.5. Motivation

Despite the great number of personality characteristics, traits and general features, a core element for creativity that merits further discussion is motivation. To be moved, interested and stimulated to act in order to achieve something has been noted by numerous researchers as a key ingredient for creative success (e.g., Amabile, 2012; Selby, Shaw, & Houtz, 2005; Deci, 2012; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Hennessey &
The concept of motivation and the extent to which it is a single phenomenon has been a fertile area of psychological theory (e.g., Bernard, Mills, Swenson, & Walsh, 2005, p. 130; Patterson, 1964) that is beyond the scope of this discussion. What is important to review here, however, are the different types of motivation and how they relate to creativity. From the self-determination theory (SDT: Deci & Ryan, 1985) point of view, the reasons for doing or avoiding something lie within the intrinsic or extrinsic types of motivation, or even amotivation. Beginning with the last one, amotivation is the total lack of interest in an activity resulting from understating it and/or feeling unable or lacking in the necessary skills and knowledge to do it and/or not appreciating the outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 61). Intrinsic motivation relates to activities we do because of personal interest; on the other hand, extrinsic motivation has to do with attaining "...some separable outcome (...) [or] its instrumental value" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). Apparently, orientation towards intrinsic or extrinsic motivation has a direct impact on how we perform and experience an activity and they are both important for creative outcome (Hennessey, 2010).

In particular, it has been documented that when a person feels that there is/are (1) other reason(s), besides, or in addition to, personal pleasure, in performing a task and/or (2) behaviour control and/or (3) lack of autonomy, including tangible rewards, such as money, or intangible ones, such as threats (Deci & Cascio, 1972), deadlines (Amabile, DeJong, & Lepper, 1976) and competition (Reeve & Deci, 1996), then intrinsic motivation diminishes. However, in cases in which an individual feels autonomy and the need to act for his/her own pleasure and personal choice, then intrinsic motivation is evidenced. Therefore intrinsic motivation is necessary in order to become engaged and to persist in the creative process involved in an activity. Nevertheless, our environment, which is reviewed below, influences the strength of
our motivation (Deci, 2012), and the older we grow, the less time we have for intrinsically motivating activities (Joseph, 2015).

2.4.6. Extrinsic motivation

According to SDT, extrinsic motivation is further distinguished into other types of motivation depending on whether an individual’s action emanates from doing something other than gaining inherent satisfaction. These types are external regulation, introjected regulation, regulation through identification and integrated regulation, all of them relating to the degree of autonomy one feels in relation to a task (for a comprehensive review, see Ryan & Deci, 2000). The categorisation of the various types of extrinsic motivation does not necessarily take place along a developmental continuum; for example, someone who starts a task with a low-level type of extrinsic motivation, such as external regulation, for several reasons may gradually become more interested in the task, resulting in a higher level of extrinsic motivation. Of course, the opposite may also be possible.

2.4.7. Intrinsic motivation

Therefore, especially for educational reasons, providing individuals with autonomous or self-determined learning or guidance generates greater possibilities for intrinsic or, at least, more autonomous extrinsic motivation. Several studies support the association between intrinsic motivation and successful creative outcomes (e.g., Amabile, 1985; Choi, 2004; Sheldon, 1995; Odena, 2012; Hallam, 2006). Nevertheless, studies of researchers such as Dewett (2007) and Shalley and Perry-Smith (2001) question this association. In a meta-analysis empirical studies examining intrinsic motivation in relation to creativity related to product, Jesus, Rus,
Lens, and Imaginário (2013) conclude that inconsistent results regarding the 
association of the two “...can be due to multiple perspectives taken on creativity. [...] 
This meta-analysis identified a positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and 
creativity related to product” (pp. 80-83).

2.4.8. Thinking styles

In addition to motivation, scholars (e.g., Farrell, 2001; John-Steiner, 2000; Noppe, 
1996; Selby, Shaw, & Houtz, 2005) have stressed the influence of cognitive or 
thinking styles on the creative abilities of individuals. Thinking style, according to 
Sternberg and Zhang (2005), “...is a preference for using abilities in certain ways. It 
is not an ability itself, but the way one likes to utilise abilities. Thus, when we speak of 
individual differences in thinking styles, we are speaking only of differences, not of 
better and worse” (p. 245). Sternberg (1988b) suggests 13 thinking styles that Zhang 
(2002) has reconceptualised into three types: the creativity-generating, the norm-
favouring and a combination of the characteristics of the first two types. Furthermore, 
Kaufman (2002) points to a holistic mode of thinking as important for creativity; 
Brophy (2000) suggests the divergent and convergent thinkers, while Kirton (1976) 
proposes the ‘adaptors’ (those who prefer improving a situation) and the ‘innovators’ 
(those who prefer doing something differently). Finally, it is important to mention that 
an individual’s thinking style may be variable; switching styles, in fact, is critical (Zhu 
& Zhang; 2011; Zhang & Sternberg, 2009).

To sum up, going back to the creative characteristics, despite the many 
/studies, the field “...has not had a commonly agreed upon set of terms or definitions” 
(Martinsen, 2011, p. 186). Possessing any, or any combination of the traits and 
characteristics mentioned in the literature does not, by any means, imply that a
person is creative. Personality seems to only partially influence creative performance, instead of providing an explanation for it (Feist & Barron, 2003). In fact, some theorists have doubted if such things as the particular characteristics of creative personality really exist (Helson, 1996, p. 301; Richards, 2007a, p. 514). Taking into consideration Parlof et al.’s (1968) warning that the qualities mentioned in the general picture of creative personality, such as self-esteem, autonomy and assertiveness, come from already widely accepted creative minds, raises the question of whether these characteristics and traits are natural/predisposed or nurtured/resulted after the creative persons had been recognised as creative (p. 529). As Prabhu et al. (2008) note, “…individuals may have certain traits and abilities that are favorable for creativity, but whether these will actually result in achieving creative results depends on their intrinsic motivation” (p. 53). Therefore, despite the numerous overlapping, yet sometimes contradictory, characteristics of the creative personality, this study adopts the position that creative potential capacity may be found in everyone (Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Singer, 2004, p. 27), characteristics vary across disciplines, people may demonstrate different behaviours and characteristics at different times and ages, creative behaviour may sometimes be manifested negatively or considered inappropriate and, finally, sustaining motivation is important for creative performance. Furthermore, what has been suggested to be vital for fostering and developing the creative potential of any personality is the influence of its surrounding environment (Hallam, 2006; Adams et al., 2010), which is reviewed next.

2.5. The Role of the Environment

The demystification of creativity as a trait that unfolds to ‘lone geniuses’ (Richards, 2007b; Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson, 1986; Simonton, 1988a) or to individuals with
particular and exclusive characteristics (see above) has reoriented research interest towards considering creativity as a widespread capacity (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2007; Burnard, 2012) and a skill that can be improved (Niu & Sternberg, 2003; Sternberg, 2000; Treffinger, Young, Selby, & Shepardson, 2002). Even though the particular characteristics of an individual may contribute to broadening the spectrum of creative behaviour, despite the plurality, or even vagueness, of the long list of potential characteristics discussed earlier, ultimately, it is the individual’s interaction with the environment that prepares the ground for creative performance and the definition of what creativity is. As Glăveanu (2018) explains, “…our conceptions of creativity […] have their own history. They grow out of certain types of society and reflect the different needs, hopes and, indeed, fears of different communities” (p. 26). The environmental conditions we experience influence our history, our perceptions and performance of creativity; these environments are discussed below.

2.5.1. Environmental categories

Jensen (2015) poses that a crucial aspect of creativity is the context, “…which emphasises the physical and sociocultural sources of creative production and the essential nature of creative products as a response to environmental forces” (p. 256). The environments in which an individual’s creativity may be nurtured, even though interrelated, may be categorised as the familial environment (including the parental style), the educational environment and the social and professional environments. Certain social, material (i.e. resources and supports), physical and emotional environmental conditions need to be met, in each category (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2014), with the ‘community climate’, that is, supporting, inspiring, collaborative and unintimidating interaction with knowledgeable people (Meusburger, 2009), being common to all (Richardson & Mishra, 2018).
2.5.2. The familial environment

Research on how familial settings may foster children’s creative potential has placed much emphasis on encouraging psychological freedom and safety, as well as supporting independence, for example, allowing children to make their own decisions and develop their curiosity (Meusburger, 2009; Sheldon, 1995; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009b). As important as the development of psychological autonomy for a successful stimulating familial environment is, equally important may be the material conditions under which an individual grows up: both abundance, or, lack of material conditions may impact on a child’s desire to explore, satisfy curiosity and develop interests for their own sake. As mentioned earlier, research on the early life experiences of well-known creative personalities has revealed that many of them grew up in non-typical family conditions, something that contributed greatly to their efforts to find alternative ways of surviving: the old adage ‘necessity is the mother of invention’ reflects the experiences of such groups of people. On the other hand, even though marginality may be “…more conducive to wanting to break out of the norm than a conventional, middle-class background” (Henry, 2006, p. 12), when the material conditions or raw survival needs are too precarious, they may form a determinant reason someone’s interest in exploration and satisfying curiosity becoming diminished (Henry, 2006). Even though not impossible, the chances of someone stepping out from a marginalised community and becoming widely recognised as a creative mind are significantly much lower than those of an individual who has access to the necessary tools and the capacity to dedicate him/herself to a domain. Furthermore, Jankowska and Karwowski (2018) report that while a family’s socioeconomic status does relate to children’s initial level of creative thinking, it is irrelevant to its development. Therefore it is uncertain whether non-typical conditions should be associated with
creative behaviour; they may sometimes be conducive to the development of creative thinking, while at other times they may prove catastrophic.

2.5.3. Childhood and creativity

Biographical research has revealed that some famous creative persons suffered during their childhood years because of problematic family situations or other non-typical life conditions. This probably forced them to develop alternative ways of overcoming difficulties and that, most probably, contributed to their later creative achievements (Roe, 1952, Selby, Shaw, & Houtz, 2005, Hallam, 2006, Henry, 2006). In terms of artistic creation, “…a lot of personal suffering” as Richards (2007a) mentions, “…finds its outlet in the arts” (p. 518).

2.5.4. The educational environment and the enablers of creativity

Psychological freedom and safety are essential conditions for nurturing creativity in educational settings as well. An educational environment has to promote collaboration, to stimulate inspiration and motivation, to be supportive and non-judgmental (Chan & Yuen, 2014), to include activities in which students have the opportunity to play, explore and design (Davies et al., 2013), to take sensible risks and accept mistakes as part of any learning activity of which the focus is the process, not the product (Richardson & Mishra, 2018). Such activities may include “…physical, social, reflective, musical, aural or visual thinking, involving children in activities which produce new and unusual connections between ideas, domains, processes and materials” (Grainger & Barnes, 2006, p. 211). Students, and teachers, need to feel comfortable about stepping outside the boundaries of predictability (Grainger & Barnes, 2006). In fact, feeling psychologically comfortable, knowing that
doing something or expressing an idea will not be received with critical or negative feedback by anyone, has been stressed as probably the most important condition for creative expression in education (Selby et al., 2005; Hallam, 2006; King & Prior, 2013). As Selby et al. (2005) explain, “…when risking everything, the individual needs to know (or feel) that, even in failure, he or she will still be valued” (p. 303). Therefore the classroom climate needs to provide psychological comfort, with the teacher introducing and gradually building constructive criticism and assessment that will provide an enabling environment, in order to contribute to the students’ creative potential (Hallam, 2006, p. 85) and to the development of their ideas in a purposeful way (Blamires & Peterson, 2014, p. 153). Ferrari et al. (2009) suggest eight prerequisite factors for maintaining an enabling environment for creativity; these factors (thematic areas or enablers, as Ferrari et al. (2009) call them) are: (1) assessment; new and versatile assessment tools, for example, portfolios, peer and self-assessments, as well as rewarding processes, need to be introduced. It is also very important that, in addition to the final product, greater emphasis should be given to the creative process. (2) Culture; schools need to support collaboration, both among students, as well as among their staff, and to embrace the teachers’ efforts and practices which aim at creativity. In addition, “…people outside classroom, such as school leaders, national policy-makers and parents” need to be open-minded with regard to new ways of teaching. (3) The curriculum needs to be upgraded so that it includes teaching flexibility and knowledge transfer across subjects. (4) The students’ individual skills need to be developed, to help them to be problem-solvers; in addition, a basic level of knowledge/expertise is most often required in any field for creative performance. (5) Teaching and learning format; traditional teacher-centred practices need to be replaced with collaboration. (6) Teachers need to be informed about creative learning practices, to be aware of the myths surrounding creativity, and how to identify, foster and promote it. This takes us back to the teachers’
behaviour; in addition to being non-critical, particularly during the early stages of teaching, a student is more likely to become engaged with a creative activity or, generally, a domain, if the teacher is encouraging, enthusiastic, empathetic, friendly and possesses a sense of humour (King & Prior, 2013; Davies et al., 2013). Finally, (7) technology and (8) tools are necessary resources for both the teachers and the pupils; teachers need to be familiar with technology and, generally, with media tools, in order to adapt them to their creative teaching, and students need to know how to use them in order to find possible new ways of creative expression, as well as for the purposes of stimulation, collaboration, interaction and networking. The more any of these enablers are present at a school setting, the more suitable the environment will be for fostering creativity and innovation and allowing them to thrive (King & Prior, 2013; Davies et al., 2013). In more recent research on fostering creativity in educational settings, Soh (2017) highlights (1) social modelling, that is, teachers serving as behavioural models for their students; therefore teachers themselves need to be creative; (2) reinforcement, that is, the students’ creative behaviours need to be rewarded; and (3) classroom ecology, that is, a classroom environment that promotes creativity.

2.5.5. Teachers' creativity

Collard and Looney (2014) explain that school and policy environments that value and support teachers, while encouraging innovation and associated risks, allowing them also to develop their own creative dispositions, inspire teachers to focus on the students' creativity and their own creative teaching (p. 350). Moreover, the Creativity, Culture and Education foundation suggests 'creative partnerships', that is, in-class collaborative teaching with artists, in order to help teachers develop more creative pedagogical practices and add add them to the school's involvement with the
community (CCE, 2018). In addition, Seashore, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) suggest the planning of collaborations with colleagues to “…establish workplace conditions that will allow staff members to make the most of their motivations and capacities” (p. 68) and “…for purposes of instructional improvement” (p. 73).

2.5.6. Activities and instruction for the development of creativity

In addition to the psychologically comfortable and enabling educational environment, for both teachers and students, “…structuring knowledge to enable effective learning and spur new insights is a key pedagogical challenge” (Collard & Looney, 2014, p. 351). Research on instructional activities to foster creativity suggests that in order for someone to be able to express themselves freely, yet purposefully and progressively, the activities (such as musical improvisation) need to consist of both solitary practice and group performance and to be under some particular constraints (e.g., rule-governed improvisation or musical composition guidelines), serving as a means of getting the participants started. In the case of group activities, such as group music improvisation, technical and theoretical aspects of music may be practised and covered individually in the student’s own time, while greater emphasis should be given to ensemble performance, since “…improvisational creativity most often ultimately takes place in a performance environment, not in the practice room and the ability to react and generate music from dynamic and unpredictable variables is one of the distinguishing features of improvisation” (Parncutt & McPherson, 2002; p. 128).

As for the second condition, according to Eisner (1972), “…it is the nature of the task that defines and refines the mode of intelligence that humans come to develop (…), [which is] a critical realm in education” (p. 139). As Blamires & Peterson (2014) report, “…a range of influential scholars on creativity in England have placed a strong
emphasis on open, exploratory and collaborative spaces as essential to enabling creativity” (p. 149). Even though it may seem that tasks lacking a framework allow room for more creativity, prescriptive task models concerning the intended outcome (properly designed for particular student groups) are considered more valuable in terms of education (Adams et al., 2010, p. 115). Burnard’s (1995) research on task design in musical composition argues that whether the density of the constraints’ will promote the students’ creativity or not depends on the students’ prior knowledge and experience. As she concludes in her paper, since the students’ needs, knowledge and experience, as well as perception of constraint and freedom vary, “…providing [then] a variety of task options, to access and challenge varied banks of knowledge and experience, should promote the individual to participate in the role of artist” (Burnard, 1995, p. 45). If considerable knowledge in a domain is necessary for the development of children’s creativity, then knowledge and creativity are two sides of the same psychological coin (Grainger & Barnes, 2006, p. 211). In addition, as Adams et al. (2010) suggest, in order for students to become engaged with the creative enterprise and maintain their interest, activities and tasks have to be carefully designed so that they make students feel autonomous, that “…they have ownership and control of them and they must be set at a level which is challenging but not too difficult” (p. 115). Part of their autonomy is also the ability to be in a position to think critically and judge the quality of their own and their peers’, creative output (Collard & Looney, 2014).

Therefore educational environments need to supplement solitary practice with group performance, assigning well-balanced challenging activities designed with tasks and constraints that allow the participants to have (or feel they have) ownership and control, operating “…at their own ‘growing edge’ of skill and knowledge development” (Byrne, MacDonald, & Carlton, 2003, p. 279). This will help to stimulate their curiosity, motivation (further discussed below) and ultimately make the task
constructive, beneficial and enjoyable, contributing to the ignition of flow, an important concept that correlates with the quality of the creative output (Byrne et al., 2003), which is reviewed below.

2.5.7. The social environment

Social traditions and norms may have a strong impact on directing familial, educational and occupational environments towards psychological freedom, independence, particular ways of enculturation and specific domains of interest. An example of how social norms may influence (positively or negatively) a child’s musical enculturation comes from Blacking’s (1985) acknowledgement that while a baby’s spoon banging on a surface in a white European family home may more likely be considered noise, a similar situation in Venda in South Africa may very well be a call to turn “…the [baby’s] spontaneous rhythm into musical action by [surrounding people] adding a second part in polyrhythm” (Blacking, 1985, p. 46). Such an example not only strongly exhibits how different meanings the term ‘music’ may have within different cultures but, also, how musical creativity is valued, developed and manifested. As Henry (2006) explains, “…creativity cannot be recognised except as it operates within a system of cultural rules and it cannot bring forth anything new unless it can enlist the support of peers (…). In the last analysis, it is the community and not the individual who makes creativity manifest” (p. 16). In conclusion, an individual’s characteristics, as discussed above, and the supporting environment within the family, education and workplace are key elements for personal creativity development.
2.6. The Creative Process

The sequence of thoughts that lead to creative performance has been one of the oldest and quite diverse and complex research quests in the field of creativity (Kozbelt, Beghetto, & Runco, 2010). Below are summarised four theories about creativity that emphasise the process, as opposed to other theories that are mentioned later, which focus on other aspects of creativity.

2.6.1. Stage theories

Stage and componential theorists (e.g., Wallas, 1926; Runco & Chand, 1995; Amabile, 1983) describe the creative process in terms of stages or the componential cognitive processes. One of the most popular stage theories is that of Wallas (1926), the four-stage model, that Ross (1980) revised later. Wallas’s theory conceptualises the creative process in sequential stages: preparation, incubation, insight and elaboration are the main stages introduced by Wallas, while initiating, acquainting, controlling and structuring, are those revised by Ross in his version (1980). Even though the two theorists seem to agree in terms of structure, they obviously use different terminology but, most importantly, they depart from one another as regards the stage into which the activities should be placed. In particular, Wallas’s (1926) first stage, preparation, has to do with defining and assessing the problem while also gathering information about it. The second stage, incubation, is the time spent away from the problem, not consciously thinking about it. The third stage, insight, is the illumination moment, when the idea for the solution is suddenly conceived. Finally, the verification stage, is the testing of the idea, which, however, may lead back to the beginning stages. Ross’s (1980) theory consists of the initiating stage, in which the individual randomly explores the situation. The next stage is the acquainting, when
the individual becomes familiar and knowledgeable. Then the controlling stage is when the individual becomes skilful and is capable of dealing with obstacles. Finally, in the structuring stage, the gathered information becomes a compressible whole which it is then reviewed.

2.6.2. Componential theories

The creative process in componential models is perceived as a combination of mechanisms that do not require the linear and interdependent progression of the stage theory. Amabile’s model (1983), for example, consists of three components: domain-relevant skills (including knowledge, e.g., how to do something, and technical skills in a domain), creativity-relevant processes/skills (such as cognitive style and personality characteristics) and task motivation (the intrinsic, or for some people, and for some of the time, intrinsic desire to overcome a problem or accomplish a task). In addition, the environment is the outside component of this model that pushes or presses the individual to continue or abandon the effort.

2.6.3. Cognitive theories

Cognitive theorists (e.g., Mednick, 1962; Guilford, 1968; Finke, Ward & Smith, 1992) believe that cognition differences, that is, different ways of thinking, and capacities, such as memory, are crucial for creative performance. Mednick (1962), for example, suggests that associating remote ideas may lead to creative output. In particular, he defines the creative thinking process as “…the forming of associative elements into new combinations which either meet specified requirements or are in some way useful. The more mutually remote the elements of the new combination, the more creative the process or solution” (p. 221). He also describes three ways of attaining a
creative solution, that is, bringing together the requisite associative elements: through serendipity, that is, creative solutions evoked by environmental or accidental contiguity; through similarity, that is, creative solutions evoked by the similarity of the associative elements or the similarity of the stimuli; and through mediation, that is, creative solutions evoked by mediating common elements.

2.6.4. Evolutionary theories

Evolutionary theorists formed their explanations of creativity on the basis of biological theories, such as that of Darwin (Simonton, 1999). Campbell (1960) developed the blind variation and selective rendition theory, based on Darwin’s (1859) biological evolution through the natural selection theory, which claims that any creative insight is the output of a two-step procedure: blind variation, that is, the production of various ideas, and selected rendition, that is, the selection and elaboration of the most appropriate or interesting idea(s) until a completed output is reached. Simonton (1988b) developed Campbell’s (1960) theory into the chance-configuration theory, focusing on scientific genius that Kozbelt et al. (2010) describe as “…a sophisticated quantitative model of how creative productivity unfolds over the life span, with broad implications for understanding the nature of eminence, the creative process and creative environments” (p. 36).

2.7. The Creative Product

With regard to identifying the creative product and how it is defined, after many decades of research, the answer to the criterion problem seems to remain controversial, without a universally accepted definition (Ford & Harris, 1992) and, thus, it remains an elusive construct (de Sousa, 2008). In fact, Treffinger’s (1996)
literature review unearthed more than 100 definitions, and 101 definitions have been reported by Aleinikov, Kackmeister and Koenig (2000). Apparently, then, the phenomenon of creativity is not a single one, it is an evolving subject matter (Runco, 2017).

2.7.1. Temporal and social frameworks

As a human construction and a product of culture, the definition of creativity varies according to the temporal and spatial frameworks in which it is situated (Burnard, 2012, p. 10), it is “…a child of its own epoch” (Glăveanu, 2018, p. 26). That is why Plucker, Beghetto, and Dow (2004) define creativity as “…the interaction among aptitude, process and environment by which an individual or group produces a perceptible product that is both novel and useful as defined within a social context” (p. 90). It is the social context that defines whether a product or an idea is beyond ordinariness; what is considered creative in a particular social context at a particular period of time will not necessarily be considered creative in a different, or the same, environment at a different time. ”[T]he norms of a social context [are the ones that] establish boundaries of uniqueness and usefulness,” (Plucker & Beghetto, 2004, p. 158) and, thus, “…different implicit definitions of creativity are operational,” depending on the social context (Kaufman & Baer, 2004, p. 14).

2.7.2. Non-Western perspectives

Considering, however, the Western product-approach to creativity as the universal standard of what creativity is seems similar to defining architecture according solely to the structure of the Parthenon. The Western perspective of, and approach to, creativity favours and values the notions of individualism and mastery, that is, a
singular understanding perspective, which leads to the notion of the cult of uniqueness, master and genius. Looking at creativity from other non-Western points of view, however, the value of innovation in material products becomes less important, with the emphasis shifting to the revelation of "...emotional, personal and intrapsychic elements" (Lubart, 1999, p. 342), which is the case with Eastern notions of creativity: it "...involves a state of personal fulfillment, a connection to a primordial realm, or the expression of an inner essence of ultimate reality" (p. 341). In addition, the Japanese regard creativity as a spiritual practice and a lifelong process in which the practitioner focuses on the cultivation of inner richness, instead of creating and perfecting new objects in a sequential process (Matsunobu, 2007). Therefore labelling creativity with a single definition, which is derived from general Western characteristics, may well lead to inaccurate generalisations and misconceptions. What may be concluded is that the degree of paradox in the definition of creativity will be greater or lesser, depending on temporal, national and social cultures and also subcultures, as well as on the discipline and domain in which someone may attempt to identify and situate creativity.

2.7.3. Different context, different definition

Nevertheless, the need for "...explication of a definition of creativity", as Plucker, Beghetto, and Dow (2004) explain, "...is necessary for the study of creativity to continue to grow, thrive and contribute meaningfully to our understanding of the processes and outcomes across and within various domains" (p. 155). Even though novelty and usefulness mentioned above are generally considered as the hallmarks of creativity in the Western world (Amabile, 1982; Cropley, 1967; Guilford, 1950; Runco & Jaeger, 2012; Stein, 1953; Sternberg, 1988a), Amabile (1982) argues that "...most definitions do not include conceptualisations that are readily translated into
useful assessment criteria, (…) [and] there is no clear, explicit statement of the
criteria that conceptually underlie the assessment procedures” (p. 999). Rubenstein,
Ridgley, Callan, Karami, and Ehlinger (2018) acknowledge that “…scholars may
never reach perfect consensus” (p. 101), the definitions vary and are not always and
anywhere ‘right’ or ‘final’.

2.7.4. Definition in education

In terms of education, “[a] common understanding of what creativity is for education
and what it entails is […] envisaged as the first step towards creative and innovative
education” (Cachia et al., 2010, p. 19). Understanding and defining creativity is
helpful for implementing a classroom that fosters creativity (Luna, Ernst, Clark,
DeLuca & Kelly, 2018, p. 27). However, Collard and Looney (2014) assert that “[f]or a
variety of reasons, relatively little attention has been given to the quality of creative
products in schools” (p. 351). As a result, there seems to be confusion about the
definition of creativity in education policy and no clear standards for judging the
students’ outputs.

2.7.5. Definition in music

In terms of music, defining creativity is “…likely to be accompanied by emotion,
tradition, mainstream interests and ideology” (Odena, 2012, p. 22), as well as artistic
taste and the subjective appraisals of each individual. Research on the scientific
application of creativity in the Music Educators Journal from 1914 to 1970 revealed
that it was frequently used in a “…casual, unnecessary and sometimes gratuitous
manner” (Hounchell, 1985, p. vi). This diverse, although misinterpreted, usage of the
term during the twentieth century has proliferated in the last decades: globalisation
and the development of technology have facilitated the dissemination and blending of various musical styles; as a result, it has obscured the usage and meaning of the notion of musical creativity. In fact, musical creativity may be found in several music-making activities, such as improvisation, composition and orchestration. In Western educational settings, musical creativity refers either to composition and improvisation and/or to a desirable way of thinking (Odena, 2011, p. 31). Both applications, however, need to be addressed carefully: starting with the second case, “...a desirable way of thinking” may be defined as “...imagination successfully manifested in any valued [musical] pursuit” (Odena, 2011, p. 30), which is susceptible to overuse or misinterpretation. As for the first instance, the distinction between improvisation and composition in a classroom environment is unclear as musical performances are not always written, especially in the first grades; as a result, the boundaries of the two activities blur to a great extent (Hallam, 2006).

This absence or confusion of standards leaves teachers without guidance and carries questions as to how to define creativity and how to assess their students. As will be discussed below, these questions form the aims of this study, that is, to explore music teachers’ perception of, and approach to assessing, creativity in the Primary education.

In conclusion, creativity has been proposed as a multifaceted capacity (e.g., Rhodes, 1961), “...a complex or syndrome and relies on a variety of traits, skills and capacities” (Runco, 1996, p. 3). Therefore, on the basis of all the above and taking into consideration “…the increased dissemination of all styles of music and musical practices” (Odena, 2012, p. 201) and that “…there is no single musical creativity for all musics” (Burnard, 2012, p. 3), the concept of creativity for the purposes of this thesis is based on a pluralistic notion: creativity is seen as a widely distributed capacity, a potential that we all possess and usually apply to personal situations in our everyday life, which, however, if fostered and developed, may evolve and lead to
high levels of creative performance. By creative performance, in terms of this thesis, the definition is discussed in the light of (1) the production of a useful, original and innovative output in a particular situated (personal, academic, artistic, scientific, or any other kind of) activity; (2) the process with which someone may achieve personal expression, revelation and fulfilment; and (3) the ability to develop desirable way(s) of thinking, that is, a diverse approach abstracted from the Western, the Eastern and the educational perspectives in order to be adequately mobilised and applicable to the analysis of creativity in various music genres and activities undertaken by different social groups, both in and out of education.

2.8. Two More ‘P’s’, ‘Five ‘A’s’ and Seven ‘C’s’

2.8.1. Rhode’s Four ‘P’s’

The sections above demonstrate Rhodes’s (1961) classification of creativity, the so-called Four ‘P’s’ framework: ‘person’, that is, the characteristics of creative individuals; ‘place/press’ (from pressures), that is, the most suitable environment for nurturing creativity; the creative ‘process’, that is, the thinking out of which creative outcomes can be achieved; and ‘product’, that is, how we define and assess something as creative. Two more P’s have recently been suggested: ‘persuasion’ (Simonton, 1990) and ‘potential’ (Runco, 2003). ‘Persuasion’ stems out of the perception of creativity as an output that is unexpected and pioneering and refers to the convincing abilities of the aspirant creator to make experts of the field believe in and who accept the creativity of their outputs. While ‘persuasion’ is linked with the ‘Big-C’, ‘potential’ is associated with everyday creativity; it refers to the latent qualities of an output, or the promising abilities of a person, emphasising the necessary environmental support required for their development.
2.8.2. Glăveanu's Five ‘A's’

Glăveanu (2013) criticises the conceptual schema of the Four ‘P’s’ as individualistic, static and often disjointed vision of creativity. Instead, he proposed the Five ‘A’s’, ‘actor’ (person), ‘action’ (process), ‘artifact’ (product), ‘audience’ (press) and ‘affordance’ (environments that welcome creative thinking). His aim is to “…rewrite this fundamental language of the discipline by using terms that explicitly endorse a systemic, contextual and dynamic approach” from a socio-cultural and ecological approach (Glăveanu, 2013, p. abstract).

2.8.3. Lubart's Seven ‘C's’

Lubart (2017) suggests a seven-theme design to represent the field of creativity: ‘creators’ (the actors or agents engaged in the production of original, meaningful content), ‘creating’ (the creative process), ‘collaborations’ (those involved in the creative process), ‘contexts’ (the environment in which the creative process takes place), ‘creations’ (the output), ‘consumption’ (the adoption of the creative outputs) and ‘curricula’ (the educational development of creativity).

The fundamental Four ‘P’s’ distinction is of particular interest in this study because, as a research study aiming to report Primary music teachers’ perceptions of and beliefs about, creativity, it should be able to examine all of the components on the basis of which numerous studies have been conducted. This is discussed further in the Theoretical Framework.
2.9. More Creativity Theories

Numerous theories have been suggested about how and why creativity may occur focusing on one, or a combination, of the Six ‘P’s. Apparently, the scope of each theory varies and each has received criticism and questioning. Due to space limits, only the ‘broad image’ of some of the most influential and representative (according to Kozbelt, Beghetto & Runco, 2010) will be addressed here, rather than an exhaustive overview of every theory. In addition to the theories mentioned already that focus primarily, or partially, on the process of creativity, more theories are presented here: developmental, psychometric, economic or investment, problem solving and finding, systematic, contextual and straight-‘As’.

2.9.1. Developmental theories

Developmental theorists (e.g., Helson, 1999; Albert & Runco, 1989; Goertzel, & Goertzel, 1976) consider creativity as a longitudinal developmental process, greatly influenced by the individual’s interaction with the environment, one that begins with personal creative performance (the so-called ‘mini-c’ mentioned above) and may gradually develop into an accomplished masterly form.

2.9.2. Psychometric theories

Psychometric theorists (e.g., Guilford, 1968; Wallach & Kogan, 1965) use tests to measure creativity; they pay attention to the creative output in relation to the other ‘P’s’ and to the reliability (consistency of measurement) and validity (accuracy of measurement) of creativity assessment. Psychometric theories are independent of models of creativity and particular theoretical frameworks, while they also consider creative performance as domain-specific and independent of other constructs, such
as IQ (Kozbelt, Beghetto & Runco, 2010). Guilford (1968) is considered the founder of this approach, introducing divergent thinking, in contrast to convergent thinking, as the major ingredient for creative performance in his structure of intellect theory. Divergent thinking is, for Guilford, a type of thinking associated with creative people and the generation and exploration of ideas. In particular, divergent thinking is the ability to fluently generate new, imaginative and original ideas, while also being able to elaborate them, in order to approach a problem flexibly and in alternative ways. In contrast, convergent thinking is the thought process that follows a set of logical steps to give a single correct answer to a question.

2.9.3. Problem-solving and finding theories

Two problem-oriented approaches to explaining creativity have been suggested: problem-solving and problem-finding. Problem-solving and expertise-based theorists (e.g., Ericsson, 1999; Simon, 1981, 1989; Weisberg, 1999, 2006) assert that the creative process stems from rationality, which requires general, not necessarily advanced, cognitive processes and domain expertise, applied in the two major problem categories: ‘puzzle-like’ or well-defined and ill-defined problems, with the problem defined here as “…an obstacle between one’s self and a goal” (Runco, 2014, p. 15). (For further reading on the categorisation of problems, please refer to Wakefield, 1992). ‘Puzzle-like’ problems, such as cryptarithmetic (Newell & Simon, 1972), are those with one prespecified correct solution; on the other hand, ill-defined problems, such as music composition, may be ‘solved’ with more than one ‘correct’ solution. Furthermore, the domain expertise in these theories espouses the 10-year rule, that is, the long and hard, yet necessary, practice to achieve a creative masterwork. On the other hand, problem-finding, or problem expression for the arts (Runco, 2014), theorists (e.g., Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; Runco, 1994) focus
on the subjective experience and the forces driving individuals to create. In other
words, problem-finding is more interested in the person, while problem-solving
focuses on the cognitive processes that give birth to solutions. Problem-finding
theorists react against problem-solving advocates for ignoring the importance of
being able to realise the existence of a problem, being motivated to understand it and
then solve it.

2.9.4. System and contextual view theories

Systems theorists (e.g., Gruber, 1981) perceive creativity holistically, rather than as
an exclusive mental process. System-oriented views understand creativity as a
combination or organisation of systems of interacting and interrelating components
that lead to creative performance and its recognition. Gruber’s (1981) evolving
systems approach developed after the author examined the lives of creative
geniuses, such as Darwin, looking for what they did to come up with their
masterworks or ideas. In other words, this approach examines the dynamic
relationships between creators’ backgrounds, knowledge, ways of thinking and
working, as well as goals, and the context in which they live. Similarly,
Csikszentmihalyi (1988) introduced the systems approach to study creativity: an
influential model, which is less person-oriented, focusing instead on the environment,
that is, the place. In particular, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) suggests that the interaction
of (1) the domain, (2) the individual and (3) the field, defines what makes creativity
come to light and be recognised as such. In other words, creativity exists less in the
mind of the individual, than in the decision of the social context. Creativity is thus an
attribute “…of social systems making judgments about individuals” (Csikszentmihalyi,
1990, p. 198).
2.9.5. Straight-‘A’s’ theory

Finally, a very recent addition to the theories of the creative process is Sternberg’s (2017) straight-‘A’ model that differentiates the creative process into five overlapping phases: (1) activators (events stimulating creativity), (2) abilities (creative, analytical and practical skills); (3) amplifiers (defying the crowd, oneself and the Zeitgeist); (4) appeal to audience (convincing the audience of the creative value of the output); and (5) assessment by audience. This theory demonstrates the long, if ever completed, and arduous phases involved in the process of creativity recognition.

2.10. The Flow of (and for) Creativity

The ‘flow’ may be described as the exhilarating feeling experienced when effortlessly involved in autotelic activities, that is, doing an activity for its own sake (Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2014). During this optimal experience distractions are ignored and a lack of anxiety about losing control prevails; being in a state of flow means the individuals are absorbed by the activity, ‘losing’ themselves as they have no sense of time and place (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). As a result, “…they tend to find the activity enjoyable and intrinsically rewarding” (Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2014, p. 233). Apparently, such a psychological condition creates the desire to experience it repeatedly; this makes it a powerful motivator for moving beyond one’s own cognitive limits, skills and abilities (Hallam, 2006; Odena, 2012), unlocking, ultimately, one’s creative abilities. In fact, links between flow and the quality of creative output have been documented (Byrne, MacDonald, & Carlton, 2003).

Achieving a state of flow requires “…a balance between the challenges perceived in a given situation and the skills a person brings to it” (Byrne, MacDonald,
& Carlton, 2003, p. 280). In education, particularly, three conditions are of key importance: (1) a clear set of goals in order to direct attention and add purpose to the task; (2) a balance between perceived challenges and current skills; and (3) a clear, immediate and constructive feedback.

2.11. Assessing Creativity

Research has also focused on identifying the individuals' level of creativity. It needs to be mentioned, however, that definition and assessment, should not be conflated, even though they are linked to each other, as they form different points of focus, with the definition of creativity, in fact, specifying the elements that will be used when doing the assessment.

The list of scholars focusing on creativity assessment, either suggesting their own methods or testing existing methods and instruments, is quite long. Based on Fürst and Grin's (2018) review of the available methods for creativity measurement, the approaches to the measures are discussed with reference to questionnaire-based and task-based methods.

2.11.1. Questionnaire-based methods

Questionnaire-based measures call for self-evaluation and they include: (1) personality inventories looking for personality factors by means of which creative potential may be estimated; (2) thinking styles inventories, for example, Fürst, Ghisletta, and Lubart's (2016) generation/selection model, which claims that generation (idea production and association) and selection (idea evaluation and formalisation) processes are relevant to creativity; (3) self-reported creative activities and achievements, for example, the Creative Achievement Questionnaire (Carson,
Peterson, & Higgins, 2005), the Biographical Inventory of Creative Behaviours (Batey, 2007), the Creative Behaviour Inventory (Dollinger, 2003) and the Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (McKay, Karwowski, & Kaufman, 2017), which explicitly ask individuals to assess their creative outputs in various ways. While the reliability and validity of such assessment instruments were initially questioned, Silvia, Wigert, Reiter-Palmon, and Kaufman (2012) advocate their usage.

2.11.2. Task-based methods

On the other hand, task-based methods include measures based on the assessment of creative outputs: divergent thinking tests (e.g., Guilford, 1950) and Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) (Torrance, 1999), which include “…open-ended tasks where participants are asked to produce a large number of different and original ideas from a basic target situation” (Fürst & Grin, 2018, p. 87). This psychometric approach has been criticised (e.g., Weisberg, 2006; Simonton, 2003) for its “…weak internal consistency and inability to find large effect sizes” (Silvia et al., 2008, p. 68). Silvia et al. (2008) have developed the ‘top 2’ scoring method with raters (two or three) assessing the participants’ top two preferred answers. Adopting a psychosocial approach to creativity, Amabile (1982) has proposed the consensual assessment technique (CAT). CAT was critical in the development of the assessment tools. Its uniqueness lies in that it remains independent of creativity theories; it verifies its validity by using expert judges, coming from the domain in question, who provide scores for anything to be assessed as creative. This method was critiqued for “…its use of a single term (i.e. ‘creativity’) and its lack of explicit definition” (Fürst & Grin, 2018, p. 87). Byrne, MacDonald and Carlton (2003) used Csikszentmihalyi’s (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2014) ‘flow’ and the Amabile’s technique (1982) in order to assess the
participants' creative products. The idea of raters has been used also by Besemer and O'Quin (1986): based on the dimensions of (1) novelty, (2) resolution and (3) elaboration and synthesis, they developed the Creative Product Semantic Scale, in which the three dimensions are assessed by raters.

2.11.3. Assessment in education

As for creativity assessment in education, it has been a particular challenge and thus

...little attention has been given to the assessment of the creative process or to the quality of learners’ creative products (particularly in comparison to the wide range of assessments developed to measure individual learners’ creative potential). [...] the lack of standards or the subjectivity of judgments regarding creative processes and products [...] may make some teachers uneasy (Collard & Looney, 2014, p. 356-358).

Self- and peer-assessment have already been mentioned as aspects of students' autonomy: in order to achieve a qualitative and constructive assessment, though, there needs to be specific learning goals and clear criteria in advance that will guide students to provide feedback for improvement (OECD, 2005). It is also crucial that both students and teachers have a deeper understanding of why and how different creative works succeed (Collard & Looney, 2014).

In conclusion, the above review cannot do more than give an idea of the research that has been conducted so far; apparently, “…no single assessment instrument or test provides evidence about all the possible meanings or elements associated with the construct of creativity” (Treffinger, Young, Selby, & Shepardson, 2002, p. xiii). In addition, scepticism and disagreement have been objected to with respect to the validity and reliability of the creativity measurement tests (Hocevar, 1981; Baer, 1993a). It is even more important, however, to note that the studies mentioned do not say anything about how judgments, such as those of the teachers,
of a creative output or process quality, such as those of their students, are being shaped. This forms one of the aims of this thesis that is further developed in the Statement of the Problem section.

2.12. The Creative Teacher

Even though the characteristics, behaviour and teaching approaches of the creative educator have already been mentioned at several points above as part of the discussion, it is necessary to summarise how the literature defines the creative teacher in general. According to Grainger and Barnes (2006),

[...] Responsible creative professionals are not necessarily flamboyant performers, but teachers who use a range of approaches to create the conditions in which the creativity of others can flourish. [...] Their own creative assurance enables them to offer the children stronger scaffolds and spaces for emotional and intellectual growth (p. 212).

Creative teachers have been studied from several perspectives, for example, the personal characteristics that they demonstrate, the pedagogical stances they adopt and their involvement in the music activities, the classroom environment they cultivate, their knowledge of the subject, the activities they include and their planning for creativity in their lessons, their beliefs about creativity and their training. For example, creative teachers encourage reasonable risks, maintain close relationship with students and motivate them, promote their self-confidence, autonomy and self-regulation, as well as self- and peer-assessment; they are tolerant in ambiguities and are prepared to learn from their students (Morais & Azevedo, 2011, p. 331). Henriksen (2016) highlights mind habits and thinking skills that enable successful creative teaching, emphasising 'transdisciplinary thinking', that is, thinking that cuts across disciplinary limits, "...stressing an interconnection of subjects in all levels of..."
education [...] centered on the notion of ‘holistic education’” (Chrysostomou, 2004, p. 23). Wang and Kokotsaki (2018) report art forms and playful activities, such as the use of dramatic activities and storytelling, as the teachers’ favourite approaches to facilitating creative teaching. This relates to Collard and Looney’s (2014) description of creative teaching as “…finding new ways to ‘make learning visible’, promote inquiry, engage learners and nurture their own creativity and stretch their capacity to develop original and high-quality work” (pp. 351-352). Similar to this suggestion is Sydykova, Kakimova, Ospanov, Tobagabylova, and Kuletova’s (2018) conclusion that “…it is necessary to find new ways, forms, content and methods of familiarising students with music” in order to develop their creative potential (p. 165). This relates, also, to Freire’s (cited in Lima, Keller, & Flores, 2018) description of the teacher as a researcher, whose “…main task is to instill the investigative and researcher essence in the students” (p. 139). On the other hand, Sawyer (2004) describes the creative teacher as an improviser, who manages to balance the students’ “…interactional dynamics, their give-and-take and the fact that learning emerges from individual actions and interactions, requiring a shift in focus from the psychological analysis of individual participants to a collective, group level of analysis” (p. 17). Finally, Maley and Kiss (2018) believe that enriching personal experience is a precursor of creativity and they suggest possible avenues that teachers may explore in order to develop a more improvisational behaviour, a spontaneous teaching style, thus preparing them for the unexpected, as is the case in most classrooms. Therefore, being creative as a teacher requires a wide range of features.

2.12.1. Creative music activities

As for creative music activities, in particular, research has praised the various forms of improvisation (e.g., Addison, 1988; Fratia, 2002; Hickey, 1997; Koutsoupidou,
2008; Nolan, 1995; Rooke, 1990) and composition (e.g., Collins, 2005; Dunbar-Hall, 1999; Hogenes, van Oers, Diekstra, & Sklad, 2016; Reynolds, 2002; Rohwer, 1997; Sætre, 2011; Wiggins, 1999; Wilson, 2001), two activities that Burnard (2000) considers to be interrelated or even sometimes non-distinguishable in educational settings. Furthermore, the employment of music technology has been introduced in the last two decades in activities nurturing creativity (e.g., Triantafyllaki & Rowe, 2018; Stauffer, 2001). Finally, interdisciplinary didactic approaches, or trandisciplinary, as mentioned above, have also been suggested in order to positively affect the students’ engagement with respect to composing skills (Cuervo, 2018).

2.12.2. Creative students

While findings on creative students’ characteristics have been discussed already, it is important to mention here that studies on teachers’ perceptions of creative students show that originality and imagination are the major aspects of how they define such students, as well as curiosity and openness (Jankowska & Karwowski, 2018). In fact, Gralewski and Karwowski (2016) conclude that the students’ characteristics have a greater influence on the teachers’ perception of creativity than do other factors, such as the process and product of the activities. This, however, is alarming as it orients them towards focusing on those students possessing such traits and ignoring others that may not exhibit them (Gralewski & Karwowski, 2016).

As for research on how students perceive creativity in music education, this has revealed that the more confident they feel about their musical ability, the more creative they are (Coulson & Burke, 2013). Furthermore, the students’ tastes and the variety of rhythmic activity in a piece of music define the music they consider to be creative (Coulson & Burke, 2013).
2.12.3. The teachers' implicit beliefs

Apparently, “[t]he successful implementation of creativity in education is largely dependent on teachers' own beliefs about creativity” (Bereczki & Kárpáti, 2017). Indeed, the teachers’ implicit beliefs about creativity have been investigated extensively in a variety of subjects and domains (e.g., Chan & Yuen, 2014; Karwowski, 2010; Leikin et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2013; Alsahou, 2015; Cachia & Ferrari, 2010; Konstantinidou et al., 2014; Stone, 2015). Two of the latest systematic reviews of the literature on teachers’ perceptions of creativity (Mullet, Willerson, Lamb, & Kettler, 2016; Bereczki & Kárpáti, 2017) offer insight into this area. In particular, Mullet et al. (2016) concluded that

...although teachers value creativity, their conceptions of creativity are uninformed by theory and research on creativity. Teachers feel unprepared to foster or identify creativity in their classrooms; they equate creativity with the arts; and personal and cultural beliefs influence their perceptions of creativity and creative students (p. 9).

As for Bereczki and Kárpáti (2017), their report reveals that the teachers’ implicit beliefs are ‘double-edged’: they may enable or disable creativity development depending on a number of internal and external factors. In addition, teaching experience and training for teaching creativity may positively influence the teachers’ beliefs.

2.12.4. The music teachers' beliefs

Finally, literature, specifically that on music teachers' implicit beliefs about creativity, can hardly be described as adequate. One exception is Snell’s (2013) survey of instrumental music teachers' perceptions, in which “…participants defined creativity in instrumental music as a blend of performing and generating music, with a greater
emphasis on recreating existing repertoire” (p. vii). Another one is Zbainos and Anastasopoulou’s (2012) report on Greek music teachers’ perception, the findings of which suggest that “…creativity is associated by Greek music teachers with a natural gift that cannot be addressed in all students, and can only be partly taught in music classroom” (p. 55). In addition, music teachers do not have an explicit understanding of music creativity and their approach to the assessment of creativity are based on non-musical criteria, such as participation and enthusiasm. Fairfield’s (2010) survey of teachers’ perceptions of creative thinking reveals that they relate it to fluency, discarding originality and syntax, that is, making sense. Finally, Odena’s (2003) research on Secondary music teachers reports that “[a]ll teachers perceived the school as an environment where creativity, understood as imagination manifested in any valued pursuit (‘new’ concept), can be developed in all pupils, although they did not agree on how the word creativity was to be described” (p. 281).

Of course, this review is by no means all-inclusive; yet it demonstrates that fertile ground lies ahead for revelations regarding music teachers’ perceptions of creativity that are further discussed in Chapter 3.

2.13. Summary

The literature reviewed above identifies research that has been undertaken in the area of creativity in the last 60 years. It provides an analysis of the most important conceptualisations on creativity, both in general and in education, with respective research examples, drawing on the numerous approaches to studying creativity. In addition, it highlights the key findings and discussions on the topic: (1) the uneasy relationship between institutional education and creativity resulting from several barriers that lead to the decline of creativity in education; (2) the distinctions between ‘historical’ and ‘personal’ creativities and how the latter relates to education; (3) the
debate on creativity generality or specificity, or the somewhere in-between nature; (4) the numerous, and sometimes contrasting, personality characteristics of creative persons; (5) the determinant role of the familiar, educational and social environments for creativity development and recognition; (6) four basic theories, stage, componential, cognitive and evolutionary, regarding the sequence of thoughts that lead to creative performance with emphasis on the process; (7) the definition of creativity and how it varies according to the social and educational frameworks in which it is situated; (8) the proposed new frameworks for conceptualising work on creativity in terms of six ‘P’s’, five ‘A’s’ and seven ‘C’s’; (9) the most influential theories that have been suggested about how and why creativity may occur; (10) the optimal experience of the ‘flow state’ and how it may be achieved in education; (11) the most important questionnaire-based and task-based methods used to assess creativity; and (12) the studies on the characteristics, behaviour and teaching approaches of the creative educator, as well as teachers’ implicit beliefs in creativity. These reviewed topics provide the conceptual framework leading to the gap in knowledge, the research questions and the theoretical framework outlined below.
Chapter 3

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

3.1. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

The above review includes an overview of approaches and procedures used in the study of creativity, as well as a discussion of some of the most influential theories in the understanding of the concept. Based on this review, the following considerations emerged: there was a need for (1) an exploration of music teachers' perceptions of creativity using a qualitative approach, (2) an exploration of music teachers' approach to assessing creativity from the perspective of the ‘new’ or the ‘personal’ concept, as already discussed, across music genres and in activities other than composition and improvisation.

3.1.1. Qualitative investigation

The first consideration has to do with the methodologies adopted so far for the study of creativity. Indeed, teachers’ perceptions on creativity have been investigated broadly and extensively; however, reports on music teachers’ perceptions of, and practices for, nurturing the students’ creativity in Primary education are less common. As mentioned above, notable exceptions are Snell (2013), Zbainos and Anastasopoulou (2012), Fairfield (2010) and Odena (2003). However, the first three used a quantitative methodology, while Odena focused qualitatively on Secondary education. While I make no claims for the absolute non-existence of such qualitative studies, Primary music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity and its multiple forms have not been examined, or, at least, they have not been studied...
extensively and thoroughly. The question of music teachers’ own approach to perceiving and approaching creativity in the Primary music education using a qualitative methodology forms a gap in the literature.

3.1.2. Historical and Personal

In addition, there is the consideration regarding the perception of creativity from the perspective of ‘personal’ creativity. Studies using task-based methods for example seem to view creativity mainly in terms of the ‘historical’ or ‘Big-C’ (Craft, 2001; Gardner, 1993a), rather than ‘personal’ creativity. In contrast to the ‘historical’, the ‘personal’ creativity is less product-oriented, it acknowledges creative potential as a widely distributed capacity, it down plays the outer impact of the product, if any, and it emphasises the personal development of the educator. For these reasons, the ‘personal’ creativity concept should have broad applications in educational contexts (Odena, 2012, p. 30) and in the studies conducted for educational purposes. However, the nature of the assessed musical acts and their outputs exampled in the studies examined in the previous chapter have been assessed by raters in terms of social standards. As a result, students’ creative thinking is rated as "...an adult-regulated precursor to adult culture" (Barrett, 2006, p. 205), rather than related to the developing individual. Hence, this kind of assessment takes no account of the ‘personal’ creativity concept and ignores (1) whether the output may, in some way, be novel for the individual concerned; (2) what it means for the students; and (3) how students may benefit from it.
3.1.3. Multiple musical creativities

Another consideration relates to the perception of creativity as a single concept or condition for all kinds and activities of music. Based on Merker’s (2006) argument that “…an infinite variety of musical forms are realisable in the multiple arenas of music as a performing art” (p. 36), Burnard (2012) suggests that “…there is no single musical creativity for all musics; (…) official musical creativity is not what it claims to be, but rather reflects the disguised interests and experiences of a dominant social group” (p. 3). In other words, musical creativity may take several forms depending on the functions it serves and the environments in which it takes place. For example, it is argued that a different form of musical creativity is assumed in a dance club, in an opera theatre, in a heavy-metal arena performance and in a jazz club. Musical creativity is seen as in a dynamic flux depending on, and illustrating, the ‘taste cultures’ and ‘collective aestheticism’ of different social groups (Burnard, 2012, p. 241). The traditional concept of creativity as an ability of a few gifted individuals, such as master composers, is an exaggeration and misconception, which is insufficient to encompass the multiple creative forms enriched in contemporary societies. The word ‘creativity’ as a generic conceptualisation implies a single phenomenon which, even though it seems convenient to use often ignores the various and diverse creative musical forms that it may take. Therefore, furthering the argument for a non-unitary creativity, that is, multiple creativities, I would argue that since there are different factors and influences defining the form that each instance of musical creativity may take, there may be different influences defining the criteria on the basis of which music teachers assess, or should/should not assess the students’ creativities. In the literature cited above, it is explicit that much research has been done on creativity assessment, yet so little of it is based on making explicit the perspectives of the teachers on various kinds of activities. As Thomson (2011) claims, “…when dealing
with issues that involve the human thought process that is affected by the beliefs and values of the individual, we as researchers must understand that there’s more to the answer than a number between one and seven,” especially when dealing with what is creative and how creative that is (p. 80).

3.1.4. The experts’ standards and paradigms

Another consideration relates to Amabile’s (1982) consensual assessment technique, described also as the ‘gold standard’ of measuring creativity (e.g., Carson, 2006; Kaufman, Baer, & Gentile, 2004; and Sternberg & Lubart, 1999). Even though it is a “…clever solution for the ‘criterion problem’ in creativity research” (Plucker & Makel, 2010, p. 59), the particular technique, whether accurate or not, besides pointing to experts in the field under question as the most appropriate judges of creativity assessment, does not tell us anything about how they come to their decisions. Hickey (2001b) has applied CAT and concludes that the most reliable creativity judges are the students’ music teachers; however, what influences and motivates each teacher in their decision-making remains unanswered, which from an educational point of view is vital, as this underpins their pedagogy and approach to the students’ musical creativity. In addition, according to Kaufman and Baer (2012), “…it is, of course, possible that experts in a different time may come to different conclusions (…). Their standards and their paradigms change over time” (p. 84). It is precisely those music teachers’ standards and paradigms that may possibly cause them at different times to come to different conclusions that I consider important, yet, as the above review suggests, are unexplored.
3.1.5. Beyond improvisation and composition

Finally, even though creativity could possibly be identified in almost any musical activity (adopting the ‘personal’ creativity conceptualisation mentioned above), the term ‘creativity’ in music education is usually associated with the aspects of composition and improvisation (Running, 2008), that is, the two activities that have been the subjects of numerous studies in the assessment of creativity. Nevertheless, creativity in music education is not necessarily limited to the activities of improvisation and composition (Reimer, 2009). It could be argued that creativity, from the perspective of ‘personal’ creativity, may be found, for example, in the process of learning how to play the guitar with a cello bow, or notate music with letters and numbers instead of crotchets and beams. However, whether music teachers would assess these activities as creative is uncertain, as, for example, in the case of an alternative music notation devised by a student, it might simply be considered wrong, inappropriate for the adult music world and the student would be discouraged from doing it, with all the possible negative consequences it might have on the student's thinking. Furthermore, whether an alternative notation or bowing the guitar are regarded as creative may depend on whether they come from a 6-year old student or a 15-year old and they are not likely to be assessed equally. In other words, the criteria by which music teachers assess the quality of creative behaviour may be defined by particular elements, such as the student’s background, as well as the musical activity, something that has not been documented as yet.

3.1.6. Purpose of the study

As already demonstrated, there is limited evidence concerning music teachers’ perceptions of, and approach to, creativity in Primary education. Yet, arguably, this
group of educators are key actors in the process of cultivating students’ musical and influence students’ overall creativity, which is often misunderstood and unappreciated (Aljughaiman & Mowrer-Reynolds, 2005). In fact, the little we know in this area has to do with (1) the plethora of quantitative studies on music teachers’ beliefs about creativity; and (2) the gap in the literature concerning studies on music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity. The purpose of the current study is to provide answers regarding how music teachers in Cypriot Primary education perceive and experience their students’ musical creativity, how the school environment influences creativity in music education and how the participants perceive creative students and music educators.

3.1.7. Contribution to the field of knowledge

As Barbot and Lubart (2012) point out, even though creativity is considered “…a fundamentally important dimension that should be promoted and integrated in educational programs” (p. 231), little information is available as to how Primary music teachers perceive and assess students’ musical creativity. Scientific research on musical creativity seems to be detached from real-life school musical experience. I argue that this limitation in academic policy and the literature highlights the necessity for this study and its contribution to the field of knowledge by providing insights regarding the influences on the basis of which music teachers perceive and approach creativity and how their views of its definition and assessment influence their pedagogical approaches.
3.1.8. Key audience

A qualitative study focusing on music teachers' experience and perceptions of musical creativity in Primary education enhances this study's contribution to creativity understanding by providing valuable insights for policy-makers, curriculum designers and training programme facilitators. Cyprus provides also a novel data collections site as Forari (2005) states, “…research projects in the field of music education researching the specific context of Cyprus are extremely rare” (p. 25). Therefore, the findings of this study form a significant contribution to the literature of creativity in general and, more specifically, to our understanding of musical creativity in the Cypriot context. Furthermore, Cyprus, as a relatively recent former colony of the United Kingdom, provides space for comparative educationalists to contrast and parallel the findings from other former colonies of the UK.

3.1.9. Research questions

For these reasons, this study focused on 10 music teachers in Cyprus Primary education in order to understand:

1. How do they perceive creativity in music education?
   1.1. How do they define creativity?
   1.2. How do they define the creative student?
   1.3. How do they define the creative teacher?
   1.4. Does the school environment influence the students' and the teachers' creativity in music education?

2. How do music teachers adopt creativity in their teaching?
   2.1. What activities do they consider creative?
2.2. How do they apply these?

2.3. How do they assess students' creativity?

3.1.10. Novelty of the study

Finally, in addition to the setting, the novelty of this study lies mainly in (1) conceptual, (2) sampling, and (3) methodological choices.

(1) Previous studies on teachers’ approach to creativity, such as Koutsoupidou (2005), Dogani (2004), Fryer (1996), Diakidoy and Kanari (1999), have limited their focus to general creativity, while Odena’s study (2001a), which focuses particularly on musical creativity, takes into consideration only composition and improvisation. This current study wishes to go beyond these two activities and explore music teachers’ views of creativity in activities such as instrumental (non-improvisation) performances, sound experimentation and, generally, activities of which their output may not be generally considered part of the ‘Big C’.

(2) The study seeks to shed light on Primary education music specialists, a group of music practitioners whose voices about creativity have been mostly silent, at least in terms of musical creativity. Exceptions to this are Kokotsaki (2012), whose participants were pre-service student-teachers, Koutsoupidou (2005), whose attention focused on music improvisation, and Dogani (2004), whose interest was in music composition. There are also studies of generalist Primary teachers and music (e.g., McCullough, 2005; Stakelum, 2005; Stunell, 2007), but not specific to creativity.

(3) As is described in the methodology section below, this study’s method of data collection invited the participants to provide and discuss their own video/audio examples, either of their own teaching or coming from elsewhere (such as YouTube, colleagues’ teaching, music teaching seminars/workshops/tutorials, performances, etc), that they considered to be creative. This allowed the participants to elucidate
and develop their views about creativity grounded in actual examples that were meaningful to them, including activities that the participants are not required to teach or prevented from doing so because of their school curriculum, facilities, instrumental needs, or any other restricting factors. Even though using video of the music educators’ own teaching of improvisation and composition to explore their views of creativity has already been applied in research (Odena, 2001a), capturing the participants’ views about the quality of other musical activities has not been reported. After all, “…finding creative or fresh approaches to looking at over-familiar problems” is among the purposes of the qualitative research paradigm (Merriam; 1995, p. 52).

3.2. Summary

This study aimed to explore Cypriot Primary music teachers’ perceptions of creativity (a research area with insufficient qualitative studies both generally and, particularly, in the Cypriot context) taking into consideration their approach to assessing creativity across musical activities and genres from the perspective of the music teacher and the ‘personal’ creativity concept. Answering the two primary research questions contributes to our knowledge about how this particular educators’ group perceive: (1) creativity; (2) creative students and teachers; (3) how they adopt creativity in their teaching; and (4) the influence of the school environment on both themselves/educators and pupils. The findings may provide valuable insights for policy-makers, curriculum designers, training programme facilitators and comparative educationalists. Below I outline the framework within which this study was deployed. I provide also a summary description of the Primary music education context in Cyprus and I discuss my role as a researcher.
3.3. Theoretical Framework

3.3.1. The ‘Four P’s’ research areas

As already mentioned, there are four main approaches suggested by researchers for the study of creativity: person, process, place/environment and product. These Four ‘P’s’ are, in fact, abstract themes or research areas derived from theories developed by researchers for the study of creativity in general fields, which have also been applied to the field of music. Studies, for example, related to the person area, that is, the personality traits of creative people, have been conducted with respect to the personality and characteristics of creative musicians (e.g., Stremikis, 2002; Wubbenhorst, 1994; Cambor, Lisowitz, & Miller, 1962) and the personality characteristics of creative students (Torrance, 1963). Studies related to the process area, that is, explaining and describing the process we go through to generate a creative output, have been carried out on the composition process of classical music (Bennett, 1976), the creation process of Brazilian musicians (de Souza, Rodrigues, Alves Viana, & Cerqueira, 2000), the thought processes of expert and novice composers (Younker & Smith, 1996) and on the process of students' composition in the Secondary education (Fautley, 2005). Studies related to the place/environment area, that is, the context for the creative process (Webster, 1996), have been conducted on students' physical and motivational environment (Fryer, 1996; Beetlestone, 1998; Amabile, 2012). Finally, articles related to the product/output area, that is, identifying the qualities or characteristics that result in a product being referred to as ‘creative’, have referred to the challenging and controversial definition of creativity (Corazza, 2016; Freedman, 2010; Runco & Jaeger, 2012; Weisberg, 2015). Bringing together these four research areas, Odena (2001b and 2018) has
developed a practical framework which may be used when studying the music
teachers' views on creativity.

As Hatch and Wisniewski (1995) suggest, “…applying theoretical frameworks
from a variety of perspectives provides ways to represent commonality and
uniqueness; operating without them leaves them open to solipsism and the elevation
of the idiosyncratic” (p. 128). Therefore, in an attempt to include all relevant issues
relating to creativity and to broaden these theoretical approaches, the enquiry about
the parameters influencing music teachers' perception and assessment of creativity
in this study are examined in relation to each of these areas.

3.3.2. Odena's Four-Fold Framework

Odena's (2001b and 2018) four-fold framework was adopted in this study, although
modified, in order to look at the context of Primary music education in Cyprus from
the perspective of the music teachers. In particular, Odena's (2003) study on
Secondary music teachers' perceptions of creativity, in which he originally applied the
Four 'P's' framework, focused on the Four 'P's' from the teachers' perspective
regarding their students' composition activities. My modification includes the music
teachers' perspectives with regard to a greater range of activities, both those of their
students and their own. To be more specific, Odena's (2003) question regarding the
person theme was "What pupils did [in the composition activity] the teacher regard as
creative? What were their characteristics and attitudes?" (p. 4). My approach towards
the person theme is to identify the following: first, the characteristics of creative
students that the participants have recognised and, second, the characteristics of the
creative music educator. A similar approach was followed for the other three themes:
regarding the place theme, Odena (2003) asked, "How was the appropriate
environment for developing creativity considered by the teacher, including classroom
settings, teaching methods, music programme and school culture?" (p. 5). My approach regarding the place theme, takes into consideration how the school environment influences creativity in music education in terms of the students and the teachers. Regarding the process theme, Odena (2003) asked "How did the teacher consider the creative process of their students?" (p. 5). My approach considers both the processes the students followed, and how the teachers assess those processes, and the teachers' own practices which they apply to their teaching. Finally, regarding, the product/output, Odena (2003) asked "How was the assessment of creativity in the students' products carried out? What criteria were used in such assessment?" (p. 5). My approach contains the music teachers' assessment and definition of creativity level, with regard to the product/output of the musical activities both the students', and their colleagues'. Therefore the theoretical framework for this study, which is seen as a guide for action, instead of a theory to be tested, became:

1. Person
   1.1. Pupils/students: examples of the creative students' characteristics that the music teachers have recognised;
   1.2. Teachers: distinctions between creative and non-creative teachers and what makes them creative.

2. Process
   2.1. The teachers' practices and creative activities applied in the classroom for nurturing creativity;
   2.2. How music teachers assess the students' processes of creating music.

3. Product/output
   3.1. How music teachers define the creative product/output;
   3.2. How music teachers assess the creativity level of the musical activities' product/output.
4. Place/environment: how the school environment influences the students' and the teachers' creativity in music education.

3.4. Music in Cypriot Primary Education

It has been suggested that “…the purpose of education appears to be different according to where in the world you are in education, in what educational system you are educated and on the design of the curriculum you experience to become educated” (Luke & Gourd, 2018, abstract). Therefore, before proceeding to my role as researcher, it seems necessary to describe the broad image of the role of music education in the Cyprus Educational System (CES), Cyprus being the region in which this research was conducted.

As Tsiakkiros (2005) describes, the CES has a centralised structure and it is under the financial and legal responsibilities of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC), which has a bureaucratic structure of authority. According to Forari (2005), policy decisions are “…driven by socio-political ideologies and present these as educational ideologies, mainly in the official rhetorical curriculum” (p. 16).

Teachers and head teachers are consulted, supervised and evaluated by inspectors, who are also responsible for their promotion. Schools are provided with syllabi, curricula and textbooks that are prescribed by the MoEC and have to be followed by teachers. Head teachers undertake administrative duties and are responsible for the smooth operation of the school; they are meant to be positive, academically progressive and supportive of both the staff and students and open to the views of the community (Tsiakkiros, 2005). This openness to the community can be seen to affect directly the music teachers who are expected to present music programmes for every formal and informal school event or extra curricular activity. Finally, optional professional development programmes for in-service educators of all
subjects and stages are offered by the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute, which, however, is also responsible for the mandatory induction programmes for newly qualified teachers.

According to the ‘Document of the World Bank’ (2014), “…in Cyprus, formal requirements to become a Primary or Secondary school teacher are similar to those in top performing international education systems” (p. 11). A general Primary class teacher in Cyprus is required to be able to teach all the subjects of the National Curriculum to classes with the maximum number of students being 25 (MoEC, n.d.a). Despite this, however, most of the schools usually have specialist teachers in some subjects, including music, which is taught on two different 40-minute-periods a week (MoEC, n.d.a).

As for music teachers, Wong (2010) identifies the fact that “…there are diverse types of music teachers in the field of music education […] [and] there are usually some government regulations on the basic requirements of the qualifications of school music teachers” (p. 706). Indeed, music teachers in Cypriot public Primary education are classified according to three categories: first, those who studied general education at university, yet chose to teach music only. Second, those who studied general education and who may happen to teach music, when there is no colleague in their schools who specialises in music. Finally, the third category involves those who studied music only and thus teach only music. Clearly, what distinguishes each type is the participants’ knowledge, academic and professional backgrounds (both in terms of general education and music in particular) and the time that they devote to music and any of the other subjects, where applicable.

It is important to mention that the University of Cyprus, from which most teachers of Primary education have graduated (International Bureau of Education, 2001, p. 8), does not offer a degree in music or music education, rather a limited
number of music education non-mandatory courses are available as part of their degree in education. Thus, as Forari (2005) concludes,

"[s]ince these courses aim to offer basic musical skills to student teachers and do not have an academic perspective, it is very unlikely that an academic discourse on music education in Cyprus will be produced, which will eventually have an impact in the official education policy of Cyprus regarding music education" (p. 17).

3.5. The Researcher's Role

According to Creswell (2014), “…the role of the researcher as the primary data collection instrument necessitates the identification of personal values, assumptions and biases at the outset of the study” (p. 256). Due to my experience as a music student, teacher and PhD student, inevitably I bring certain biases to the study. The current section is intended to disclose the connection between the study and myself as the researcher, partly by declaring my motivation for conducting this study, tracing my background, my thinking and my personal assumptions that underlie this topic.

3.5.1. Personal reasons

Research is often motivated by curiosity and interest in a phenomenon or an issue that we wish to understand better and for which we wish to offer suggestions for improvement. Initial thoughts regarding the formation of the above questions have been coloured by personal interest in the subject of musical creativity; that is, in addition to my potential original contribution to the field of musical knowledge and general creativity, I do have my personal reasons for espousing this line of inquiry: my academic and artistic background in improvisation, composition and music technology, my passion in my profession for music technology, improvisation and guitar teaching in the Cyprus music high schools.
3.5.2. Being an Insider

Confessing my personal reasons for proposing this study brings forth the issue of conducting a research study in one’s immediate work-setting, where the researcher shares the identity, language and common professional experiential base with the participants. According to Kanuha (2000), studies conducted with populations, communities and identity groups of which the researcher is also a member give rise to the ‘native’, ‘indigenous’, or ‘insider’ (p. 439) or ‘backyard’ research (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). In other words, one’s intimate knowledge of the group being researched, prior to entry into the group, makes one an insider or an outsider: the more intimate the knowledge of the group, the more the researcher is considered an insider and vice versa (Griffith, 1998, p. 361).

Several authors (e.g., Asselin, 2003; Mercer, 2007; Taylor, 2011) have highlighted the following advantages and the limitations of conducting insider research: due to the researchers familiarity with the setting under study, they may have easy and regular access to the research site and possibly to better-informed participants; trust and rapport may have already been established between the researcher and the prospective participants; the researcher’s prior knowledge of native language, behaviour and relevant patterns make him ‘empirically literate’ (Taylor, 2011); therefore, the insider may be in a privileged position easily to collect and accurately interpret the data.

In contrast, the researcher’s familiarity with the setting may generate misleading assumptions about the environment or culture under study; taking for granted already-established beliefs or views may result in ignoring part of the data, misinterpreting it, or generally in preventing the researcher from detaching his own past experiences and emotions from those participating (Asselin, 2003; Merton, 1972). In addition, familiarity with the setting may very well mean that participants
have already formed views, preconceptions or expectations about the researcher, which may not be positive; as a result, this may limit or alter the information that they provide (Asselin, 2003; Mercer, 2007). Furthermore, the role confusion or imbalance of power, that is, perceiving or responding to the participants’ information from the stance of a researcher, is also a pitfall, particularly in cases in which participants may already be familiar with the researcher in a different role, such as that of educator, colleague, manager, or employee (Asselin, 2003).

From the foregoing discussion, both perspectives have their advantages and disadvantages. Each position is defined by who the researcher is and what they know about the group under research. However, our social statuses and identities are not always stable, nor solitary; they are “...relative, cross cut by other differences and often situational and contingent” (Mercer, 2007, p. 3). Merton (1972) advances the belief that the two doctrine boundaries are “permeable” (p. 37), and Deutsch (1981) takes it even further, suggesting, “…we are all multiple insiders and outsiders” (p. 174) or, according to Mercer (2007), temporary insiders and outsiders.

To conclude, as Wolcott (1999) argues, "...there is no monolithic insider view (...) every view is a way of seeing, not the way of seeing" (p. 137). An "...insider research is not faultless, nor should one presume that as an insider, one necessarily offers an absolute or correct way of seeing and/or reading the culture under investigation" (Taylor, 2011, p. 6). Furthermore, Mercer (2007) reminds us that being an insider "...does not, of itself, make the data any richer" (p. 5). Arguably, though, a naive insider will produce different knowledge from that of an outsider and vice versa. Therefore what I consider to be important, whether as an insider or outsider, is to be aware of the pitfalls of each position and cautiously make decisions about the whole research process in an effort to maintain the study’s validity. Neutrality is the byword. As Dwyer and Buckle (2009) posit, “…the core ingredient is not insider or outsider status but an ability to be open, authentic, honest, deeply interested in the
experience of one's research participants and committed to accurately and adequately representing their experience” (p. 59). Thus, in an effort to maintain an accurate and adequate representation of my experience, below I present the reader with my professional and academic background and the perceptions that I bring into the research.

3.5.3. Professional and academic backgrounds

In terms of my professional and academic background, as partially stated in the personal reasons paragraph, since 2012 I have been employed as a part-time music improvisation and music technology teacher in the Cypriot newly formed music high schools, as a general music teacher in the Cypriot all-day compulsory Primary schools, as a guitar teacher in the Cypriot adult education centres, as well as a teaching fellow at the University of Cyprus. My position requires teaching a course ‘Introduction to Music Education in the Primary School’ (obligatory for all undergraduates of the Department of Education). This is in addition to observing and providing feedback to students teaching music as part of the course ‘School Practicum for Teachers III’ at the University.

As for my academic background, I earned my bachelor’s degree in ‘Contemporary Music Writing and Production’ from the Berklee College of Music, my first master’s degree in ‘Scoring for Film and Multimedia’ from the New York University and my second in ‘Advanced Musical Studies’ from the Royal Holloway University of London.

Therefore my background as student and teacher involves my participation in past educational and current work experiences that tie directly to my research topic (i.e. musical creativity) and its objective (i.e. how musical creativity is defined and assessed). Although every effort has been made to ensure objectivity, I understand
that my background may shape the way I view and understand the collected data and how I interpret them. As a qualitative researcher I understand that my background is “...part of the research process and thus affect[s] the results” (Thomson, 2011, p. 80). Thereby, as Creswell (2014) suggests, I recognise the need to be explicit about how these experiences may, consciously or not, make me “…lean toward certain themes, to actively look for evidence to support my positions and to create favourable or unfavourable conclusions about the (...) participants” (p. 237).

Below I present a personal account that reflects an open and honest description of my own perceptions of what creativity has come to be for me, what expectations I have about the influences that may define the music teachers’ approach to defining and assessing creativity and how bracketing is involved in this study.

### 3.5.4. Reflexivity

My perception of the definition and assessment of musical creativity has been shaped both by my educational and professional background, and my reading and review of the literature. As a music student involved in Greek and English pop, rock and American mainstream jazz guitar performance, as well as song writing, music composition, film scoring and arrangement/orchestration, my understanding of musical creativity was the epitome of the monolithic product-based Western perspective, that is, composition and, especially, improvisation are the only two musical creative activities; any music activity not including improvisation or composition was classified as not creative. However, my understanding of musical creativity has changed dramatically since I started teaching professionally, especially in Primary education, as well as when I started reviewing the literature. Researchers, such as Hallam (2006), Welch (2005), Kaufman and Beghetto (2008, 2009a, 2009b), Meusburger (2009), Runco (1996), Burnard (2012), Green (2002), have greatly
contributed to reorienting my perception of musical creativity from a singular understanding to a more pluralistic notion that encompasses music-making activities beyond improvisation, composition and orchestration, such as classical music performance and 'Djing'. Theory of musical creativity currently acknowledges that the simplest transmission and reception of musical ideas, even without an audience, to whatever level, he/she, is in some sense a creative act. Based on this understanding of creativity, in Appendix XIII you may find what I consider to be influential in defining and assessing a musical creative output or behaviour.

3.6. Summary

Odena's (2001b and 2018) Four Fold framework (an accumulated version of the person, the place, the process and the product areas of research) has been adopted in this study as a guide for action. It has been modified, however, in order to examine the participants’ perspectives of the Four ‘P’s’ both in terms of the students and themselves. In addition, I have outlined briefly the role and the structure of the music education in Cyprus and, finally, I have provided information about my background and my role as a researcher. Next, I discuss and justify the system of methods I chose to use to answer my research questions.

3.7. Methodology

3.7.1. Research design

The purpose of this study is to explore music teachers' perception of creativity in the Cypriot Primary education. As exemplified above, qualitative studies of Primary music teachers' experience of, beliefs in, and approach to, the students' and their
own musical creativity, are quite sparse. Exposing the music teachers' voice was at the core of this study.

3.7.2. Philosophical worldviews

Scientific research requires, then, a set of principles, or worldviews, defined by Guba (1990) as “...a basic set of beliefs that guide action” (p. 17) or “…as a general philosophical orientation about the world and the nature of research that a researcher brings to a study” (Creswell, 2014, pp. 35-36). These worldviews are organised into scientific perspectives that encompass the values, assumptions, beliefs and, generally, the knowledge about the nature of reality (i.e., ontology), the nature of knowledge or how to arrive at knowledge (i.e., epistemology), the role of what is valuable (i.e., axiology) and the methods and processes (i.e., methodology) that will be applied in the research (Gelo, 2012, p. 111). Consequently, and very importantly, these values, assumptions and beliefs conjure up the prism through which readers will understand how the outcomes should be regarded and why they should be taken seriously (Crotty, 1998, p. 2).

Nevertheless, despite the pivotal role of philosophical worldviews in the practice of research, they are not often mentioned in research studies (Slife & Williams, 1995). As Creswell (2014) suggests,

> [i]n planning a study, researchers need to think through the philosophical worldview assumptions that they bring to the study, the research design that is related to this worldview and the specific methods or procedures of research that translate the approach into practice (p. 34).

My own approach to practice is outlined below.
3.7.3. Ontology

According to Crotty (1998): “…all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (p. 42). Such an ontological claim is also linked to what I consider to be valuable and ethical in the research planning and implementation and to what I value with regard to the results and how to write about them. According to Aliyu, Musa Singhry, Adamu, Mu’awuya, and Abubakar (2015), researchers declaring their approach to making decisions based on their beliefs help “…to set and clarify the guiding tone and rigour for action in research” (p. 13).

3.7.4. Axiology

In a naturalistic methodology, according to Carr and Kemmis (1986), the researcher acts as a participant observer, whose values and beliefs will be reflected in the study results. There is a consensus sought among the researcher and the participants and thus truth is co-constructed. A framework for ethical practice is described below in order to achieve a balanced and honest representation of views. My ontological and axiological leanings served as a map for my epistemological approach.

3.7.5. Epistemology

My epistemological profile as a prospective researcher espouses certain definitions and approaches and, inevitably, excludes others. As mentioned above, I assert that all knowledge is contingent upon human practices, therefore the basic generation of a definition of creativity and the approach to teaching and assessing it “…is always social, arising in and out of interaction with a human community. (…) Human beings
construct meanings as they engage with the world they are interpreting” (Creswell, 2014, p. 38). This social construction assumption relates to the temporal and social frameworks of the definition of creativity in which its meaning and learning are socially constructed. It shares Csikszentmihalyi’s (1988) System Approach mentioned above, holding that creativity cannot be isolated from the individuals’ social and historical milieu as its meaning is constructed as a result of interaction with social influences. This constructivist view forms the epistemology, “…the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective” (Crotty, 1998, p. 3) that lies behind this study. In other words, learning is seen as a social activity, whereby knowledge is formed through the learners’ active interaction with the society (Webster, 2011).

The study also takes into consideration the interdependent interaction between the researcher and the participants, the complex and unquantifiable nature of reality, as well as the context specificity of its output. Furthermore, it considers the influence of (1) my background and beliefs as a researcher and, thus, all decisions taken, such as the theoretical framework and research design, (2) the chosen participants and (3) the place and time the study was conducted (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 83).

3.7.6. Constructionism and phenomenology

Constructionism, as “…a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know” (Crotty, 1998, p. 3), is intertwined, among other theoretical perspectives, with phenomenology, “…in which the researcher identifies the ‘essence’ of human experiences concerning a phenomenon, as described by participants in a study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 15). The researcher seeks the essence of the participants' lived
experience through interviewing. In fact, examining the essence of a lived experience is what distinguishes phenomenology from other epistemologies (Van Manen, 1997).

Essence, however, is “...inconceivable apart from consciousness” (Husserl, 1964, p. 144) as human consciousness gives meaning to it. Consciousness thus plays a crucial role in mediating ourselves with respect to our surroundings, since we would not be able to understand and make meaning of the world without it (Moran, 2005). This approach to knowledge and the role of consciousness are important for creating meaning and fit this study’s goal as the music teachers' views of the concept of creativity, and how that concept is created, are at the core of this thesis.

Research on the music teachers' perception of creativity cannot be subjected to clinical trials or deterministic assessment due to its fluidity as a topic. Therefore, as an exploratory research that wishes to go deep into the issue of the nature of creativity, as defined by a particular group of practitioners, and to explore its nuances through a descriptive set of data, the most viable and adequate instrument for studying such a topic is through interviews. However, this is not to argue that this is the only way to gain insight into the topic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 120); my philosophical worldview and ontological leaning point to phenomenology as an epistemology that is more suited than others.

Phenomenology has gained popularity within the past decades and is already well tested in the social sciences (Moran, 2005). Strauss and Corbin (1998) describe it as “...a way of thinking about and studying social reality” (p. 3) with its preferred methods involving prolonged interviews, usually with a small number of selected participants. Prolonged interviews allow the researchers “...to put behaviour in context and provide access to [participants'] understanding” (Seidman, 2013, p. 19): how they perceive, describe, judge and remember their experience (Patton, 2002, p. 104).
Research guided by phenomenology strives to understand the interviewees’ experience from their point of view (Seidman, 2013). However, genuine understanding of the other person may never be perfectly possible (Schutz, 1967). The goal, then, is “…to come as close as possible to understanding the true ‘is’ of our participants’ experience” (Seidman, 2013, p. 17). Researchers, thus, need to hold their own beliefs and presuppositions (Groenewald, 2004; Van Manen, 1997) employing the idea of phenomenological reduction (Husserl, 1964; Spiegelberg, 1982) or bracketing, that is, “…to liberate oneself from the captivation in which one is held by all that one accepts as being the case” (Cogan, 2018). In order to achieve this, researchers need to be aware of their own presuppositions and assumptions when collecting and analysing data, attempting to see things with no prejudgment and preconceptions.

In an attempt to engage deeply with the participants and “…to deal with [their] inner experiences unprobed in everyday life” (Merriam, 2002, p. 7), I decided that in-depth conversations, asking primarily open-ended questions that would allow the participants to reconstruct and reflect on their experience, would be the ideal method of data collection. Transforming the participants’ lived experience into a textual expression of its essence (Van Manen, 1990, p. 36) gave me the opportunity to shed light on the phenomenon of interest: how music teachers in Cypriot Primary education perceive the students’ creativity. As already mentioned, knowledge is seen as being co-constructed among people who are active in a particular field; therefore, my attempt was to understand the phenomenon from the point of view of those who experience it and to provide description of human experience as the individuals themselves have experienced it (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, p. 96).

After collecting data from individuals who have experienced the phenomenon under study, systematic descriptive techniques were then applied to understand in depth the essence of their perception of the phenomenon: how the participants’
experience contributed to their perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity in music education.

Finally, it is important to recall Keen’s (1975) concern about phenomenological studies: “…unlike other methodologies, phenomenology cannot be reduced to a ‘cookbook’ set of instructions. It is more an approach, an attitude, an investigative posture with a certain set of goals” (p. 41). This is by no means to declare my reluctance to focus on specific guidelines in phenomenological methodology; on the contrary, being aware of the absence of a ‘cookbook’ procedure, I am sensitive to the number of issues that need to be addressed and thus a number of steps suggested by Hycner (1985) were followed so as to be as close to the phenomenon as possible: transcription, bracketing, data familiarisation, delineating units of meaning, reliability check (peer review), determining themes, summarising the major findings regarding the participants, member checking and modifying major findings (if necessary), identifying themes for all the interviews (Hycner, 1985). All these steps are discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

3.8. Framework for Ethical Practice

Ethical concerns in research may be found at every stage of a study: from a clear research conception, ambition and clarity regarding the problem posed, to data collection, analysis and implications of findings (Gregory, 2003). Thus, in order to operate within an ethical framework of respect for every one engaged in, or related to the study, attention was paid to the tenets and principles stipulated in the British Educational Research Association code of conduct (BERA, 2018) and in the British Psychological Society (BPS) code of human research ethics (beta.bps.org, 2009). In addition, ethical guidelines and procedures of the UCL Institute of Education were adhered to.
In particular, the interview process was made explicit in the approach letter (Appendix I) as suggested by the BPS code of human research ethics (beta.bps.org, 2009, pp. 18-19) and by a personal phone call inviting participation, making it clear that there would be neither trick questions, nor would the discussion be used to test the participants’ knowledge. It was also clearly stated and emphasised that the aim of the inquiry was completely non-judgmental. Next, the participants’ voluntary informed consent to be involved in the study was obtained from each interviewee and they were informed about their right to withdraw their participation whenever they chose to (BERA, 2018, p. 18). It should also be emphasised that during the interviews, care was taken at all times to ensure that the participants would feel comfortable with the discussion and with the recollection of the aspects of their musical backgrounds, beliefs and practices. My intention, and obligation (Orb, Eisenhauer, & Wynaden, 2001) as an aspiring qualitative researcher, was to anticipate any potential risks, involved in the interview process, thus interviews were conducted informally in the participants’ chosen convenient settings in which they felt comfortable. In addition, caution and sensitivity were applied throughout the analysis of each participant’s interview and their anonymity as well as complete confidentiality regarding their recorded interview material were ensured (BERA, 2018, p. 21; beta.bps.org, 2009, p. 2). In short, the present research was designed according to the UCL Code of Conduct for Research and followed the guidelines suggested by BERA (2018) and the BPS (beta.bps.org, 2009). My goal was to undertake a study that abided to the highest ethical standards, not just by following the letter, but also the spirit of the tenets and principles too.
3.9. Recruiting the Participants

According to Hycner (1985) “…the phenomenon dictates the method (not vice-versa) including even the type of participants” (p. 285). As the study was not concerned with statistical generalisability – after all, “…particularity rather than generalisability is the hallmark of good qualitative research” (Creswell, 2014, p. 253) – the choice of participants was non-probabilistic. The participants were purposefully selected according to the needs of the study (Morse, 1991) following a ‘maximum variation’ approach that was based on the participants’ educational and professional background. It is also important to mention that the needs of the study called for some preparation and cooperation from the participants; when using random sampling though, “…the researcher has no control over the choice of informants, [and] it is possible that quiet, uncooperative or inarticulate individuals may be selected” (Shenton, 2004, p. 65). Therefore, in order to meet the standards of ‘good’ informants (Spradley, 1979), the participants needed to be “…qualified, experienced and currently involved in teaching” (Odena, 2001a, p. 110). In addition, following Morse’s (1991) suggestion about the selection of participants, a good informant is “…one who is articulate, reflective and willing to share with the interviewer” (p. 127).

Therefore, the participants needed to suit the methodology, meet the needs of the study and ensure representativeness in order to be able to answer my questions and produce and document findings that would be regarded as dependable and trustworthy. The goal was to obtain insights into a particular group of individuals. The participants were thus purposefully selected in order to generate understanding of the underlying concept to the greatest possible extent. Therefore, since my focus is on Primary music teachers' perception of creativity and “…based on my [the researcher's] judgment and the purpose of the research” as Groenwald (2004, p. 45) suggests, participants were intentionally selected.
Regarding the approach I adopted in order to recruit the participants this included a combination of convenience, snowball/chain and opportunistic techniques. In particular, in order to identify the participants that would be invited to participate I relied on my personal acquaintances and on my colleagues’ suggestions but, mostly, on my judgment of who had had adequate experience relating to the purpose of this research. I started collecting data from a music teacher whom I knew, who fitted the characteristics I had set, and who was easily accessible and available. She then recommended other music teachers that she considered to be good informants and they, in turn, recommended others. The first contact with them was via the telephone to describe and discuss the purpose of the study in order to confirm their interest and to identify their suitability. I then proceeded with sending them the approach letter (Appendix I) as a formal informative approach. Attention was always paid to avoid any diminishing of the homogeneity of the groups formed, or risking the data’s intellectual credibility. Finally the participants were enlisted as to whether they were (1) general teachers, or (2) general teachers specialised in music, or (3) music teachers (for more details about these categories please refer to paragraph 3.9.6 Participants from each category).

### 3.9.1. Defining the experienced teacher

However, one more parameter needs to be clarified here: I was more interested in those who “...have had experiences relating to the phenomenon to be researched” (Kruger, 1988, p. 150) and this generated the question of who was to be considered an experienced teacher. A logical answer would be: those who have a considerable amount of teaching years. Still, though, the question, ‘what is assumed to be a considerable number of teaching years’ remains unanswered. In order to deal with this issue, I had to define what I mean by the experienced teacher. Even though not
explicitly stated, Vonk and Schras (1987) define educational experience as “…the teachers' professional development, the period from beginner to full professional” (p. 95). According to Hoyle and John (1995), professional development is “…the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will improve the service they provide to clients” (p. 17). Even though the context in which Hoyle and John (1995) frame professional development is not education, nonetheless, knowledge, skills, attitudes and values were considered for this study as important aspects determining professional development. Therefore, in order to answer the question of who was to be considered a professionally developed music teacher, research has shown that

the period from beginner to full professional, averages out at about seven years. The practice experienced and the behaviour developed during these seven years are considered to be of major influence on their teaching behaviour during the rest of their career (Vonk & Schras, 1987, p. 95).

3.9.2. The participants' portraits

The portrait of the participants for this study was sketched according to their full-time status and a minimum of seven years of teaching experience in Cypriot public state schools. This clear specification of the type of participants chosen for the research resulted in a selective process; Sandelowski, Holditch-Davis, and Harris (1992) define this approach as the “…decision made prior to beginning a study to sample subjects according to a preconceived, but reasonable initial set of criteria” (p. 302) in order to maintain a certain homogeneity amongst participants.
3.9.3. Number of participants

The question coming up next was the number of participants. However, “…guidelines for determining non-probabilistic sample sizes are virtually nonexistent” (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006, p. 60). Researchers (Baker, Edwards, & Doidge, 2012), conclude that

“…it depends”: key considerations are methodological and epistemological perspectives, as well as practical issues, such as the “…time available, institutional committee requirements, (...) the judgment of the epistemic community in which a student or researcher wishes to be or is located” (p. 42).

The old rule, as Morse (1995) observes, is that “…saturation is the key to excellent qualitative work” (p. 147), that is, the point at which collected analysed data do not provide any new notable material that will inform the results. However, saturation is resilient and, to a great extent, subjective; how and when one decides that no more new information could be derived from collected data depends on the data complexity, the knowledge and experience of the researcher and the number of people reviewing the data (Ryan & Bernard; 2003). Consequently, stating in advance the exact number of participants needed to achieve saturation was inappropriate; as Guest et al. (2006) mention, “…saturation is reliant on researcher qualities and has no boundaries” (p. 77). Therefore I counted (1) on my dedication to do the best in terms of my knowledge and abilities to achieve valid and convincing saturation; (2) on my peer analysts who reviewed the data; and (3) on my supervisors’ guidance and advice.
3.9.4. Setting and specificity of context

It was, also, important to identify the specificity of the context and the reasons for choosing this particular geographical location for this study. As Arcury and Quandt (1999) explain, "...the process used to locate and recruit participants in a qualitative study is important for controlling bias and for efficiently obtaining a representative sample" (abstract). The two determinant factors, according to Hodgkin and Fresle (2004), for selecting the site of a study are (1) the objectives of the research and (2) the pragmatic factors, such as travel distance, availability of participants and access to communities (p. 57). Therefore, the choice of the setting for this study was shaped by my attempt to choose a location that would provide me with rich information data to achieve the study’s objectives, also taking into consideration the various practical factors, as well as other limitations, such as financial constraints, that I would encounter as a student. In addition, however, Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba (2011) hold that "...researchers must understand the social context and the culture in which the data are produced to accurately reflect what the data actually mean to the study" (p. 109). Consequently, as a part-time MPhil/PhD student, whose base for living and working as a music teacher in Primary and Secondary education since 2012 has been Cyprus, the place seemed to be the most suitable and desirable setting, in terms of practicality, for the achievement of this study’s objectives.

3.9.5. Procedures for selection and recruitment of participants

The choice of the type of the school, that is, public instead of private, lies in the fact that public schools are part of a highly centralised educational system and would provide me with a clearly bounded group of participants. In contrast to public schools, private schools in Cyprus employ their teachers regardless of the MoEC employment
procedures. As for the selection and recruitment procedures of the MoEC, the World Bank (2014) reports that “…formal requirements to become a Primary or Secondary school teacher [in Cyprus] are similar to those in top performing international education systems” (p. 12), that is, a recognised four-year Bachelor’s degree in education, equivalent to the BAQTS in the UK (World Bank, 2014, p. 12). Therefore maintaining a certain professional homogeneity was a priority for choosing as the participants for this study public education teachers located in Nicosia.

In addition, I was aware that the specificity of the context in Cyprus, as of course any site selection for research, raises limitations or particularities, such as the society’s approach to musical habits and celebrations and the different structure of the curriculum. Therefore the findings that emerged from this study about creativity are placed contextually in Cyprus; in Chapter 5 they also are discussed with respect to how they relate to other researchers’ findings and what implications for practice and theory they have.

3.9.6. Participants from each category

In order to gain insight into the phenomenon under study and look at it from different angles, participants from each category of music teachers in Cyprus Primary education were recruited, i.e., (1) General education teachers who teach music only; (2) General education teachers who may teach music, along with other subjects; and (3) Music teachers, who teach only music. Repeated attempts were made to find suitable volunteers for the third category. Three persons were approached, but they preferred not to participate: the first two gave lack of time as their reason and politely withdrew their interest. The third person explained that such a commitment would be very stressful for her, even though I tried to explain that such a feeling would not be caused and that, at any time, she had the option to opt out.
After the three rejections I tried through various contacts to find one more participant with these characteristics. Eventually, one of the music teachers whom I had initially contacted, but could not participate because of lack of time, agreed to be interviewed. However, in the meantime another volunteer came up. Consequently, I ended up with four participants in that category eager to take part as I did not want to turn them down, no matter if the data saturation might have already been reached.

To sum up the participants were categorised as follows:

1. General education teachers who teach music only: ELN, KSN, KZS
2. General education teachers who may teach music (along with other subjects): SKR, CPA, STL
3. Music teachers (who teach only music): TBR, NGL, KKS, MRA

3.9.7. The choice of interview approach

The methodology consisted of semi-structured interviews about how the participants perceived and assessed a process and/or an output as creative within a spectrum of musical genres, activities, situations and student levels, as well as discussions about the various theoretical issues concerning creativity that emerged in the literature review, such as domain specificity or generality, characteristics of creative students. Even though theorists, such as Brenner (1981), argue for exact questions and ordering of the standardised prompt, my decision to use a semi-structured type of interview was based on the fact that the intention of phenomenology “…is to understand the phenomena in their own terms — to provide a description of human experience as it is experienced by the person herself” (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, p. 96), something that is best achieved through a semi-structured type of interview that “…allows respondents to express themselves at some length, but offers enough shape to prevent aimless rambling” (Wragg, 1984, p. 184). In addition, the interactive/conversational approach provided space for the interviewer to adjust the
phrasing and the order of the questions, as well as the themes to be discussed (Smith, 1995). Interaction, however, as an attempt to encourage the participants to elaborate their responses is a double-edged sword; being sociable in order to encourage the participants perhaps to say more than they had intended to say, may bring into question the validity of the research (Mercer, 2007). Therefore, whether adopting structured, semi-structured or unstructured interview approach, researchers need to be cautious so as to avoid manipulating the participants by exposing or imposing their own thoughts, assumptions and beliefs on them, as this would most possibly contaminate the data (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003).

3.9.8. The interview protocol

Up to this point, the interview protocol was deliberately and carefully designed on the basis of the theoretical approaches stated in the literature review to elicit the music teachers’ perception of, and approaches to, creativity. In addition, questions stimulated by the participants’ responses that could not have been predicted in advance, but were considered important for the study’s outcome, were added to the protocol; interviewees who did not answer any additional questions were contacted subsequently to update their views, if necessary, as this was a condition of the consent form. Interviewing took the shape of an evolutionary/dynamic model in which each completed, transcribed and preliminarily assessed interview, in terms of whether the conversation rendered new points for discussion or shed light on more focused or intriguing questions that could serve the study’s ends (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 881), informed the next. This contributed also to the validity of the study, which was dealt with iteratively throughout the whole research process (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002, p. 17); as Court (2013) suggests, “…the very
nature of qualitative research invites ongoing examination (...) and adjustment of the primary research instrument” (p. 8). Finally, all participants were provided with their individual transcripts for verification, reflection and further comments.

3.9.9. Information for prospective participants and consent form

“The informed consent requirement in human participant research exists to protect the self-determination and autonomy of the participants and to protect them from the malfeasance of researchers” (Ogloff & Otto, 1991, p. 239). In order to ensure the voluntary and acknowledged involvement of the participants, both information for prospective participants and consent form were carefully composed to make adequate disclosure of information regarding “...the purpose of the study, the procedures to be carried out, the risks, discomforts and inconveniences of a proposed intervention (...) and the benefits to the subjects and to others.” (Macklin, 1999, p. 85). In particular, emphasis was placed on: (1) my role as a researcher and learner, rather than that of an inspector and judge; (2) the confidentiality of the data and anonymity of the participants; and (3) the utilisation of the study’s data and findings. These details were added in order to ease the participants’ possible concerns, to correct any misperceptions about the researcher/interviewer and the study and to contribute ultimately to the collection of true data about the phenomenon of musical creativity and its assessment, satisfying both ethical and legal requirements. Furthermore, in order to ensure that prospective participants understood the purpose and procedure of the study, Ogloff and Otto (1991) suggest comprehensive explanation of the information contained in the form should be provided, a suggestion I followed.
3.9.10. The data collection procedure

The procedure for data collection used in this study can be characterised as a variation of the visual elicitation technique (VET), one of several ways of using video for research (Jewitt, 2012). The VET is based on the idea of including non-textual elements in the interview process “…as a useful tool both to triangulate between different information sources and potentially to bring different insights into the research” (Bignante, 2010, p. 2). The VET employed in this study drew upon the works of Silvers (1977), Lennon (1996) and Odena (2001a), who explored their participants’ thinking as they reflected on their own choice of video-recorded practices and actions. In general, as Allett (2010) explains, elicitation methods (such as videos, photographs, diagrams, pictures, objects and music) are considered “…routes to gain contributions that would usually be difficult to achieve and explore areas/themes that may only receive partial or muted response in the qualitative interview” (p. 3). Due to time restrictions, sensitivity and practicality issues, as well as a desire to use an innovative method, this study varied the type of VET previously employed by using existing videotaped material as vignettes to prompt discussion and provide the basis for reflection. In particular, VET is a highly time-consuming activity, both for researchers and informants (Henry & Fetters, 2012; Bignante, 2010; Odena, 2001a). Furthermore, as Heath, Hindmarsh, and Luff (2010) acknowledge, “…even with a clear understanding of the form of data required, few researchers are able to gather good audio-visual data when first entering a setting” (p. 38). In terms of sensitivity issues, finding participants willing to be video-recorded is difficult as such a technique may be viewed as an invasion of privacy because of its ability to capture “…images or information that participants would not want strangers to see” (Richards & Morse, 2012, p. 131); thereby inflicting stress or embarrassment, and changing the participants' behaviour (Richards & Morse, 2012). In addition, research settings such
as schools are considered ‘closed access groups’ (Hornsby-Smith, 1993) to which access has to be negotiated from a large and disparate collection of people, such as teachers, head teachers, the Ministry of Education and the children’s parents. Finally, in terms of the methodological innovation, capturing the music teachers’ views about the quality of a variety of musical activities through VET has not been reported. This may be another contribution to the field of musical knowledge and, generally, to qualitative research due to the alternative data-collection method.

Taking the previous points into consideration, the participants in this study were initially invited to bring examples of musical activities that they considered to be creative, either their own or of others (Appendix XI). This approach set the participants’ perceptions, grounded in actual examples, and formed the starting points for the discussions to gain insight into the meanings behind the activities of their choices, which carried implicit theories and views of what were perceived to be really meaningful for them. Furthermore, as Pitterson, Ortega-Alvarez, Streveler, and Adams (2016) explain, tasking participants with selecting a visual object in order to answer a particular question and then discuss it gives participants autonomy and the chance for more engagement with the research process than a typical interview would allow (p. 5). Packard (2008) asserts also that the utilisation of visual methods “…democratises the research relationship through the process of mutual discovery and refinement of the research agenda” (p. 65). As is the case with photo-elicitation, using the videos as artifacts to elicit the meanings and experiences embodied in them allows participants to make connections with personal experiences or beliefs (and the meanings associated with these) that can be difficult to elicit using other interview techniques (Hatten, Forin, & Adams, 2013). At this point it is important to mention that the participants were not necessarily required to have taken the videos themselves, primarily for logistical reasons. This allowed the participants to overcome issues and complications, such as, (1) having to collect consent forms and
permissions from the school and students’ parents; and (2) needing to find a camera or have the skills and knowledge to appropriately use the equipment and later edit it, if necessary.

Furthermore, additional videos of musical activities were supplied to the participants by me to provide points for further discussion, and on the basis of which they were asked to reflect on their opinions about creativity, thus extending their answers in the interviews to commenting on complementary specific cases. The videos, both those of the participants and those provided by me (Appendix XI), took in some way the form of vignettes, which Hazel (1995) defines as “…concrete examples of people and their behaviours on which participants can offer comment or opinion” (p. 2). Videotaped vignettes, instead of narrative, have also been used in other studies, such as those of Cohen and Strayer (1996) and Leierer, Strohner, Leclere, Cornwell, and Whitten (1996). The complementary video vignettes in this study facilitated the discussion of a range of musical activities that participating teachers might, or might not for some reason, apply in their lessons (e.g., lack of time, limited school facilities, the music teachers’ weaknesses resulting from lack of experience and knowledge of particular activities, the students’ limited music background, or any other circumstances). This generated a systematic comparison of the participants’ responses to different musical activities. Using the interview protocol as a guide, the participants were invited to comment on and discuss the reason(s) and the meanings they attributed to their choices, as well as raising issues, making suggestions and validating the choice of the additional examples in terms of their applicability in the Cypriot music educational environment. Thus ambiguities regarding the objectivity and appropriateness or suitability of the complementary videos were addressed, first, because the videos showed activities suggested by the National Music Syllabus of Cyprus (MoEC, n.d.b) and, second, because the participants were also asked to validate the videos in terms of appropriateness. In
addition, contaminating the informants’ interpretations of musical creativity with my own understanding was avoided as the additional videos were offered for discussion only after the participants' choices had been discussed. My approach sought to prioritise the participants’ perceptions, delegating authority over the musical activities of their examples. Therefore, while the additional videos might have ensured a baseline for comparison, this version of VET gave freedom and creative control to the participants to choose or create what they considered to be creative musical activities, as well as time to consider thoughtfully what they would subsequently discuss in the interview.

3.9.11. Visual methodologies

Cultural studies, social anthropology, geography and sociology are some of the first disciplines that developed visual methodologies (Knowles & Sweetman, 2004). However, "...the use of visual research methods has become increasingly widespread throughout the social sciences" (Knoblauch, Baer, Laurier, Petschke, & Schnettler, 2008, p. 1), including educational research (Goldman, Erickson, Lemke, & Derry, 2007), in which it has been used, for example, to explore the interaction between pupils and teachers (Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010, p. 21). This, according to Emmison and Smith (2000), is a consequence of post-modernism, whereby “...the visual has become more important as a pivotal aspect of social life” (p. ix) which has caused, in turn, the disengagement of social sciences from purely verbal or written language (Allen, 2009). In particular, using visual stimuli to trigger responses beyond words has been of much interest during the last two decades (Frith, Riley, Archer, & Gleeson, 2005) as, in addition to reducing misunderstandings, it provides more quality and comprehension to the interviews by evoking deeper elements of human consciousness than words do and thus different kinds of
information (Harper, 2002, p. 13). After all, as Hatten, Forin, and Adams (2013) argue, “...a main challenge of interviewing as a method is participants being hesitant to discuss abstract concepts” (p. 4). Images and visuals, according to Bignante (2010), “...generate insights that do not necessarily or exclusively correspond to those obtained in verbal inquiry” (p. 2): due to their polysemic quality (Barthes, 1981), they take the form of uncoded messages that can “...be deciphered according to the person interviewed” (Bignante, 2010, p. 2). The videos for this particular study were considered a means of eliciting from the participating teachers their perception and approach to assessment of musical creativity, acknowledging that the video footage, in addition to being situated in a particular time and space, was also constructed through various practices, technologies and knowledge. These various parameters, as Dittmer (2008) warns, do never make the visual imagery be unbiased (p. 171), calling for caution in terms of how such imagery will be used. In this study, both the videos brought in by the participants and those provided by me, were not intended to be considered points of arrival, but of departure; the point is not to do content analysis of the visual objects, for example, judging the music educators’ methods of teaching, as those are presented in the videos, but rather to expand on the participants’ comments regarding more and specific music activities, looking for the reasons they consider them creative or not and how they assess them. This was a pivotal aspect of the way I approached VET, as my interest was not in analysing the content of the visual objects as such (that is, the musical activities per se), but in how the informants responded to them.

3.9.12. YouTube videos in research

Studies in which we may find the utilisation of 'naturally occurring' third-party video data (i.e. information gathered from outside sources, or someone besides the
researcher), such as news reports, police CCTV recordings and home-made videos, include, for example, Goodwin (1994) and Laurier (2013). For this study, however, the videos were streamed from the YouTube, a user-submitted video-sharing website for public use that was established in 2005 and which today ranks as the second most visited website globally (Alexa, 2013). As Kousha, Thelwall, and Abdoli (2012) explain, “…although YouTube is predominantly used for entertainment, such as music and comedy (see YouTube Charts, 2012), (...) many academics are now using YouTube for recording and disseminating course lectures (...) or as a data set” (pp. 2-3). In fact, YouTube videos provide researchers with a video collection of cultural, sociological and micro-interactional practices, which, according to Jones and Raymond (2012), “…since the selection of video recordings operates simultaneously as cultural record and analytic resource, the viewpoint of the videos should become itself an object of analysis” (p. 120). As already mentioned, however, the videos in this study were not analysed for their content, and the discussion about them was not the core activity of the study; videos were introduced in a preliminary phase, and we returned to them if and when necessary, while the discussion about creativity had taken a ‘conventional’ interview form.

3.9.13. Choosing additional videos

One of the challenges, however, in using third-party videos in research, especially from a website where choices abound, is how to choose those to be used as tools for data collection. In order to face this challenge, the videos were selected based on the same principles that guide the design of research that uses vignettes, as those were distilled from the literature by Barter and Renold (1999). In particular, the videos should be characterised as plausible and real, that is, they should be based on actual and ordinary experiences and lengthy enough in order to “…contain sufficient context
for respondents to have an understanding about the situation being depicted” (Barter & Renold, 1999, p. 4).

In addition, the video choices were filtered according to the suggested activities and the structure/pedagogical approach of the National Music Syllabus of Cyprus (MoEC, 2012), as this was reconstituted by the Ministry of Education in 2010 as part of the educational reformation of the country. The result was the construction of the New National Curriculum (NNC), according to which the musical activities of the lesson plans were to be based on the principle of “listening, performing, creating (improvising and composing)” throughout the learning process (MoEC, 2012, p. 330). Therefore, according to the NNC, musical activities of a typical lesson plan may consist of: (1) listening; (2) group and individual singing; (3) movement (interpreting and/or dramatising music through movement); (4) performing (playing the classroom instruments); (5) group and individual creative activities (including sound-stories/pictures, instrumental compositions, creating sound effects and other forms of such activities that promote free creative expression); (6) reading and writing music (stressing, though, that music symbols/signs and theory only come when students have already and repeatedly taken part in activities 1 to 5, so that they can give meaning to the notation. In other words, sound should come first). According to the curriculum, the combination of the above and the natural interrelationship with each other will help the student to develop sufficient aural ability and sensitivity to understand the various musical concepts through practice and to express their inner world (MoEC, 2012, pp. 322-333).

To sum up, the criteria for choosing the additional videos (Appendix XI) were based both on the principles underlying vignette implementation and on the condition of listening, performing and creating. Nevertheless, it is by no means suggested or implied that the complementary videos cover all of the activities that music teachers adopt in their classrooms; they were just sparks for initiating discussion.
3.9.14. The data-translation procedure

The term ‘researching multilingually’ applies to cases in which researchers “…collect data in a language or languages different from that of […] the institution to which they belong; they may then translate the data for the report, or thesis” (Holmes, Fay, Andrews, & Attia, 2013, p. 286). This term applies to this thesis too, to the study’s participants whose native language is Greek Cypriot, which they use to teach music and which is tied to their lived experience of the phenomenon under study, namely creativity. Thus my decision was to collect the data in my own and my participants’ native language and then proceed to translate it. In order to deal successfully with the challenges of multilingual research, careful attention was paid to translation and transparency. In fact, translation and transcription took place simultaneously and a professional English literature professor, in addition to two peer reviewers, were invited to check the accuracy of the translation and the transparency of the data.

3.9.15. Critical incident chart

The participants were invited to complete a critical incident chart, which is a constructivist elicitation technique (Denicolo & Pope, 1990) also used as a tool to assist interviewing by Burnard (2000), who named it ‘musical river’ and Odena (2001b), who named it ‘musical career path’. Participants were asked to outline particular moments of their life and formative music experiences that they considered crucial to their professional music career. The aim of using the charting of critical incidents (in this study referred to as ‘musical development river and professional career path’) was to allow the participants to reflect as naturally and qualitatively as possible, on specific and critical music incidents in their lives, gaining insight into their
musical and professional development, something that might be limited with predetermined questions in a questionnaire.

3.9.16. Interview transcript approval

In addition to ensuring transcription quality, there is a need to secure the quality and trustworthiness of the transcription content. A commonly applied procedure is to request the participants’ approval of the transcripts. This is one of the strategies often adopted in the qualitative paradigm to strengthen the internal validity of the study (Merriam, 1995, pp. 54-55). Further possible actions to ensure the validity of the findings, which were used in this study, are discussed below. With regard to the interview transcript approval, however, there is debate regarding its appropriateness: Lapadat (2000), Page, Samson, and Crockett (2000), Kvale, (1996) and Saldaña (1998) stress the advantages of this procedure, as it may clarify unclear points, stimulate further discussion and preserve politeness and respect. On the other hand, Hagens, Dobrow, and Chafe (2009) and Mero-Jaffe (2011) advise caution about adopting this procedure since valuable data may be deleted at the request of participants, the impact on the interviewee may be negative and the participants may not respond.

To sum up, requesting transcript approval from the participants poses risks; however, there are possible advantages, as well as ethical considerations that cannot be overlooked. Therefore, in an attempt to improve the rigour of the interview transcripts and preserve research ethics, thus contributing to the quality and validity of this study, without, though, ignoring the disadvantages that could result, my decision was to give the participants the option in the consent form to decide whether they wished to review the verbatim transcripts of their interviews or not. In this way, validity and ethical considerations were preserved: validity, because the study’s
participants functioned as a lens for checking how accurately their realities were represented in the final account (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 125), and ethical issues, because the participants, being informed about the issue, consciously placed further confidence in the researcher with respect to the accuracy of their interview transcription. After all, validity refers not to the data, but to the inferences drawn from them (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983).

3.10. Summary

This section was an account of my understanding of knowledge, the qualitative method I chose in order to elicit the participants' perspectives about creativity, the ethical framework I followed, the methods for defining the most appropriate participants and how I recruited them, as well as the data collection procedures. In the remaining pages of this chapter I describe the steps I took to secure the verification of my findings.

3.11. Validity, Reliability and Generalisability

Sensible concerns about the rigour and, thus the quality and worthiness, of qualitative studies' research findings have been extensively discussed (e.g., Merriam, 1995). In the rest of this section, my goal is to convey the steps I took in order to check for verification of my findings, that is, “...the mechanisms used during the process of [my] research to incrementally contribute to ensuring reliability and validity” (Morse et al., 2002, p. 17).

As Ratcliffe (1983) suggests, "...quite different notions of what constitutes validity have enjoyed the status of dominant paradigm at different times, in different historical contexts and under different prevailing modes of thought and epistemology"
Therefore, before outlining my strategies for validating the findings of my research, it is essential to discuss the concept of validity and explain how it has been constituted in this study.

3.11.1. The concept of validity

Validity “…is relative to [research] purposes and circumstances (…) [and] it is not an inherent property of a particular method” (Maxwell, 1992, p. 284). Therefore, it should not be considered a single monolithic concept applied across research studies. As Winter (2000) maintains, it is “…a contingent construct, inescapably grounded in the processes and intentions of particular research methodologies,” and this raises problems with its definition (p. 1). As Hammersley (1987) notes, “…when one looks at discussions of reliability and validity, one finds not a clear set of definitions but a confusing diversity of ideas” (p. 73). In fact, in the naturalistic interpretive paradigm, the term has received a confusing array of typologies, such as authenticity, trustworthiness, plausibility and credibility (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Maxwell, 1992; Lather, 1993; Schwandt, 1997), and it carries different connotations from those of the positivist perspective. As a matter of fact, Golafshani (2003) explains, “…many researchers have developed their own concepts of validity and have often generated or adopted what they consider to be more appropriate terms” (p. 602). As a result, a range of definitions, and substitute terms, has been provided (for a review see Hammersley, 1987), something that, according to Winter (2000), verifies its relationship “…to the person and belief system [from] which it stems” (p. 2). The confusion, however, is exacerbated when, in some cases, validity is merged with the concept of reliability (for example, Black & Champion, 1976, p. 222; Kerlinger, 1964, p. 430; Hammersley, 1987, p. 75) or, in other cases, where it is asserted to be problematic, or even rejected as a tool that is useless in qualitative research (Simco
& Warin, 1997, pp. 663 - 670; Wolcott, 1990) since the scientific objectivity has been lost (Atkinson, 2004, p. 33). The result is a condition under which it is unclear which qualitative study findings should be verified and what this process should involve.

3.11.2. Definition of validity

However, as Morse and Richards (2002) explain, "…claim[ing] that reliability and validity have no place in qualitative inquiry is to place the entire paradigm under suspicion" (p. 168). The bottom line is that validity may be applied differently in a study, depending on the researchers’ philosophical worldviews; each one generates different means of validation and approaches when it comes to considering at which stages of the research process measurement of validity is necessary (Winter, 2000, p. 10). As Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) hold, validity “…has to be evaluated in relationship to the purposes and the circumstances of the research” (p. 528). Therefore the absence of a ‘standard’ definition of validity calls for qualitative researchers to provide their own concept of the term that will be in line with their philosophical worldviews and the particularities of their studies. As Marshall and Rossman (2011) put it, “What is now contested is how these key terms [i.e. validity and reliability] are to be defined, by whom, for which research project and for what audience” (p. 41). Consequently, since validity in qualitative research “…is most appropriately [seen] in an individualised contextual meanner” (Given, 2008, p. 909), the concept of validity in this study, as is the case with the definition of creativity, is an amalgamation of definitions already developed by other theorists, tailored to the needs of this study: validity refers to the data, the methods of collecting and the inferences drawn from them (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 191). Validity in this study is also concerned with the extent to which it actually measures, or seeks, what I claim that it does (Simco & Warin, 1997, p. 662), referring to the appropriateness of
the tools used and the processes followed (Leung, 2015) in order to accurately and truthfully represent those features of the phenomena that the study is intended to describe (Hammersley, 1987, p. 69), providing an accurate representation of the participants’ realities with regard to the phenomenon of musical creativity (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 124). Accurate representation is interpreted as my personal standpoint with respect to the particular phenomenon, which cannot and does not claim that it explains the ‘whole truth’ from all possible perspectives; it is only one possible understanding of the issue.

3.11.3. Validity terms and criteria

Validity in qualitative research is an iterative process which needs to be applied at various stages of the research (Morse et al., 2002; Court, 2013) and “…particularly in the planning and the analytic phases” (Whittemore et al., 2001, p. 533). Depending mainly on the perspective of the researchers, as well as the stage and the part of the study where they seek to check for validity, theorists have developed various terms, typological frameworks and alternative criteria for validity: Maxwell (1992), for example, suggests ‘descriptive validity’, ‘interpretive validity’, ‘theoretical validity’, ‘evaluative validity’ and ‘generalisability’; Guba (1981) suggests ‘credibility’, ‘transferability’, ‘dependability’ and ‘confirmability’; LeCompte and Goetz (1982) suggest parallel qualitative equivalents to their quantitative counterparts: ‘internal validity’, ‘external validity’, ‘reliability’ and ‘objectivity’; Eisner’s (1991) alternative terms are ‘structural corroboration’, ‘consensual validation’, ‘referential adequacy’ and ‘ironic validity’; Lather (1993) reconceptualised the concept as ‘paralogic validity’, ‘rhizomatic validity’, ‘situated/embedded voluptuous validity’; Richardson and Pierre’s (2005) perspective correlates validity with the reflections of a crystal, suggesting that “…what we see depends on our angle of response, not triangulation [which is
insufficient as there are more than three sides to approaching the world] but rather crystallisation” (p. 963). The list with the terms and the criteria is longer; the current discussion, however, has no space or intention to conduct greater investigation of this topic. The purpose was to delineate some of the key terms and criteria and how some of them were applied in this study.

3.11.4. Lenses used to view validity

Each of the above examples of alternative criteria has been suggested with the appropriate procedures for applying them; Creswell and Miller (2000, p. 125) refer to the choice of validity procedures in terms of viewpoints or lenses: those falling under: (1) the lens of the researcher, that is, the researcher’s conscious decisions regarding data collection, analysis and saturation; (2) the lens of the study participants, that is, the involvement of participants in checking the accuracy of the interpretations of the findings and (3) the lens of the account of an individual external to the study. Given the above framework for thinking about validation (the concept, the definition, the terms, the criteria and the perspectives), the next step was to translate it into the strategies I would apply to ensure validity in this study.

3.11.5. Techniques used to ensure validity

Regarding the ‘flexibility’ of the definition of validity,

It is proposed that differing interpretive perspectives and differing research designs may require flexibility with regard to the practical application of these standards [i.e. validation techniques]. (...) Contextual factors [such as the audience we are addressing and the people who will assess the study] contribute to the decision as to which technique will optimally reflect specific criteria of validity in particular research situations (Whittemore et al., 2001, pp. 528-532).
Multiple perspectives on validity techniques flood the pages of books and articles; Whittemore et al. (2001) identify four types of validity technique: design consideration, data gathering, analysis and presentation, which correspond to a wide range of techniques that may be applied in a research study to check for the accuracy of the findings. Lincoln and Guba (1985) offer four sets of procedures: prolonged engagement in the setting field, member checks, triangulation and peer debriefing. Creswell and Miller (2000) develop their ideas into eight primary procedures:

1. Triangulation: using different sources to corroborate evidence;
2. Member checking: sharing data and interpretations with the participants;
3. Exhaustive, rich and thick description: using rich description and offering many perspectives in the analysis, thus giving the opportunity for the findings to be conveyed to readers;
4. Clarifying bias: stating and commenting on any assumptions as well as past experiences related to the field, so that the reader is clearly informed about the researcher’s position;
5. Discrepant information: including negative or contradictory evidence in the analysis;
6. Spending a long time in the field: being in the setting for a long period of time;
7. Peer debriefing: discussing findings with critical peers;
8. External auditor: asking an external auditor to assess the accuracy of the process and the product of the account.

Following Creswell’s (2014) recommendation that researchers need to include a range of validation techniques as evidence of having produced consistent results, I engaged in all of the primary strategies summarised above, apart from
spending a long time in the field, which I consider to be related to observation studies. In addition, I have already been engaged for a prolonged period in the field of music education in Cyprus. Given that, I did my best to build trust with the participants, as well as checking for misinformation stemming from any unintended distortions introduced by myself and the informants that this strategy involves. In particular, triangulation was achieved by corroborating evidence from the participants’ interviews/discussions and the supplementary materials that they brought with them, such as audio and video samples. Member checking was at the end of the analysis by sharing interpreted ‘polished’ particles from the narratives produced by the participants (more about this in Chapter 5). An exhaustive, thick and rich description of the interviews was put together (see Chapter 3), using short quotations to let the participants' voice be heard and to offer alternative perspectives so that the readers may comprehend the findings. As for the procedure used to clarifying bias, I extensively commented on my background and beliefs about the topic (see researcher’s role), so that the reader may be well informed about my position and the study’s direction. Regarding discrepant information, contradictory evidence was noted, presented and interpreted in order to achieve data completeness (see interpreting the participants’ contradictions). Peer debriefing and external auditing procedures were both followed with the meetings I had with my supervisors, as well as the auditing by external researchers (see Appendix IV) in order to assess the accuracy of the analysis and the results. To be more specific, four external researchers, that is critical friends and colleagues with doctorates, had been invited to go over the chapters of the thesis and make suggestions for improvements, such as apt data analysis, interpretation of findings and, in general, to confirm the high quality of this study. Finally, in order to adhere to the ethical considerations of the research, the participants’ names were coded in the transcripts, and names were deleted from the audio recordings in order to maintain anonymity and confidentiality.
3.11.6. Definition of reliability

Just as the definition and techniques of validity differ in quantitative and qualitative research, so does reliability. In particular, “…definitions for ‘reliability’ are as varied and as complex as those for ‘validity’” (Winter, 2000, p. 2). Regarding my approach to the validity of definitions above, an attempt to provide a detailed range of the definitions of reliability would probably be futile for the purposes of this section. Instead, replicability of the processes and results, which is the essence of reliability in quantitative research, will be considered in this study in terms consistency (Black & Champion, 1976; Leung, 2015; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Gibbs, 2007; Smith & Noble, 2014). As a naturalistic inquiry, the study considers that people’s behaviour is in constant flux and thus obtaining the same results measured at different times and different places is often challenging. Consequently, reliability will be defined as whether the results are consistent with, or “…reflect to the best of the researcher’s ability” the data collected (Merriam, 1995, p. 56-57), as well as by participants’ subsequent feedback on the annotated interviews.

3.11.7. Reliability strategies

According to Yin (2009), documenting as many of the steps of the procedures as possible enhances the reliability of a qualitative study, as it “…allows the reader to assess the extent to which proper research practices have been followed” (Shenton, 2004, p. 71), thereby providing the opportunity to repeat the study. In particular, procedures to enhance the reliability of a study may be grouped into two categories: those used during the design and preparation of the study, such as detailed description of the planning, performance and evaluation of the effectiveness of the process of inquiry (Shenton, 2004); and those used during the data analysis, such as
providing accurate transcriptions’ ensuring, consistency with the definition of codes, 
cross-checking of the codes (Gibbs, 2007), constantly comparing and 
comprehensively using the data, as well as including deviant cases and refutate 
analysis (Silverman, 2009).

3.11.8. Generalisability

Generalisation refers to whether the results of a study may by applied to wider 
groups and other situations. As the case is with validity and reliability, generalisability 
in qualitative research has received alternative names, for example external validity 
and transferability of theoretical constructs (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), as the 
contextuality and subjectivity of qualitative research comes to sharpen the contrast 
with the statistical generalisability and objectivity of the quantitative research 
(Whittemore et al., 2001).

Overall, since human behaviour and the context of music education in Cyprus 
are constantly in flux (Forari, 2005), although the context of the research is very 
specific, the value of generalisability in this study is limited; though not ignored. 
Whether the findings of this research may automatically be generalised to other 
contexts cannot be claimed; my goal is to provide thick description of how the 
phenomenon of creativity is perceived and assessed in this particular context, which 
may “…make contact with the more implicit and informal understandings held by 
readers who are able to see parallels with the situation in which they work or 
otherwise have knowledge about” (Robson, 1993, p. 73). The particular case of 
music teachers in Cypriot Primary education is of value and relevance in itself; as 
Hycner (1985) suggests, “…if they [results] illuminate to some significant degree the 
‘worlds’ of the participants, then that in itself is valuable” (p. 295).
3.12. Summary

Discussions about validity, reliability and generalisability of the findings in any kind of research are perplexing. There are very close ties between validity, reliability and generalisation that demonstrating one goes some distance towards ensuring the other (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and thus the overall quality of the study. Such a demonstration is the goal of this study. This last section has outlined the steps taken to achieve it. In the following chapter I proceed with the stages I followed in analysing the data, as well as dealing with contradictions.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS

4.1. Data Analysis

The process of data analysis begins with data collection (Carspecken, 1996; Strauss, 1987; Wolcott, 1994) and "...pervades all phases of the research enterprise" (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 144). As Creswell (2012) suggests, "...the processes of data collection, data analysis and report writing [...] are interrelated and often go on simultaneously in a research project" (p. 182). Therefore it is an iterative process in which all stages of a research study are interconnected and interdependent.

4.2. Stages of Analysis

Colaizzi's (1978) seven-step phenomenological method was adopted to guide the analysis of my data. In general, this method includes the following steps: (1) familiarisation with the data; (2) identification of significant statements; (3) formulation of meanings; (4) generation of themes; (5) exhaustive description; (6) formulation of the fundamental structure; and (7) verification of the fundamental structure.

In particular, once having organised and completed the verbatim transcriptions, while paying attention to different types of transcription error (Poland, 1995), the first step was to (further) familiarise myself with the data (Merriam, 2015; Riessman, 2008; Emerson et al., 1995). This included re-listening to the interviews, re-reading the transcriptions (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002), field notes and relevant
documents, while also taking memos, writing down questions and concerns and reflecting on my initial thoughts.

Once having gained a general sense of the whole data, the second step involved continuing with data cleaning and labelling, that is, the initial cycle of coding (Rogers, 2018; Saldaña, 2009): identifying and marking significant statements or natural meaning units (Kvale, 1996, p. 194), that is, phrases or passages that related to the phenomenon under study and, then, labelling each one with code(s) (See Appendix VII). This initial process included open and in vivo coding, before moving onto axial coding (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Ary, 2010).

At this point it is worth mentioning that no dedicated software of qualitative data analysis (CAQDAS) was applied. Microsoft Word and paper and pencil were used in order to analyse the data. While I acknowledge the efficiency of technology, it has been suggested that CAQDAS do not contribute to the analyst's capacities and they may yield potential risks or temptations (e.g. García-Horta & Guerra-Ramos, 2009). In fact, the ‘traditional’ approach brought me closer to the data and the absence of software contributed to keeping me close to Colaizzi's original method, which was initially designed for no application of the CAQDAS.

The third step was to formulate meanings; following Graneheim and Lundman's (2003) suggestion concerning qualitative content analysis, codes were grouped into categories, that is, the manifest content (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003, p. 111) originated from the interviews (see Appendix VIII).

In step four, using meaning units and combining categories, I ended up with themes, "expressions of the latent content" (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003, p. 111), also described by Patton (1987) as "...thread[s] of an underlying meaning through, condensed meaning units, codes or categories, on an interpretative level" (p. 107) (see Appendix IX). These will be discussed in the following chapter.
Step five involved putting together an exhaustive, thick and rich description of each participant's interview, incorporating the categories produced in step four. Using short quotations in each case, I tried to let the participants' voice be heard and to rationalise my own thinking about why and how something said was considered important and may contribute to answering my research questions or generating other conclusions. Furthermore, while “…the segmentation of field data and retrieval of marked data segments is a valuable resource in the management of qualitative data” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 52), careful attention was paid to maintaining the sense of the storied quality from which each quotation was extracted.

It should be mentioned that, while the discussions with the participants were not identical in terms of the question ordering and wording, the structure was fairly similar, as described in the methodology chapter. This, as a consequence, gave rise to more or less the same major findings, without suggesting, however, that this was the only orthodox way to conceptualise the data, or the final wording of its exploration. In fact it was quite the opposite since this approach was adopted in order to fragment, or as Richards (2002) puts it, to decontextualise the data in order to handle it effectively and “recontextualise” (p. 200) it later on when searching for comparisons and drawing conclusions about how the music teachers experience the phenomenon of creativity in music education.

In step six I condensed each participant's description down to short and dense statements that I considered to have captured the essential aspects of the phenomenon and, in step seven, I returned them to the participants asking them to verify if these standards aptly represented their experience.
4.3. Interpreting the Participants' Contradictions

As Delamont (1992) suggests, the initial stage of the analysis process is not only about classifying patterns and regularities, but it also deals with contrasts, paradoxes and irregularities relating to similar subjects. This draws on the discrepant information technique mentioned above, with which to explore any negative or contradictory evidence for analysis.

"People, it seems, are eminently capable of talking about an issue in different and apparently contradictory ways" (West, 1990, p. 1229). Therefore, contradictions or inconsistencies in participants' narratives is a noted 'problem' in qualitative research (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; MacLure, 2003; Power, 2004; Watson, 2006). Finding, presenting and interpreting contradictions is, in fact, a criterion for achieving completeness of the data (Fortune, Reid & Miller, 2013, p. 23). Furthermore, "...conflicting discourses within respondents' narratives can contribute to the interpretation of data rather than invalidating it" (Antin, Constantine, & Hunt, 2015).

My approach then to deal with contradictory remarks was, firstly, to trace them back in my field notes and research memos, as suggested by Antin, Constantine, and Hunt (2015). Then I sought to distil the participants' essence by applying Power's (2004) suggestion for understanding and interpreting such contradictions "[t]hrough interpretive listening and reflexivity" (p. 858). Secondly, I invited the participants to validate the findings, that is, to member check, as described below.

4.4. Thick and Rich Description

Following the seven-step process mentioned above, an exhaustive thick and rich description was created. The major findings that emerged from this description
include, but are not limited to, those mentioned in the theoretical framework, that is, descriptions of practices and creative activities applied in the classroom in order to nurture creativity, that is, the ‘process’; distinctions between creative and non-creative teaching and the teacher, that is, the ‘person’; references to the definition and nature of creativity, that is the ‘product’, and examples of assessing music creativity (that is, the ‘process’ and the ‘product’); examples of the creative students’ characteristics and how their backgrounds influence their creative behaviour, that is the person; an outline of how the school environment and the school system in Cyprus relate to creativity in music education, that is the ‘place’; and, finally, the additional issues relating to methodology. Having in mind Graneheim and Lundman’s (2004) suggestion that “…the process of analysis involves a back and forth movement between the whole and parts of the text” (p. 107), It should be noted that while the findings are divided into different sections, they are all considered and treated as interrelated, with one informing the others.

### 4.5. Musical Development River and Professional Career Path

Furthermore, following Denicolo and Pope’s (1990), Burnard’s (2000) and Odena’s (2003) method of collecting information about the participants’ backgrounds, in addition to the information surfacing from the discussions, a separate sheet called ‘Musical Development River and Professional Career Path’ (MDRPCP) was used (Appendix II). In particular, the MDRPCP asked the participants to recall and write down the memorable events of their musical and professional experience. Thus an introductory section describes each participant before of the major findings of their transcripts are presented.
4.6. Participant I: SKR – General Teacher

SKR studied general education at the University of Cyprus and has been teaching in Primary education for 15 years. At the age of 18 she passed the Grade 8 of the ABRSM piano examinations and the certificate examinations of the Greek Music Board with distinction; she also succeeded in several theoretical modules, such as harmony and music history. Even before graduating from the university, SKR taught private piano lessons and Kindermusik at a private afternoon music school.

As a university student, SKR admitted that musical creativity in education was an arbitrary term for her: “I can’t say that graduating from the university, I knew either teaching or assessing or measuring or even perceiving it [creativity].” She went on to explain that even though a few guidelines were provided by the university, the lack of teaching experience was a drawback during the first years of her career:

when you eventually get into the classroom and you get in touch with the children […,] you reconsider many things [theories] about all the articles you have read and all the theories you have heard of. I think it’s only by trying out a few things [theories] that you can be sure about how creative they are. Something that may sound creative, if you don’t have the experience to structure it correctly, it may come out just as noise. That is, it may turn out to be a total failure. I think experience helps you very much to realise how you can structure accomplished creative lessons that yield something to the students. Teaching creativity is not something I’ve learned at the university, not at all.

To sum up, SKR has a rich musical background, particularly as a Classical pianist; however, the absence of creativity, as a topic at the university, in addition to her teaching inexperience, that is, lack of awareness of the music classroom reality and the behaviour of the students, seem to have been seen as major drawbacks with regards to structuring lessons to nurture the students’ creativity and, generally, for being in a position to teach creatively at the beginning of her career.
4.6.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

SKR described practices and activities that she applies in the music classroom, namely lyric-(re)writing, orchestration, composition, interpretation, instrumental performance and the presentation of the students' own original work. Generally, SKR considers creative activities to be those that involve the students and do not expect them mechanically to repeat an action: "If you don’t ask students to do something, let’s say to see [assess] their independence, their initiative, their way of thinking etc., then everyone is just repeating an instruction." Therefore initiative and independence, that is, performing without merely repeating a given instruction, are important elements that encourage students in musical activities.

Furthermore, she talked about inter-disciplinarity, namely, the integration of other subjects in music: “…there needs to be inclusion of other forms of art, so that it [teaching] is not something dry, as is the case with other subjects (…) the more subjects you can engage in the more you can help students to be even more creative.” She also referred to the process of allowing students to “…discuss or argue [with each other], if it’s necessary, and to end up” with a collective output, as this “…requires [students] to listen to each other, to accept a different opinion that they had not shared before and all together build (…) something new from scratch.” Therefore, a successful creative activity for SKR needs to encourage discussion or even argumentation among the students, something that points to the process of a music activity.

Nevertheless, SKR seemed to be also concerned with the product; interpretation and performance, in particular, have their own interest as they are part of the creative process:
So here comes the issue of interpretation. Because in music, for me, it is the third, the third resultant, after composition let’s say, that you teach where students will compose or recompose and will present, they will perform, they will interpret. So interpretation is creative […]. Even finding the formula of performance is creativity for me. […] so the performance in front of all their classmates is very important, since it is part of creativity and since you introduce to the rest of the students a different way of music thinking.

Therefore the students' creativity may also benefit from performance of their own work to class for two main reasons: it is a way of sharing their work, “…because you introduce to the rest [of the students] a different way of music thinking” and because it involves them in a creative process of finding the most appropriate way to present.

SKR reported that students usually made careful choices regarding the orchestration and the overall staging of their performances. As she explained, even though performing in front of others

…may be embarrassing at first, because they [the students] have to stand up in front of the class and perform, sing, etc, (…) it is very strange that they find the way to find the most sweet-voiced [student] that will sing, the one who is rhythmically accurate that will play the basic instrument and the rest will just fill in with the rhythm.

Therefore challenging students to perform in front of an audience is also a way of sharpening their aesthetic criteria. She gave the following example:

I prepare them ‘We’ll do this and as soon as we finish the lessons [of the unit], because it may take you four lessons until you finish it, we’ll invite the A’2 class to come and listen to it’. Yes, they will like it as a challenge, they will try even harder to do something better.

An important distinction SKR made is that the distribution of roles/parts needs to come from the students in order to be creative. These procedures offer to the
students “the opportunity to act by themselves”, which relates to how SKR perceives and assesses the music creativity discussed below.

In addition, SKR used the words ‘traditional teaching’ to describe situations in which the educators lack creativity. This happens, for example, when educators provide detailed or non-flexible instructions, which the students have to follow, as opposed to providing them with “…the raw material and let[ting] them build [create] something alone.” SKR described the ‘traditional’ teacher as a person who does not inspire students, as “…‘dry’, who opens the book every day, teaches the lesson in the same way etc., and will ask them once in a while to do a creative task.” It was clear that, for SKR, creative teaching equals creative students: “it is you [the teacher], above all, who has to be creative, get into the process to understand how you can be creative, in order to take them a step further.” However, she recognised that while being creative as a teacher may help students, teaching creativity is not an absolute task: “…you can help kids, by giving them some guidelines, in order to acquire skills. […] It is something that can partially be taught.” Therefore while a creative teacher may be helpful, personal dedication and self-taught process are necessary for the acquisition of knowledge and development of creative skills.

To sum up, practices and activities that SKR considers creative in music education are those incorporating other forms of art and disciplines, those encouraging students to be independent and take initiatives – rather than mechanically repeating something – and those encouraging discussion, or even argumentation, among the students. Examples of such activities were lyric-(re)writing, orchestration, composition, instrumental and vocal performance. Furthermore, requesting students to perform their output was seen as a positive way of sharing their work and way of thinking, as well as a means of motivating and challenging them. Finally, creative teaching was seen as being marked by the educators’ enthusiasm for the subject and their own creative behaviour and approach.
to teaching. While these teachers' traits may involve students in the lesson, developing creative thinking and abilities depends on the students' own-desire, as the teacher simply provides guidance.

4.6.2. Assessment

SKR was clear that “…all [students] are positively assessed in front of all the class” as this gives the opportunity for peer-assessment among the students:

…there is also peer-assessment, meaning ‘What did you like best from the performance you saw? What would you prefer to be different?’ so, we ask students to criticise, always with [proper] behaviour, their classmates and when you receive criticism, the next time I give them a similar activity to do in a Cypriot song they try to take it into consideration.

Therefore encouraging students to comment on each other’s performance is one of the ways that SKR copes with assessment as it was seen as effective in their performance efficiency.

As for the criteria with which SKR assesses the students’ creativity, these seemed to be vague. The fact that she frequently mentioned that there are more and less creative students may suggest that she perceives creative performance or thinking as a continuum, in which adjacent elements are perceptibly different, yet related (i.e., more or less creative) from each other. Nevertheless, her attempts to explain how, and based on what criteria she decides, and to what point something is located on the continuum, were unclear:

I mean, you will see groups which decide to do something, but this is identical to the others; the groups that usually stand out, and those are assessed as more creative, and we mention it in the classroom during assessment, are those achieving their goal, that is, they follow the teacher’s instructions, but they do something very different. They take an initiative to overtake the instruction; it is like meta-cognition this thing,
[and, thus] they go even further from what they had been asked to do; however, they are still within the topic.

"Doing something different" and "overcoming teacher's instructions" are reported as decisive parameters for whether something is creative or not. Nevertheless, SKR did not articulate whether there are any particular principles influencing her approach to assessing the students' creative behaviour; that is, how doing something different or overcoming the teacher's instructions is measured or perceived as acceptable, extraordinary, or unacceptable. Furthermore, enjoyment seemed to be an indicator of the level of creativity: “You see the students are more alive when you include creativity in your lesson. (…) I experienced this. And I think this made my lesson successful; the fact that the students couldn’t wait to come to the lesson.” Therefore it seemed that, the elements influencing her approach to assessing creativity are: the more students demonstrate initiative, alternative approaches, different viewpoints, emotions and sensitivity, and enjoyment, the greater is the level of creativity.

In addition, for SKR, both the process and the product of a creative activity have particular importance. While SKR initially stated that the process is more important than the product, it emerged that there may be a confusion: “So the fact that they [students] understood what I asked and they started thinking that way to make it, it is more important than the five-minute performance, which may not be that good.” However, she went on to add that

I think the more creative the students are, the more completely creative is the result they have. The less creative [students] may make, what we said, noise, instead of music, but still their effort is appreciated, [and] we don’t criticise them. I think the final result shows which students managed to be more creative in essence [emphasis added].
In other words, the final product is a reflection of the process that students have followed: the more creative the process, the more creative the output. It could be thus concluded that the process of an activity and the product are equally valuable. Nevertheless, SKR’s following comment places more weight on the product than on the process:

…if you go, though, to an event [of our school] with usually 300 people [as audience], maybe it’s also your personal responsibility to present something good. And that’s why we resort to pre-existing [non-original] songs, because in Primary education we count the final product as more important. We neglect the process” [emphasis added].

What may be derived from this, then, is that performing at school events is a demanding obligation, which urges teachers to resort to non-creative musical choices, depending on the ears of their colleagues; for the parents the output has a greater value than the process and the quality of music education itself.

One element that emerges is that of the students’ background, that is, musical knowledge and age, seems to influence the way SKR perceives and assesses creativity.

Kids who attend afternoon music schools usually are...they have a higher performance level than the others, they can definitely do something more. They usually are more creative, but it doesn’t mean that students who never attended a music school cannot be much more creative than those who take private music lessons; this is definitely true.

While she made it clear that pre-existing music knowledge does not necessarily mean creativity, she admitted that she expects such students to be more musically creative.

With regards to the comments and the assessment that she provided on the video samples, her feedback for the first video was quite negative, something that was clear from the mark she gave, which was only 2 out of 10. On the one hand, she
finds the organisation interesting: "…the fact that they sit on the floor in a circle and do something different than sitting behind the desk, is a good move." On the other hand, though, the overall repetition and the lack of the students' self-action meant that the activity and the students' output was not creative: "there is a repetition that makes me tired and doesn’t let the students... It doesn’t allow for self-action, so how can it be creative? They only follow instructions. I think that every music creative activity should allow for self-action." She goes on to suggest how this, as an activity, could become more creative:

The teacher, let’s say, may begin with something similar; she may also sit down in the circle and, if she wants, do this beat to take it like…to let the students do rotation, where the next [student] tries to imitate the rhythmic pattern of the previous one. That is, every time you play a different rhythmic motive, basically every student can be creative because he will create his own improvisation; the next student will listen to the previous and try to reproduce the motif and, then, think of something on his own.

Nevertheless, she explains that utilising this kind of approach in every activity is impossible:

Of course you can’t constantly be creative, because... this is a very nice activity, but its development… we start our lessons in this way, imitating, but they can conclude creatively with something very simple. If you don’t ask students to do something, let’s say to see [assess] their independence, their initiative, their way of thinking etc., then everyone is just repeating an instruction. We do this, we definitely do, but if we want to be creative we want to go a step further, we involve them, but here the involvement is limited. [...] They are all expected to do the same thing, how can their creativity emerge?

Therefore activities that provide opportunities to take initiatives in which students can reveal their alternative approach is what makes one activity to creative than another. However, activities in which students simply repeat the teachers’ instructions are also necessary, and SKR herself applies them very often in her teaching.
As for the second video, SKR marked this with 8 out of 10 because it combined some of the most important elements for an activity she considered to be highly creative: the students' initiative, alternative approach, collaboration and enjoyment were all exploited:

[Students] collaborate, each one had a different part but they altogether had to form a group and, if I understood right from their reactions, they made it themselves. Above all, the fact that they did compose and they did orchestrate means they worked as a group. OK, it could have been done each one by himself, it doesn't mean that all creative activities should necessarily be done in groups, but if they are, they have to work as a group. This activity put them in the process of making a product on their own. Clearly, they followed instructions given during the lesson, regarding beat, rhythm, percussion instruments, that they made by themselves etc. Maybe that was their music score that I think they may have done it themselves, so this [video] has many elements of creative work in it. And they enjoy it.

In terms of the last video, SKR explained that school event performances, such as the one provided in the vignette, were a waste of time and does not offer much, if anything, to the students in terms of creativity:

Yes, this is a painful story [laughs]. OK, [...] my opinion is that this should not happen, it's so much labour, a non-creative process at all [laughs], there is nothing creative in this thing, except maybe the feeling the students ultimately have of enjoying this show. But, the music scores are given, it's being done with a similar orchestra, I provide the music, orchestrated of course, I rehearse with the orchestra separately, then with the choir separately, it is so much labour, there is much irritation, students get tired with the many rehearsals for a final product. You waste a lot of time from the music subject, in Cyprus, in order to prepare school celebrations.

Prompted to suggest if participating in school events may be more creative, SKR replied: "Of course it could be creative, let's say, they compose their own song during the lesson, then they write the lyrics of their composition and perform it as their own, a complete composition of their own." Therefore, the greater the students' input, the more creative a school event could be. When, however, the song is not
original, that is, the students are reinterpreting a given song, SKR explained that the process and thus the result, can still be creative, as long as the students themselves arrange the performance, both musically and even theatrically or in some other way:

If they work on it during the lesson and they decide that some students will sing, [while] others will play the instruments, this role which has to do with their own choice is necessary for the students. We [teachers] decide ‘You will be in the orchestra, you will be in the choir’. [...] And this kills totally the whole thing. Yesterday I was in a school to present my book, there was something, which I think was very creative: they used a traditional story, which they had read with their teacher, as I could figure out. Based on the story the students wrote their lyrics, while the music teacher composed the music and they presented it; the teacher played the piano and they sang. While singing they raised some figures that they had made themselves based on the story. It is a step more creative than singing a trite song as we are used to doing. It consisted of something... yes, it was first of all something new, because let me tell you that in such school events or celebrations we hear the same songs over and over again every year and this becomes dull; I mean this repetition is very tiring, for everyone.

She went on to explain how the final result, the product, was a testament to the process:

I don’t know if the teacher used the figures during the lesson, I don’t know how she worked with them, I just saw the final result and I said to myself: ‘Which song is this? I haven’t heard of it before’, because you often hear the same songs, and then I read in the leaflet that this class composed the song. They mixed tradition and literature. [...] I don’t know how they have done it, she might have worked with it more creatively. And it is much more creative than anything else, even just what they had done, which was not... I mean, it’s 5 out of 10, but, if they had done instead a given song with music score, as we usually do, that’s 1. I mean, how creative is it? Nothing. Simply students repeat an exercise.

For SKR the process appears to determaine the product; the process is a mirror image of the product and vice versa: the more creative the process, the more creative the product. In her own words: "Yes, it’s the process that I consider very important in Primary education, but the final product will show off creativity. That is, it will give it...a final touch, let’s say.” Therefore, while she stated that the process is
the most important aspect in musical activities, the students' output is also taken into consideration.

To sum up, there seemed to be a tension regarding what matters more for SKR. Taking into consideration the body language and the overall behaviour of the participant during the discussion, SKR seemed to distance herself from the formal organisation of Primary education, that is, the academic staff, the Ministry of Education and the parents, even though she is part of this. She clearly disagrees with the approach that pays more attention to the product, rather than to the process in education. However, being part of Primary education, she seems not to have other choices when she prepares students for school events, in which, as we have seen, the product is more important than the process. Therefore, while she values the process more than the product when teaching, her focus shifts when it comes to preparing for school events: "If you are going to present in front of an audience in such a formal way, you also want the result to be good." As for what influences her decision about what makes the students' process more or less creative in an activity, this is based on the students demonstrating initiative, alternative approaches and viewpoints, emotions, sensitivity and enjoyment.

4.6.3. Creative students

SKR believes that "...all students, at some level, can be creative." However, what she considers more important when it comes to engaging students in creative activities and nurturing their creative behaviour are the teachers themselves. Regarding common characteristics that she might have noticed in students whom she considers to be creative, SKR mentioned initiative, organising skills, sensitivity, intelligence and high IQ: "...so independence, initiative, [and] autonomy of movement are crucial; being able to function, act by themselves... [and] take initiatives are very
important and point to maturity. These are all characteristics of what we call emotionally and conceptually/mentally mature.” Therefore being creative means that the student is also mature in his/her thinking.

Maturity in thinking, however, which may give rise to creativity, does not necessarily relate to knowledge:

Creativity is something independent from knowledge […]. [K]nowledge by itself, as good as it may be, doesn't determine creativity. That is, I don't think that a kid who takes private music lessons and he is virtuoso in his instrument, may be very creative, this may not be true.

Therefore for SKR the students' knowledge is not a prerequisite for creativity. Moreover, she made a distinction between “traditionally good” students and “passive” students, who both, however, may surprise her:

This is true, creativity is not related to typically traditional good students, those students who are bright, but they may be considered naughty, but, I repeat, they may surprise you. There are also the other students who are passive in school, they are those who are very quiet, you almost don’t notice their presence, and you assign such an activity that suddenly you see that something inside wakes them up and they surprise you.

Therefore, besides, maturity, organising skills and intelligence, SKR did not notice any behaviour characteristics suggesting whether a student may or may not be creative.

Commenting on why some students display some of those characteristics and thus are considered by SKR to be more creative than others, she referred to the students' inherent ability, and also to their background:

For some students this is natural […] I think this is something cultivated also by the family. (...) That is, the music they have been listening to from their early years, their readings, if there was a grandmother singing at home, the kind of music they listen to at home. (...) They all have the criteria, when you help them develop it. When you introduce them to a
new song the students will accept it, the problem is how many children come to school ready, from their home, to accept this song, to listen to it and capture its beauty from the beginning?

She went on to explain that

[There are students whose social, cultural background is so minimal, that you have to put much effort to mobilise them and to provide them with many examples in order to do the activity. And this is not measurable, but you see it, [...] [basically] it is the maturity of the kid, the emotional and intellectual maturity, the experiences, what has been carried in with him until coming to me [Primary school].

Therefore, SKR was pointing to the familial background of the students as a decisive influence with regard to developing characteristics of maturity that contribute to advancing their creative thinking.

Furthermore, SKR observed that the younger the students are, the more creative they are. According to her experience:

When they come to Primary school their level of creativity is very high and we suppress it. The kids come from kindergarten, (...) they come with great potentials, let’s say. We [in Primary education] ask them to remain seated [...], do classwork, move about only a few times and this nails them. I think that in preliminary grades students should be more creative because they have the potential to be more creative. Growing up they become mature and because they are mature, if you give them the opportunity to be creative, they will succeed. But this doesn’t happen very often, so I think that this is suppressed as the years pass. In any case creativity is inherent in young ages and you can also see this in students of the first or second grades who react very nicely when they have such activities, even though they are young. They come from kindergarten with great creativity, I think, however, that in Primary education the way the [school] system works though it suppresses it, unfortunately.

Therefore SKR disagrees with the approach followed in Primary education as it is seen as suppressing the students’ creative behaviour; the enculturation process taking place in Primary school causes students to lose their spontaneity which, for
SKR, seems to be important. This brings forth an important topic that is further discussed in the ‘school environment’ section below.

To sum up, for SKR, all students may be creative. However, some students may be more creative than others, mainly because of inherited abilities, but more decisively, because of their familial and general background. Furthermore, spontaneity, initiative, organising skills, sensitivity, intelligence and high IQ are attributes that she groups under ‘emotional and intellectual maturity,’ and are attributes of creative students. Finally, while introversion or extroversion are not precursors for creativity, neither is knowledge; that is, young students, particularly those in the first and second grades, are more creative than those in higher grades.

4.6.4. The domain issue

It is also worth mentioning the domain issue of creativity, as this is perceived by SKR. SKR is convinced of the domain-generality of creativity; as she put it

I mean, I don’t think that a student who is creative in music, if you give him anything else will not be creative, to fulfil it creatively. The creative student will also be creative in music, but just musically creative? [doubt]. Look, you find this very often, this is true, students who have creativity, they spread it everywhere.

This suggests that for SKR creativity is a way of thinking that, once developed in a knowledge area, for example in music, can then be applied to other subjects of education.
4.6.5. School environment

Another two areas related to each other to which SKR referred were the school environment and, generally, the functionality of the school system. In particular, four issues emerged:

(1) While SKR recognised that all school subjects may be taught creatively, subjects related to the Arts, such as music and art, are considered more appropriate for nourishing students' creativity. As she asserted:

...creativity is everywhere, simply though, as the school system is, we teachers tend to push it more in these subjects: health education, arts, in literature very much, in design and technology, subjects that are more...a bit more open, of which syllabus is not that strict.

Therefore all subjects may be taught creatively, thus nourishing the students' creativity; however, subjects, such as music, teachers of which may be more flexible when it comes to teaching, are considered more related to creativity, rather than others with heavier and more demanding syllabuses.

(2) Music is not considered an important subject:

Music as a subject is not taken seriously by parents and consequently by the head teachers. Greater attention is paid, even by parents, to subjects such as maths and Greek language. [...] You know, because education in the eyes of everyone is competitive, let's say, if a colleague assigned five more handouts than you, this may cause you trouble.

Therefore, mathematics and Greek language are considered superior to music; this seems to be a social perspective, about what is important in education, which inevitably affects the operation of the school. In addition, it may also be suggested that the fact that the syllabus for music is not as heavy as those of other subjects may actually relate to the fact that the subject is not taken seriously. Finally,
stating that "education in the eyes of everyone is competitive" suggests tension, which brings us to the next issue, the relationship between colleagues.

(3) There is competition, or even rivalry, between some teachers regarding the progress of their classes. Therefore being creative as a teacher and thus devoting more time to some activities, may exacerbate tension among the 'competitive' teachers. This issue is identifiable in the following quotation:

We are two 5th grade classes and I want to be more creative than my colleague, who, particularly this year is totally traditional. Creativity takes time...she may indirectly tell me [...] 'You know, parents said that your colleague is one chapter ahead of you, why is this?' No one is going to check if, while doing the chapter on animals, let's say, in a Greek lesson class, you stayed much longer because you did five creative activities. Creativity takes time, you need to have plenty of time, [and] we don't have this at school. We are very stressed and OK, if you are told two to three times a reproach, you will be impelled to change your method and while you used to do five creative activities, you will do one so that you can compromise with everything. [...] I mean, we submit our [lesson] plans to the head teacher, who compares them, but who cannot see of course the creative part in the planning and there comes a reproach that stops you. This happens very often in all subjects.

The progress reports on planning that teachers provide for their head teachers and, generally, on their students' progress, seem to reflect the teachers' own competence. However, instead of healthy competition, there seems to be a rivalry to do with progress among colleagues, which, of course, works against the students. SKR repeatedly mentioned that creativity takes time; this, however, becomes almost impossible when a teacher rushes to cover as many topics and chapters of the syllabus as possible, in an effort to avoid reproaches from the head teacher or even the students' parents.

(4) Teachers spend much time in their music lessons to preparing students for the school events that are part of the school system, which SKR does not consider to be creative at all. In her own words:
...a huge part of music in Cyprus public Primary schools, particularly in high grades, you squander it in preparing a music show. When I say huge, I mean definitely 60 per cent. Therefore my opinion is that this should not happen, it’s so much labour, not a creative process at all [laughs], there is nothing creative in this […], except maybe the feeling that the students ultimately have enjoyed this show.

As already mentioned, school event performances cause SKR to resort to non-creative music choices in order to perfect her product, as such occasions are seen as another ‘test’ for music teachers to prove their competence, all this, of course, at the expense of the students.

To sum up, SKR described a rather unhealthy school environment, particularly for music educators, with music being underestimated as a subject. Still, however, this devaluation seems to give some freedom to the teachers in terms of the music syllabus that they follow and this may make the subject more creative than others. Yet the fact that music teachers are responsible for preparing students to present songs at the numerous school events means that an excessive amount of teaching time is taken up and much stress is caused, something that contributes possibly to adding more value to the product than the process of music activities.

4.6.6. Definition

SKR attempted repeatedly, and provided several examples during the interview, to define creativity in education. Key-words derived from the transcript attached to her definition of creativity are: the students’ self-action, initiative, alternative approach and different viewpoints, emotion, sensitivity and enjoyment. Particular examples in which SKR defined creativity were as follows: “I consider creative whatever deviates from the traditional, the given [pre-existing], the strictly contextualised”, “the different viewpoint of each group is by itself creative,” and while discussing one of the video vignettes, she pointed out that the particular activity “…doesn’t allow for self-action,
so how can it be creative?” In addition, she considered that creativity is defined by emotion, sensitivity and enjoyment:

Music for me, for all the years I have been teaching it, it is something that will touch students, something that will inspire them. So, in order to be creative, their output has to touch them, to be made with emotion, to be artful.

Furthermore, when students enjoy an activity, it is a sign that creativity may take place: “I think that part of creativity is also the aesthetic enjoyment, something that I might have not told you before.” It may be concluded, then, that music creativity for SKR is defined as any process that encourages the students' initiatives and self-actions, in which they have the opportunity to apply their alternative approach or points of view and, eventually, to produce an output that they like and they enjoyed making.

**4.6.7. Methodological issues**

No major issues concerning methodology arose while interviewing SKR. It should be noted, however, that the participant brought an audio track (Appendix XI), instead of a video, with which the interview started. This, however, was not a problem since it served the purpose of initiating a discussion about creativity from the perspective of the participant. Another minor issue which, however, was not directly mentioned by SKR, was that she had to guess or make assumptions about some aspects of the videos provided at the end of the discussion. In particular, she firstly guessed that “[c]learly they [students] followed the instructions given during the lesson” and, secondly, she assumed that “[m]aybe that was their music score, that I think, they may have made it themselves.” Eventually, however, this did not pose any difficulty in the interview process. The goal was not to judge the teacher or the activity per se,
but to draw conclusions about music teachers’ perceptions of creativity by asking them to reflect on the videos. Thus participant’s assumptions, in fact, do say something about how she, as a teacher, perceives and/or assesses creativity, something that is taken into consideration below.

4.7. Participant 2: ELN – General Teacher Specialising in Music

ELN grew up in a family that loved Greek music and dancing, something that was passed on to her. From the age of 6 EKN started experimenting with the recorder and very soon after with the accordion. As a student she participated in the choir and the school orchestra. At the age of 12 she started taking private piano lessons. Even though she was very passionate about learning how to play the piano (she could play the Greek songs she loved within the first three months) she never took any piano examinations because she perceived them to be stressful. She received a ‘C’ in music in the third grade of the Secondary education, which made her wonder: "…how could someone who plays the piano get a ‘C’ because of a test?" It was only at university that she finally accepted herself as a musician:

I was always feeling bad for not attending a music school. I never received any diplomas or passed any examination. […] During my studies for the teacher's degree I accepted that not having a piano diploma or any examination passed does not make you a bad musician. In fact, it makes you a different, free musician.

Even though ELN's first ‘crash test’ on music teaching was not successful, she found support from the music inspector of the Ministry of Education, who helped her to cope with it. At the age of 29 and while working as a general teacher in Primary education, ELN decided to become a music teacher specialist. As a university student majoring in Primary general education ELN's musical development
stagnated: “I didn’t study to be a musician; I studied to be a teacher, so I was not aware of the music development.” Once having decided, however, to devote herself to becoming a music teacher, she explains that “I went through training with a fantastic trainer. Lesson plans, activities, skills, vocals, creative activities.” In fact, it was during this training that ELN encountered musical creativity: “…creativity is something that I discovered along the way,” explaining that “my studies, though, didn’t prepare me at all for music creativity. I learned about music creativity when I was doing my training to be a music teacher.” In particular, ELN described vividly how she asked the trainer to explain what ‘creative activity’ means:

The first two or three times she said, “And you include a creative activity.” The first time I was embarrassed to say “I don’t know what’s this.” The second or the third time I asked “Namely?” [the answer was] “To do something by themselves” [and I ask again] “That is?” “They may do a short composition, you may ask them to do a short theatrical act, you may provide them with a couple of notes and ask them to come up with two rhythmic measures and compose, you may take with you a story, a fairy tale and ask them to….” And I started realising that doing something by themselves, which I can’t predict [the result of], is not so bad [laughs]. But again, I hesitated to do it, (…) I had to go through, to digest the core knowledge and the teaching applications, to be in a position to say “OK, now we are ready to try something more” formally. Informally, thinking back now, it’s something I have always been doing. I mean this challenge “How can we play this? The same as last time? Let’s find another song etc.” has always been in my teaching. But only recently I started making structured creative activities.

Furthermore, once having finished the training and started working as a specialist music teacher, she continued to update her knowledge by attending music seminars: “After the first ‘surviving’ year I began to attend various seminars in music teaching. I knew I had to try out every new technique.” In addition to attending seminars, ELN tries to apply her knowledge by organising educational events:

After a course I had [on jazz], I organised an event with a saxophone orchestra. Children from different schools played together for the first
time with professional musicians. Extremely creative project! Changing a common song into jazz was fun and stimulating for the kids.

Obviously, rearranging or adapting a song to a different style is an activity that ELN finds creative and appealing for the students, something discussed further below. Moreover, ELN invited a composer to collaborate with the students in an effort to write music together: "Children came up with wonderful ideas. A lot of experimenting, a lot of shy students gave inspiring solutions. [Finally] [w]e performed in front of audience."

After being diagnosed with tendonitis, ELN turned to choral singing. In an effort to maximise her proficiency in the new topic, ELN “…attended seminars on vocals and conducting [which] gave me and my students a new perspective. I could teach everyone to sing really well.” After recovering, ELN joined a percussion band and two years later she "managed to teach samba and reggae for the first time. Kids loved it."

To sum up, despite her 20 years of service in Primary education, ELN remains a restless professional, who continues to evolve, both as a musician and a teacher. In general, while she was very positive and willing to participate in this study (her enthusiasm, in fact, may also be witnessed to the extensive length and details she provided in the MDRPCP) it should be noted that during the whole interview she talked softly and occasionally she left her sentences unfinished, something that made me feel her uncertainty about the topic of musical creativity and, particularly, about composition activities, which are discussed further below.

4.7.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

Activities that ELN considers to be creative are those triggering the students’ motivation, bringing them enjoyment and satisfaction; in particular, she mentioned
orchestrating, adapting and/or modifying a song's style, “…learn[ing] a piece in a particular way and then chang[ing] its style”, adding acting and dancing to a song, making a sound story or writing a short story to a piece of music. In addition, having disagreements while discussing how a piece of music should be danced to or performed is also something that ELN finds creative. Furthermore, while she mentioned composition as a creative activity, she admitted that it is something she is afraid of: “Doing composition, I admit, is something that scares me and I’m afraid to try it. When I say composition, I mean structured song, not just a simple sound story.” This suggests that ELN considers a sound story as inferior to composition, while also adding ‘mystery’ to the latter. Composition is an activity that ELN, after about two decades of teaching in Primary education, is reluctant to use in her lessons. Therefore, nurturing creativity in the music classroom, using various activities, including composition, demands skill, knowledge and confidence.

In terms of singing performance, ELN explained that in order to be creative, students need to like the songs:

I do consider performance as a creative activity when we don’t play school songs, but songs that students like, songs from their everyday life, songs which they can identify themselves with. When using this kind of music, students are very different.

Otherwise they become very uncooperative; anything that is close to them brings excitement, inspiration and motivation, crucial elements in order for creativity to flourish:

There needs to be motivation and then some kind of satisfaction. Satisfaction [such as] we listened to it and we liked it [or] “Mrs, next time can we add in this instrument?” Now if a group just played it once and that’s it, I don’t consider it creative. There needs to be a desire from the students to keep it on, either “Mrs, will you bring something similar next time?” or “Mrs, can we try it as dubstep?”, something that will inspire
them to move forward. Or “Mrs, we decided with our group to also do this song”.

In addition to motivation and inspiration, ELN mentioned that students also need to be challenged and determined:

I believe that in order to have creativity there needs to be challenge. If a student fails to play something, but he insists, because he didn’t like it that his group didn’t do very well and wishes to try it again, maybe the new aspect, maybe musically speaking that wouldn’t be very creative, but as a character and as a person this gave him a great lesson.

Apparently, this belief is closely related to the importance of the process of a musical activity, the inner personal development of the students.

Her perception of what a creative activity is has changed in the course of her teaching experience:

In the past I couldn’t by any means understand the techniques of using materials (…), particularly in the first grades, with newspapers, plastic cups etc. And little by little I realised that this is also useful, because when you ask the student to make the howling wind with no musical instruments, if you don’t give him the experience, the student can’t respond, to think, “Aha! Mrs, I have this newspaper and we can rub”.

This is related to her perception of creativity itself, which seems to be an evolving term, influenced by her experience and knowledge in music and teaching.

Regarding the factors that influence the development of musical creativity in education, the teacher’s own creativity is the most important:

First and foremost, the teacher: how determined is the teacher to help their students achieve that level of creativity? You realise after all this that in order to be creative it is you who has to take the decision.

On the other hand, ELN explained that teachers who are unwilling to fight to overcome problematic school situations or challenge themselves by updating the
teaching material they use, and thus evolve as educators, will lack creativity in their teaching:

When the teacher is not willing to find new things, when the teacher listens to a song and likes it, but he or she can’t think of “it would be a challenge for me to use it, to adjust it to the students’ level” or when the teacher is not willing to come up against some ‘status quos’/the system, for example, “This is the book, this is what I will teach,” then how can this teacher be creative? What new aspect will this teacher bring?

Furthermore, by simply following a traditional teaching approach, the lesson is likely to become boring and uncreative: “It is the class, the syllabus, the book, OK nice, teach this and this. All right the first year the students didn’t know you [and] you did well, they learned from you. Next year, the book again?” Therefore, educators have to keep evolving and updating their teaching material and approach to their lessons, as this will make them more capable of nurturing their students’ creativity.

Finally, perceiving creative teaching as the most crucial factor in the nurturing of musical creativity in education also relates to ELN’s sense of responsibility as a music teacher for developing her students’ creativity; as she explained,

…to some extent I feel very responsible for this, because I didn’t graduate from a music school. I am self-taught. So I can’t ignore all that I fought to learn and let someone else teach it. Who is going to do it? If you don’t let them think freely, or develop music thinking, or just use body percussion, who is going to do it? History, maths and Greek?

Therefore, in addition to feeling responsible for developing students' creativity in music, it can be noticed that ELN considers music as a more appropriate school subject for nurturing students’ creativity than others.

To sum up, the principle elements that make an activity creative for ELN are challenge that brings motivation (and thus enjoyment and satisfaction), application of inter-disciplinarity, such as dancing and acting, and encouragement of
discussion/peer-assessment. In order to achieve these, the teacher's skill, knowledge and confidence are seen as necessary. Furthermore, ELN puts the responsibility for creative music teaching on the educators' willingness to grow, to continue to learn and enrich their teaching material and approach.

4.7.2. Assessment

ELN's answer to whether she assesses her students' creativity was repeatedly negative because, according to her, creativity cannot be assessed: "I know how to introduce it [creativity], how to motivate them [students], but at the end I can't assess it", adding later on: "To tell you the truth, I think I've never assessed it, never because I don't think it is something that can be assessed, [maybe] I take it as granted?" What comes out of this is, again, ELN's ambiguous picture of creativity: she considers it to be something that she is capable of introducing to the students, but which she cannot assess.

Asked to comment on the creativity level of two student groups’ performances, ELN responded that,

If the group performs exactly as I ask, then, OK, they will get a 'bravo'. If the other group, though, effectively adds the chime tree in more measures, or if a student adds a high note while playing or makes a mistake accidentally and plays higher and sounds differently, this will be creativity for me.

Therefore the students' initiations seem to be decisive when it comes to considering something as creative. This impelled me to ask whether the greater the students' role in a performance are, the more creative the output of the group. ELN, however, did not confirm this, explaining that it depends on the teacher's instructions:
This is something I haven’t figured out yet [laughs]. I’m not sure, what limits this, what instructions did they have? Were they asked to do [perform] a given song something entirely different? If yes, then OK (...), I think it depends on the instructions.

Therefore the ambiguous image of creativity arises again. It should be noted, however, that, for ELN, initiation greatly influences her thinking about what creativity is. Asked to comment on the output of two students who perform within the same context and follow the same instructions, ELN repeated her difficulty regarding assessment, pointing to peer-assessment among students instead of providing her own comments:

This is very hard. I would try firstly not to express my feelings. That is, something the students played and they are excited, may be a trifle for me. I would prefer having the class commenting. Sometimes age and experience are very different, so I would consider as creative exploring the capabilities of an instrument. Like the girl of the second video, she didn’t like the sound [of the instrument], she shook it, she turned it upside down...well, this takes you a step forward. I think this group, the group that would explore the capabilities of an instrument, using them to go somewhere, to get something good. Now good, what is good? Well, good is subjective [laughs].

What may be suggested then is that asking students to comment on or assess each other's performance is an 'escape' for ELN. Furthermore, an alternative approach to an activity also contains an element of defining and raising the level of creativity. Finally, the fact that ELN mentioned that "...[the students] using the instruments to go somewhere, to get something good" indicates that her attention is oriented towards the good quality of the product, rather than the process of the activity. As for what makes a product good, ELN points to the subjective taste of each individual.

While ELN expressed the belief that creativity cannot be assessed, she showed no significant hesitation in commenting on the video vignettes and rating their creativity. In particular, while discussing the first video, she considered
interesting that the students sit on the floor, with everyone having a stick and participating:

…it may be the beginning for something very different later on. And these activities are useful, they may seem part of the routine, but it may be an activity on which you will be based on, it may save you time, so that later you can have time to let the students create. But I wouldn't consider this a very creative activity.

Therefore students' seating arrangement for an activity is important as it sparks their interest and motivation. Furthermore, activities in which students just repeat given motifs are not considered creative, but part of the routine. Such routine activities, however, may be helpful for the course development of the lesson. Inviting ELN to suggest what could have made this example more creative, she recommended adding “…movement and playing to be something more unconstrained beyond the structured sit-and-play, which is the same [repeated].” Therefore, including movement and encouraging students to use their bodies adds to the creativity of the activity, thus, stimulating students' creative behaviour.

ELN's opinion about the second video vignette was that it was creative because of

…the way they used the instruments, she got [it], she played it, she was not satisfied, she tried the other way around, well, yes, this is creative activity and it seems that they have a plan, something, there is a goal to play something, to try something.

Therefore students' alternative approach to an activity emerges as an important aspect of the creativity puzzle. In contrast, however, to focusing on the product that was mentioned earlier, ELN seemed to be more interested here in just having the students try something. This shift of focus may be explained because of the students' age: “…they had to create, but even just making something, even with
the guidance of the teacher, is very creative, I believe, in this age.” Therefore, the age of the students seemed to be an influence to the extent that the students' output is considered creative.

As for the third vignette, the participant expressed her dislike of it:

I don't like it, no, I don't consider it creative because it lacks the most prominent element of the song, which is the beat. (...) I mean, OK, it's good effort, we put some effort, we experimented with the blues scale, but you also need to use a percussion (...) Simplifying a piece and making it sound the same as others, lacking a very basic element, then it is not creative. I mean, if they presented the piece as heavy metal, or rap, yes, that is creative.

While ELN recognised that the students might have experimented with the blues scale, something that relates to the process, her attention seems to be attracted to the outdoor ‘ceremonial’ performance, that is the output, the product, which is the major reason that she does not consider it creative, basically because of its stylistically inappropriate interpretation.

To sum up, students' initiations and alternative approaches to an activity, which are within the teacher’s instructions, have a decisive role in what is considered creative. As for the activity itself, students' seating arrangement is important for stimulating their interest and motivation. In addition, routine activities may become more interesting and creative when movement is added. Lastly, ELN's focus in assessing students' creativity seems to be variable: sometimes it is on the process while, at other times, it is on the product. In fact, the age of the students seems to be an influence to the extent that students’ output or the process they followed is considered creative.
4.7.3. Creative students

ELN’s teaching experience points to high achieving students: those with confidence and social skills. Moreover, relationships and age are also important factors that influence the creative behaviour of students: “…usually students with confidence, not that much in music, but in their social skills are acceptable by the class, it is easier to throw an idea or dare to try something.” In terms of age, young students, such as those from first and second grades, are more free and spontaneous, that is, they say or do what comes to their mind with no second thought, suggesting that this also makes them creative, unlike older students, particularly “…from grade three the social restrictions start” which make students reluctant to express themselves; they want to avoid being derided by their classmates:

Young children feel more free and are more spontaneous to say what they think. The first that comes into their mind when they listen to a song or watch a video. (…) Unfortunately, a student of the fifth or sixth grade starts thinking, “What does my teacher expect me to answer? Should I say what I’m thinking or not? Should I say it or would it be nonsense? Wouldn’t the other student who goes to afternoon music school and has music knowledge make fun of me?” (…) Little ones, on the other hand, are more free, that is, even if they grapple with each other, they don’t have issues and doubts, they will give it a try, they are more daring, more free. Of course the output of the older students will be of more quality.

She also clarifies that intelligent students are not necessarily creative: “We usually tend to rely on smart students, but the more creative surprises may come from students of special education. (…) Creativity is a different type of intelligence.” Therefore, intelligence is not a prerequisite for creativity, but is a different type.

To sum up, confidence, social skills and relationships with other students, as well as age are important factors that influence the creative behaviour of students. Intelligence, on the other hand, seems to be irrelevant to creativity for ELN, as creativity is a different kind of intelligence for her.
4.7.4. The domain issue

Perceiving creativity as a particular kind of intelligence relates also to its definition, as well as to its nature, particularly to its domain-transcendent attribute and to the fact that it is teachable.

In terms of the domain issue of creativity, ELN commented: “I mean I can’t separate music creativity from creativity in general any more (...) I think that if you are creative, every subject can be taught creatively.” While this statement applies to the teachers, it suggests that if a person, in this case a teacher, is creative, that is, they have developed that type of intelligence, then that person can extend it into other areas, too. Furthermore, as a particular type of intelligence, ELN holds that it can be taught:

And I believe it can be taught, creativity can be taught. That is, by rewarding a creative behaviour, a creative activity, a creative output and discuss it a bit, I mean, point out what you feel when being creative, how you achieve to feel that, to control the emotion (...) there are some stages that are the same. A painter will try hard several times with the colours.

Therefore, creativity, as a particular kind of intelligence, can be developed, or ‘taught’, as ELN explains, yet it may take time and hard work. Once developed, though, this kind of intelligence can “transcend” and be applied generally into someone’s life.

4.7.5. School environment

Time-pressure, an undervaluing of the subject of music and sometimes tension among colleagues are the points highlighted by ELN regarding the school environment, which, unavoidably, has an impact on her teaching:
Unfortunately there is the time pressure sometimes, I mean, you have to set as a goal that every week, even just once in every class, you will have one creative activity to prepare for, otherwise, you will waste your time building a technique or working on a performance for the school events.

ELN expressed her antipathy towards specific school events as she does not consider them creative, while they are also overwhelming:

There are school events that I don't consider creative at all, such as those celebrating the nation, something that almost made me come into conflict with my colleagues until I realised that it is inevitable and I had to do something creative.

In an effort to increase the creativity in national ceremonial songs presented at school events, ELN intentionally attempts to include other forms of art, such as acting, whenever she can: “Any time I can make a song look like a theatrical performance I do it.” Nevertheless, as she explained, “There are many music teacher colleagues who are oppressed because of the school events.” This oppression stems firstly from lack of time, because the time needed to prepare students for school events, thus requires other activities to be eliminated and, secondly, from the misconceptions other teachers have about music as a subject and music teachers in general.

In terms of the time issue, while being creative, and to what extent, is up to the teacher, the situation may still become difficult, as ELN explained, depending on the school:

School policy in relation to creativity depends much on the music teacher, that is, if you are in a school where the head teacher strictly follows the rules, the school events etc. and suffocates the school, may cause you trouble in terms of what and how to present [in school events] and intrude into your job, meaning that this stresses you, and when you are stressed, the first thing you try to do is to do the most necessary things from the book so that you don’t get into trouble. If you are
experienced, though, and not afraid to conflict even with all your colleagues, then nothing touches you.

Therefore a heavy schedule of school events works against musical creativity. Still, however, it depends on the music teachers whether they will follow the head teacher's planning of school events or not. In fact, being experienced and confident as a music teacher is not only necessary in order to nurture creativity in the music classroom, as already mentioned above, but also for coping with awkward situations that may arise in the school, including the relationship with the head teachers.

As for the second issue, that is, colleagues' misconceptions, this is apparent in the following quotation: “My colleagues have not understood what music is, what music education is. Many times they think that you [the music teacher] are the person who will do their needs, you are the person who will sing at the school events.” As ELN explained, however, this may change depending on the output of the music teacher’s work and behaviour:

It takes time, if you work properly, to appreciate that your subject is important; and it depends of course on your attitude and behaviour (...). Also, when they [colleagues] see your first or second [school] performance or observe your lesson then, they realise “OK there is something here” and my experience has shown that year after year, I mean the first year they may see you as “She is the music teacher, she will fulfil our needs” and then they start appreciating you.

Consequently, while music as a subject, and thus the person teaching it, are necessary for the numerous school events, music is still considered inferior to other subjects. However, this approach may change if the music teacher proves the opposite. For this reason, it seems that music teachers may be, by default, regarded as different by their Primary colleagues, something that makes the subject of music problematic:
In general though the subject suffers. I mean, if I ask the school to buy musical instruments or other necessities, I encounter reaction, for example, “Come on now, is it necessary?” But when there is an event “Will you [the students] sing for us?” For them we are those that will carry out the school events.

What may be concluded is that music teachers experience a lot of pressure to prepare students for various formal school events. In addition, the higher the quality of the students' performances, the more appreciation music teachers may receive from their colleagues, and thus the pressure may be greater. Furthermore, such school events require much time, something that eliminates the possibilities for including activities than those required for preparing for the events.

4.7.6. Definition

ELN considers anything that breaks rules and brings forth new knowledge to be creative. Commenting on creativity in music, she says that “…creativity for me [is] something new that will drive you into something new”, explaining that “there is nothing that doesn’t lead somewhere; it may not lead to where I had originally planned it, but somehow, I will earn something. So that’s how I understand creativity.” In an effort to clarify what she means by “something new, driving into something new”, she explained it as “…to see or listen to a piece of music, to be impressed by an instrument and then my imagination starts to ‘fly’ (…) thinking about how I could use that piece in the classroom.” What may be derived from the above is that motivation, inspiration and the generation of new knowledge or product have important roles in the definition of creativity for ELN. In addition, while discussing her video choices, ELN described them as very creative “…because they shake down rules, which I previously considered as the absolute correct to be followed” and this
was freedom and some kind of relief for her, who as a classically trained pianist felt guilty about playing ‘easy’ pop songs when she was student.

When asked, however, about what she thinks of her students’ creativity, she seemed uncertain and vague, a little reluctant or afraid to express her opinion as it might not be aligned with what may be the ‘standard’ definition of creativity:

I’m not sure if this is related to creativity as we define it [emphasis added]; that is, seeing students being happy at the end of the lesson every time I teach something new, which may not be so innovative; it could be just how to play the glock or a new note on the flute, it could be singing, interpretation, a new song and how to perform it. This makes me feel good.

Two points may be identified from this statement: first, ELN believes that there may be a formal definition of creativity that she is unaware of, something that relates to the insecurity she evidenced during the interview, as already mentioned, and second, that it is very important and satisfying for her to see happy students in her lessons. In fact, this perspective goes along with her belief about students' inner personal development that was mentioned above. In addition, as already concluded, ELN's perception of creativity seems to be evolving; experience and knowledge in music and teaching are decisive influences in this evolution.

To sum up, creativity for ELN seems to be an evolving term, currently related to the ‘demolition’ of anything established or standard, thus generating new knowledge or product. Important elements that bring this about are inspiration and motivation, and important elements that arise from this are the students' satisfaction and personal development.
4.7.7. Methodological issues

ELN’s interview did not raise any significant issues about the study’s methodology. ELN brought three videos (Appendix XI) with which we started our discussion about how she perceives creativity. She also had one more video to show at the end of the interview. This may be interpreted in two ways: first, it may be seen as an affirmation of her willingness to participate; second, it may relate to her ambiguous way of perceiving creativity. Finally, ELN brought four video examples with her, and in such a case one might suggest also doing content analysis of them; however, as already explained, this falls outside the scope of this methodological approach and may be a future study in its own right.

Regarding the positive aspects of the methodology, one should note the ‘liberation’ of ELN to assess creativity, even though she initially stated the opposite, when provided with the video examples. Therefore what she was not able to describe out of context, emerged after watching the video vignettes.


KSN started taking private violin lessons at the age of seven. After joining the Cyprus Youth State Orchestra at the age of 16 she started taking music theory and piano lessons, while also being a member of other orchestras and music groups/bands. Even though studying to become a Primary school teacher was not the dream of her life, she eventually decided on this as that would secure her a prestigious job after graduating from university. At the age of 22 and while teaching full time in Primary education, she continued her music studies in composition and music pedagogy. In her late twenties, she decided to undertake a master’s degree in music pedagogy at the Institute of Education in London, where new knowledge and
inspiration drove her to start a PhD. Coming back to Cyprus, KSN decided that she wanted to teach only music in Primary schools. Surprisingly, KSN confessed that at the beginning of her teaching career she did not want to teach music:

...I was not even saying that I know music so that I teach the other subjects. And the reason was that I didn’t want to do events only. It was also my inexperience as a new teacher. […] and precisely because I wanted to be creative with my students and I didn’t want to do only events, that’s why I said ‘No’.

Maturity and further studies in music led KSN to feel ready to cope with this endeavor:

Finishing, however, my second degree in music, doing also my master and becoming mature as a person, I said that “Good, I’m ready now to get into this thing that I love so much, to convey this thing that I love so much to my students.

Her passion for music education, her strong character and confidence as a person were observable throughout our conversation.

4.8.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

KSN holds that creativity is teachable:

Yes, I think creativity can be taught and it’s not like ‘Take this, take a glass of flour and a glass of sugar, blend them and make a cake’. You provide the supplies and the training, that is, the opportunities for someone to be creative.

Therefore there is not a standard recipe for developing creative skills; it is through opportunities and practices that creativity may be nurtured. In fact, providing
opportunities for creating music is something that KSN repeatedly mentioned as a significant element in teaching creativity. KSN’s applied practices for nurturing students’ creativity revolve around activities of improvisation, composition and orchestration, that is, activities in which students have the chance to act by themselves within a framework set by the teacher’s instructions. As KSN explained, however, “…there needs to be a preparation before doing this [i.e. composition]”; in particular,

…you will start with improvisation […] so you play something as a call using percussion instruments and you let them respond as they wish. And then you start altering parameters: ‘I don’t want you to play the same rhythm I did, I want you to try something else’.

Therefore the preparation starts with imitation, then variation and, ultimately, unconstrained improvisation or composition, with the teacher setting particular parameters each time. As will be seen, these parameters form the framework according to which KSN assesses students’ creative output. Through these preparatory improvisation activities, KSN progresses to more demanding instructions and requirements.

In terms of composition, and particularly when the students’ compositions are to be presented in school or out-of-school events, KSN’s role shifts from that of a facilitator to that of a co-composer:

‘The Prince of Venice’ was our [theatrical] play and I told the students “OK, we’ll write the music.” I gave them instructions like, “here we want to create this mood” or I gave them lyrics for which they had to count, but […] it was totally free. And they got into groups, they got instruments and we had […] little rough diamonds, […] and what I did was that I took the idea and turned it into a song. Or sometimes I combined, this was hard,
but we did it and *the students felt that this is our song, “it’s mine”* [emphasis added].

Obviously, students feel very satisfied when they identify their contributions to the construction of a song, even if that was made with the assistance of the educator. KSN admitted that the boundaries, in terms of the teacher’s contribution to the final product, are flexible: “Now, where your help stops and where your own contribution starts, that is, your own idea of how to do it, is blurry. But it’s something not easily distinguished in a creative process.” This, however, as she goes on, creates a “…positive attitude towards this process”; these activities “…convince the student that even if he doesn’t know anything about music, he can still create.” What may be concluded from this is that assisted composition boosts students’ confidence, which is the primary characteristic of creative students that KSN mentioned, as we will see below. Furthermore, in addition to boosting students’ confidence, KSN notices that adopting creative activities from a young age helps students to be expressive and positive towards music: “Firstly, it’s easier for them to express themselves after having done composition activities from a young age and, secondly, they are generally open to music.” Therefore improvisation and composition are fundamental to the musical development of the students.

As for presenting students’ musical output, KSN explained that such opportunities as writing music for presentation, function as motivators for students: “[It was] something that greatly enthused them. And this song received distinction, it ranked second in a competition, so their pride was much greater.” In fact, students’ enthusiasm about presenting in upcoming school events raises their desire to practice and prepare for it: “…and you can see them ‘Oh my God!’ [excitement], they were trying, they devoted time from their break […] to create music, […] which would help the whole process of the theatrical play. […] You notice that their little eyes are
more shining when they will do such activities." Therefore, providing opportunities, which act as extrinsic motivators, to prepare for school events, is a promising way of stimulating students' interest in music, something that they enjoy and it may eventually become an intrinsic motivator. In fact, enjoying the process of doing an activity, is another parameter for helping someone to be more creative. KSN recognised this while judging the creativity of the first video: "It’s fun, it’s a fun activity and part of creativity is the fun of it." Therefore having fun doing something, and thus being willing to devote more time to it, which inevitably will gradually make one more experienced on that area and of course will raise the possibilities of overcoming barriers, provides the chance to do something one has never done before and thus be (more) creative. While this was not expressed in these exact words by the participant, it is clearly considered to be important for nurturing creativity, and it will be discussed later.

Another mutual practice in which students’ creativity may be nurtured according to KSN, is not necessarily by literally composing music, but simply by asking for students’ opinions about aesthetic choices with regard to orchestration and composition:

…it may not be composition as such, like ‘Write a piece of music;’ but even just the question ‘What do you think about what we have done here?’ You activate their critical thinking to assess the music output, the final music product, and ask them to tell you whether they like it or not.

Therefore developing students’ critical thinking and musical taste by asking them either to guess or to imagine what might sound good, or just listen to some possibilities given, for example, by the teacher and decide what the best choice is when orchestrating and/or composing music, is considered important in nurturing students’ creativity.
In addition, KSN placed strong emphasis on students' performance of their work: “When a composition activity is completed, you will then have to present it. Of course your [students'] assessment is your performance and it is something that definitely needs to be done, I don't negotiate it.” Performance for KSN, then, is considered very important to students' musical development and it is part of their assessment. Furthermore, depending on the situation, presenting students' work needs not be restricted to the school environment:

It depends on the performance, it depends on the situation, for example, the composition my students did for the theatrical play was presented to the whole school. The composition that I helped to be completed within the framework of a contest was presented on TV. Composition as part of your unit, for example, a unit in jazz, [...] will be presented in class.

Therefore performing students' output in front of an audience holds a high position in KSN's teaching, who recognised that a significant factor in the development of students' musical creativity is to provide opportunities for them to experiment and practise their creative skills.

Regarding whether the teacher has to be creative to teach creativity or not, KSN confessed at first her uncertainty:

...I'm not sure because I haven't ever thought about it. Maybe yes, maybe no. Again, it depends; to inspire creativity out of students, you have to understand the importance of being creative, you don't do it just for doing it [...], just realise the importance of this and if you have realised it, then it means that you also are a creative person.

Two points that may be concluded from this are, first, the fact that KSN admitted that she has never thought about this topic suggests that her beliefs about creativity are genuine or, at least, she has not been informed by literature and is not
biased. Second, creative teaching and teaching creativity, both go hand in hand and are a prerequisite that the teacher at least recognises the importance of creativity. According to KSN this is much more likely to happen if music teachers have been through this process, or maybe even when following instructions from a book, meaning that they prepare for the lesson: “He [the teacher] himself needs to have inside him these processes, these creative processes. He might have read about them in a book, though, […] or he may follow the instructions of someone who has written a music unit.” Nevertheless, KSN believes that creativity will work its way into the educators' teaching, no matter what the subject, if they are creative as persons:

When I was teaching only Greek, creativity was involved in my teaching in another way: we did advertisement, we did radio; that is, creativity was always finding a way to sneak into my lesson, to let the students create something out of the strict context of ‘writing, learning, doing spelling etc.’, this was getting in.

Moreover, KSN refers to the teachers’ own creativity in terms of preparing students for performances:

…many things that are presented outside [the classroom] are part of the music teacher’s creative process. […] [Y]es indeed, it’s the student who is there performing in front of an audience, either your choir or the orchestra, it depends on the teacher’s creativity, though, the exercises in the classroom; […] there comes the teacher’s creativity. And when I say teacher’s creativity, it’s very creative to know that you have some students with particular strengths and particular knowledge and try to get out of them an aesthetic result that is acceptable by a large audience, which may not be in a position to appreciate that the students’ knowledge is up to this level. And how do you achieve this? You do it through orchestration, through the choice of a song that will not be difficult, but the students will be able to sing it correctly. And how is the teacher creative at this stage? He focuses on the students’ strength in order to project this. And the teacher herself takes over the harmony of an arrangement by playing the piano or by splitting [the harmony]: [e]ach one of the students may play one note […] which will form the chord.
Therefore, to be creative as a music teacher, both as a musician and as an educator, it is necessary to succeed in the school event preparations as this requires orchestration and arrangement skills, preparatory activities and critical thinking in terms of the repertoire.

Furthermore, she explained that as a teacher, particularly in Primary education, she feels responsible for nurturing students’ creativity:

So I consider myself not more responsible because I do just music, [...] but responsible. [...] because if you don’t give him the opportunity, who will? The Secondary education where he will have to solve math exercises to get into a university or I don’t know where else?

Therefore it becomes apparent that for KSN, Primary education, where students do not worry about examinations, is more suitable for nurturing students’ creativity than Secondary education.

Finally, KSN expressed her disagreement with teaching students to be ‘parrot-like learners’, that is, learning a particular pattern for composing music and keep repeating it, as this does not promote creative thinking:

We prepare our students for the ABRSM exams for which they will take music theory (...). You know that when it comes to the point where you have to add rhythm, if you teach your student that he can do something different on the third measure and finish it with a long note or, if you teach him one more rule, that is, to repeat the same rhythm of the first measure to the third, it will be fine. And if he practises this 500 times and takes the exams he will certainly get a good mark; but, is this creative?

Therefore, music creativity is not simply teaching students to repeat the same type of patterns in order to complete an exercise.
To sum up, frequently providing opportunities for students’ creative expression that are enjoyable (still, however, within the teacher’s specific instructions, that is, parameters) is crucial for nurturing their creativity. In addition to knowledge and skill development, such opportunities boost students’ confidence and make students generally more open to music and to composition, in particular. Furthermore, discussing with students creative possibilities and aesthetic choices or, in other words, co-creating with them, develops their critical thinking and musical taste. In addition, the performance of students’ work is mandatory for KSN and it often contributes to their motivation. Moreover, creative teaching and teaching creativity are both necessary; even if the teachers are not creative as musicians, they at least need to be able to recognise the importance of creativity. However, if an educator is creative as a person, then creativity will find a way to emerge in his teaching. Furthermore, being creative as a music educator is necessary to successfully prepare the students for participation in school events. Finally, the students’ creative skills are much more likely to grow in Primary education where they do not have to worry about examinations, as opposed to the Secondary education and this makes KSN feel even more responsible for her students’ creative skill development.

4.8.2. Assessment

With regard to whether KSN assesses creativity, the participant could not have been more explicit: “If you find the answer, please let me know [laughs].” KSN stated clearly that assessing creativity is very hard; there has to be some kind of context and a range of parameters that the instructor can check: “You will assess some points; if it’s a creative activity where you gave them some parameters [instructions] that they have to use, [then] it is easy to be assessed, you basically tick boxes.” On
the other hand, KSN recalled Stravinsky's failed premier of 'The Rite of Spring,' only to conclude again that checking boxes according to the teacher's instructions is the only method:

I personally think that you have to assess... to tick the boxes according to the parameters you gave, if they have to write something, or if they used call-and-response or if they used imitation, or anything that you've asked them; still, though, it's hard.

Therefore it may be suggested that students' creativity is judged according to whether they followed the teacher's instructions and parameters. As for what makes her consider one creative output more creative than another, however, KSN explained that "I could say that, yes, I like one more than the other, I could use this verb [i.e. like], because it's closer to my musical taste [...] or, they [students] used... something that I had already in mind." Therefore, the music teachers' background and taste define their criteria as to what makes a student's output creative and to what extent. This, however, refers to the product; in terms of the process KSN explained that,

If one group [of students] had more 'supplies', this means more knowledge, or more exposure to music in general; or they may be more skilful, let me not use the word 'talented', as the other group was not that much [talented]...but they put real effort: what do I eventually assess then? The process or the final product? (...) It's not something stable.

Therefore both the product and the process are taken into consideration when assessing students' creativity. In addition, KSN stressed that,
…the intention of the student to let himself free to use the knowledge and the tools he has available, [in order] to get into this process, [and] to experience this process, at this age is more important than the final product, because the final product may depend on skills that the student doesn’t have in Primary education.

Therefore, both the product and the process are important; KSN sometimes may focus on assessing the product, while at other times it is the process and that is because, as she put it: “...your job as a teacher is to push to help the student with a reward, especially if he has put a lot of effort into it.” For some students the output may be satisfying without using a lot of effort, while for others, it may be satisfying after very great effort. Since the job of the teacher is to help all of the students to feel that their effort has been rewarded, then the product and the process may be taken into consideration in both cases.

Furthermore, KSN referred to self- or peer-assessment: “There is also self-assessment, where students themselves will assess their creation, as is the case with their song.” This, of course, is a further technique to sharpen students’ critical thinking, which, as mentioned above, is important in nurturing students’ creative skills.

In terms of assessing the first video, KSN asked whether the rhythmic pattern originated from the teacher or the students; as long as there was no confirmation she made her own assumptions, assessing it accordingly:

We’ll assume they followed the teacher’s instructions [...] So, if the students [...] felt the [...] beat and decided that “I want to do this here, which sounds good in my opinion and we’ll change this one to do something else”, in my opinion, is more creative than what they have just done [in the video]. If, however, it is the first part of an activity that will lead to a creative result, which will provide the students with knowledge, then I will consider it as part of the process.
Therefore, including students’ suggestions in an activity is seen as making the activity creative; otherwise, the activity is considered as preliminary: "...it is the first part that will lead to a creative result." Therefore the activity in which the students follow the teacher’s instructions, with no personal input, is not considered creative, that is, the student’s process of preparation for composing or improvising, for example, is underestimated in terms of its creative potential. Nevertheless, KSN gave emphasis that students enjoy an activity: "I think it is fun and the music too, very much, but if they just followed instructions, then it’s not very creative." Therefore KSN considers an activity’s output to be creative when students enjoy the process and when the music performance or, at least, the elements of it derive from the students’ ideas.

Prompted to suggest what could have made this activity creative, KSN exemplified the students’ initiatives, that is, giving the students the opportunity to alter something prescribed or making their own decisions about how to perform it: "Letting the students decide [for example] ‘I show you this, it can be done this way; it can be done in another way, however. Take your own decision to perform with your… you may hit the other’s head’” [laughs]. Again, then, when students take initiatives and override the teacher’s instructions and come up with a product marked by their own input, this raises the creativity of the activity.

KSN’s comments on the second video reveal what the epitome of a creative activity is:

Yes. This is creative. Students were deciding on the spot, they didn’t follow instructions; they had some ‘tools’ in front of them that they could use, they decided the order they would play, there was … the little girl was like a maestro, trying to… I think yes, 10 out 10 in terms of creativity [...]. The fact they used maybe more… a given context in which he [the teacher] asked them to write music in this mood, that is, they had a parameter on which they could build on, [and] they had their instruments, they had to be coordinated.
Therefore, no matter what the aesthetic output is, the fact that students followed their instinct using the sonic sources they had available and came up with a result is what makes the process of such an activity to be truly and fully creative, something that points to the process.

Regarding the third video, KSN divided it into two parts: the creativity of the students, which she found to be average and the creativity of the teacher, whom she exalted for her creativity because of her choices in directing:

Yes, it is creative: the students 6 out of 10, for the teacher 10 out of 10, because [...] you [the teacher] are also in the creative process, so you chose what you’d do, you took into consideration the means you had available, the strengths of your students and you gave them to do something very specific. I don’t know if she had asked them whether they would have liked to have done something better.

Urged to suggest what would upgrade her rating of students' creativity, KSN would have liked more student contribution: "I would expect more of their input."

Invited to elaborate on that, KSN seemed to reconsider her opinion:

The students in the choir are very happy and they create… I will recant something I said earlier; creative may also be the performance…let me think about it, give me a moment. Maybe it is…let’s take the definition of creativity and the root of the word ‘creation’: they create this aesthetic result. If we approach it this way, yes, they create something, they produce something. Yes, but they don’t compose anything.

Therefore, while KSN was initially negative about the musical performance of the non-original music, in terms of its creativity as an activity, she concluded that this may also be considered creative, yet not as much as composition. Students' input,
such as utilising their ideas about orchestration, as mentioned in the quote below, could have raised the level of creativity.

Finally, it is important to take into consideration KSN's thoughts on the hypothetical scenario of students having done the orchestration:

If the students have done the orchestration, then congratulations; this is very creative. But being familiar with the context in which this takes place, bravo to the lady [the teacher], the maestro. She created an excellent orchestration, she did a very good job with the students' singing, she adjusted the students' various levels giving them the appropriate melody or whatever else, do they all play the same melody? […] OK, it has its harmony. Harmony and melody. So that's it.

Therefore, the students' contribution, such as orchestrating the song, could have lifted KSN's rating. However, KSN's experience made her believe that the whole setup was based on the teacher's skills and instructions. However, the teacher's own creativity, as great as KSN might have considered it, does not seem to have had such a strong impact on students' creativity.

To sum up, creativity in KSN's classroom is often assessed by the students, a means of sharpening their critical thinking, which is important for developing creative skills. As for the participant herself, students' creativity is judged as to whether they followed the teacher's instructions or not; however, their input, initiatives and ideas and, generally, going beyond the teacher's instructions, increase the level of creativity. Otherwise, the activity is considered preliminary. Furthermore, for KSN, product, process and students' enjoyment of the activity are taken into consideration when assessing creativity. Apparently, the music teacher's background and taste define their criteria for what makes a student's output creative and to what extent.
4.8.3. Creative students

Confidence was the first and foremost characteristic of creative students that KSN mentioned: “A creative student or, at least, someone who lets his creativity come out, has more confidence rather than another who may be shy, who may be creative but is embarrassed to show it.” She continued, adding that “…I don’t want to say that a creative student is smarter than another because there are different types of intelligence; maybe a creative student is cleverer and gets it quicker, or s/he is able to do the connections more easily.” As for intelligence, KSN explained that in the Cypriot Education System, the term is defined as being good at the Greek language and at mathematics. However, she makes it clear that being clever does not automatically make you creative in music or the opposite: “I have many students who excel in music, but in other subjects they don’t.” Therefore, KSN shares the belief of multiple intelligences and explained that being intelligent when it comes to music, does not mean that the student will also be intelligent in other subjects, and the opposite will also be true. In general, however, it is confidence and being able to make the connections more easily that KSN considers to be important in terms of creative behaviour.

In addition to students’ characteristics, KSN notices that the age of the student may relate to their creative output: the older the children, the more musically creative they are: “Towards the end of the Primary education they are more creative. Maybe because they have the experience, maybe because they have more knowledge, they are more creative.” Furthermore, she clarified that while younger students are also creative, the fact that “…they haven’t had the opportunities yet to project their creativity” and that “the older students act quicker because they have already been used to this process”; this suggests that (1) experience and knowledge are closely related to the creative potential of a person and (2) product is valued
more than the process of a creative activity itself. Both points will be further discussed in another chapter.

**4.8.4. The domain issue**

KSN clarified that creativity is not magic; loving what you do and working hard are prerequisites for developing this way of thinking. As she explained, “I consider myself creative but I’m not good at painting, perhaps because painting is something I didn’t like much to do, but I can still judge if something is nice.” Therefore creativity for KSN is not transferable, even though one may have the eye to judge the quality of something; one has to practise hard in that area to achieve creative performance.

**4.8.5. School environment**

School environment and how the system generally functions were recurring topics in the interview with KSN to which she made extended reference; in particular, the major issues related to time pressure and colleagues’ attitude.

Beginning with time pressure, KSN referred to the Curriculum Development Unit, groups of educators appointed by the Ministry of Education, “working to make chapters/sections available to [music] teachers, particularly to those of the lower grades [of Primary education], something like a base on which they can build on [in order to teach improvisation and composition].” While, in her opinion, this is useful and balanced material that she herself applies, her time is limited because of the various school events:

Unfortunately, the system is structured in such a way that the academic year of a music teacher in the Primary, and maybe in the Secondary,
education has milestones: the first is on the 1st October, October 28th, Christmas, March 25th, April the 1st and the closing celebration. Because you have to present something in these events, […] head teachers put a lot of pressure on you, something that is wrong, for me, especially if it’s an event where parents are invited; so you start preparing a month ahead so that you have the most aesthetically pleasing result. This leaves you with very little time to teach other things in the music classroom.

She went on to add that:

…these [the above milestones] are the main events that I mentioned; there are others […] which I no longer do, because if I was doing every event I wouldn’t do any teaching […]. But, still, there is this kind of pressure to do this and it takes you very much time […] I mean, you give much emphasis to voice interpretation, instrumental playing so students do learn some stuff, and maybe orchestration, if you do it during lesson time, but you don’t have time to do the rest that you may want to do. And this affects composition, the creative activity and the creative process.

This time limitation, because of the numerous events, also affects the kind and the structure of the activities that music teachers may adopt, such as group instead of individual activities. KSN pointed out that “…you don’t do activities individually] because you always worry about time.”

KSN’s description of the school events sounds as if it is an out-of-control depressing situation; at this point, however, it should be noted that these are not the official instructions of the Ministry of Education. As KSN explained: “in a newsletter [produced by the Ministry] it is announced every year that the choir and the orchestra do not have to present in every event; there can be the choir of just one classroom, the band of one classroom: there can be just one song.” However, the events that each school actually organises depends on
...the school 'tradition', i.e. what the school has been accustomed to do so far, e.g., to do Christmas events or not, to honour the local hero of the village, the borough, or of the community, or whatever; so you have one more event [...]. So it depends on the school 'tradition', on the Head Teacher and on the teacher if he will give in or not.

KSN made it clear, however, that is not a conflict, it is rather “the teacher's duty to present his students because [...] performing is an integral element of music education.” Along this line of thinking, KSN explained that there could be manoeuvres that allow the music teacher to survive:

I managed to separate them [events] this year: it is the Choir Festival, for example, that I will participate [...] I will participate with my fourth grade students, not the fifth or sixth grade who have already presented, because you work with the students, so the students are prepared to present, to the extent of their capabilities, of course, I mean, the fourth grade is not the same as the sixth grade, to present both orchestra and choir; at this event, I will have the fifth grade presenting something and, at the other, the sixth grade. That is, I have managed to be balanced. This, however, has come out of experience, [...] I didn’t want to do only school events, I was unhappy to think of that "Now I will start preparing for the March 25th event and I will not teach the unit about the music of Cyprus, or about jazz, or other topics".

It should be mentioned that KSN's suggestion for juggling the school events may work well in cases in which the music educator teaches music to all the grades of the school and, thus, he/she has the opportunity to participate in each event accordingly. In cases, however, in which the music teacher is not in charge of all the grades, then the participation that KSN described is impossible and consequently the music teacher is left with little time to cover several music topics and to include creative activities: “...if you have only fifth and sixth grades and you have to take part in events, then you are left with very little time.”
Therefore it can be concluded that experience is crucial in scheduling and balancing responsibilities, and it depends on the music teacher as to whether he/she will conform with the events’ calendar of the school or deviate.

As for her colleagues' opinion for herself, as a music teacher, and music, as a subject, KSN raised important points: while she described her colleagues’ attitude as very positive, she clarified that it is something that she has managed to gain for herself:

This is also something that you gain for yourself, meaning that [...] I have done many ground-breaking things. My knowledge, the fact that they know that I’m also a musician and not just a teacher, my position as a music counsellor, the fact that I know what I’m talking about, [and that] I also have knowledge for music education etc., gives me a status: “She knows what she’s doing,” the trust they place on me, which you first have to prove that you deserve it, because I’ve been through a questioning period, “Who is this, now? Is she capable of preparing students for the school events?” Because their criterion is the school events […] The fact that I do several sample lessons that showcase [promote] the school, I do sample lessons with this group of students, and teachers of other schools attend, so you raise your [status]… and they [colleagues] don’t make your life hard.

This is statement generates suggestions about how a music teacher may be judged. First, music teachers are under question and they have to prove their capabilities to their colleagues; this is done by organising successful performances of the choir and the orchestra at the school events. Furthermore, by organising additional events, which are outside the music teacher’s responsibilities, such as the sample lessons that KSN mentioned above, showcase [promote] the school and raise the teacher’s status. Finally, inability to achieve the above may have unpleasant results in one’s daily school routine: “…they just don’t take you seriously.”

A clarification that needs to be made here has to do with what successful performance means to the colleagues. In order to satisfy her colleagues’ expectation,
KSN explained: "I will try to find and present songs that they haven’t heard of before or I will play the violin or the oud, or you know, unusual things. And they [colleagues] will be like ‘Wow’ [expression of admiration and surprise]." As a result, “...they trust you, because your output product, which is the events, is good.”

KSN’s good relationship with her colleagues is a pattern that can also be found in her relationships with the students’ parents: “I think they [parents] are very positive. Many parents have come to thank me because they think that there’s good work done in the music lesson.” In addition, the satisfaction of the students’ parents derives from the opportunities that KSN provides: “…the parents are very satisfied because I give to many students the opportunity to sing solo, to play instruments. […] I try to give opportunities to the students; so parents, teachers [colleagues] and head teachers are all happy.”

While KSN enjoys the respect of her colleagues, and students’ parents in general, she still recognises that music, as a subject, is not considered as important as others. As mentioned earlier, intelligence in Cypriot Primary education is mirrored in the students’ achievements in the Greek language and in mathematics. This indicates that music, along with other subjects, is a minor subject:

They [colleagues] definitely don’t regard it as of the same level as the Greek language and maths; the same opinion is shared by the parents, as well. The same is also true for art education and for physical education, they are not of the same level.

This devaluation is a topic that needs to be taken into consideration.

To sum up, Primary education in Cyprus is full of numerous national, religious, local and other events, which encroach on the time available for music teaching. As a result, most of the music time is devoted to voice interpretation and
instrumental playing, bypassing other activities and skill development. However, KSN considers participating in school events to be a music teacher’s duty, because performance is an integral element of music education. Furthermore, she explained that scheduling and balancing responsibilities is what her experience has taught her in order to cope with the many duties she has. As for the environment of the schools regarding music and music teachers, KSN made it clear that successful performances at school events are vital for the music teachers’ professional image. Any additional events organised by the music teacher that promote the school are greatly appreciated and add to the music teacher’s value.

4.8.6. Definition

In terms of defining creativity, KSN explains that

Creativity for me is expressed in many things. Creativity is first of all the composition, not the music composition, [that is] to compose from your knowledge, from what you see around you, to apply your critical thinking so as to find a solution for something or to make a table, or to solve a problem in maths.

She also adds that “…being creative as a person even when building a house by using this material and making it pretty and aesthetically pleasing is very creative.” It may be suggested then that creativity is the application of already existing knowledge and critical thinking in order to solve a problem, deal with an issue and obtain a result that is satisfactory.

As for creativity in music education, KSN stated that: “So, creativity and music composition, for me, personally, is that you will use all of your knowledge about music, or the styles, or anything else, to compose them, to put them together, having
as a goal to do something new.” A couple of points may be noted here: first, her emphasis is on producing something new, instead of just enjoying the process without necessarily attempting to get something new out of the activity. Second, while my question did not refer to musical composition, but generally to creativity, KSN made a clear link between the two, instead of any other activity, such as singing. However, when asked about other activities, KSN clarified that,

...[singing is] also creative, but it’s the point where students get the knowledge that they can later use, in order to do something else, to do something new; this is the definition of creativity. We can also regard singing or playing as creative, but [emphasis in the original dialogue], honestly, I think their creativity will be beyond that point, they will learn from that, they will be able to express themselves and they will get the knowledge so that it will help them for what comes next.

Therefore, for KSN, musical activities, in which students’ input is limited, or in which output is mainly a reproduction or an imitation of already existing music, are considered as preparatory stages that will help students to achieve creativity in activities such as orchestration, composition, lyric-writing and improvisation, in which students’ knowledge is utilised to make something original.

KSN also explained that creativity needs preparation: “First, you have to provide them [students] with some fundamental elements that they will have to use, so at the beginning it’s more structured.” It can, thus, be concluded that a variety of musical activities is necessary in order to be used to prepare students to make their own creations and to move from the structured to the unstructured. It should also be noted here that experimentation is also considered to be a creative activity as long as it is within a context: “I may accept it as improvisation if I tell them, ’Take this, take your sticks, (...) find various ways to make sound out of the table’. Still, however, in this case I put them in a context.” As explained below, the context within which
students are expected to function, in order to create is, in fact, what makes assessment, to some extent, achievable.

4.8.7. Methodological issues

A couple of issues came up during the interview with KSN. First, the participant did not bring with her any examples of videos or audios; still, however, she was versatile enough to find one that satisfied her (and she applies in her teaching) on YouTube before the beginning of the discussion (Appendix XI). Nevertheless, I anticipated this issue when planning my methodology by being in a position to provide the participants with additional videos, in addition to what they might or might not have brought with them. This confirms the careful and flexible structure of the study, with attention payed to every detail. Second, she raised questions about the videos that I was not in a position to answer, such as: "Was it the students’ decision to play on every four [beats]?” or “[Is this] the students composing?” As was the case with SKR, asking for more information before discussing the activities suggests that in order to make valid comments, to judge creativity or to give a mark, there needs to be at least some information about the context of what has preceded, that is, the instructions that the students had been given and what their goal was. This will be discussed later on in Chapter 5.

4.9. Participant 4: CPA – General Teacher

CPA has been working as a general teacher for years. Her music enculturation started with her mother's singing songs to her, of the so-called ‘art song’ with Greek singers that her father used to adore and with documentaries about the Beatles. At the age of 6 she started taking piano lessons exploring classical music and falling in
love with Bach. She participated in her school events either playing the piano or singing solo or as a member of the choir, while also becoming familiar with other kinds of music, such as rock and metal. After passing grade 8 in the piano, and while being a university student, CPA started taking harmony and theory lessons. At the age of 22, she started taking vocal lessons and contemporary piano lessons. She participated in several concerts as a pianist or singer and she had the opportunity to expand her orchestration knowledge. At the age of 24, and having realised that she wanted to teach only music, she started taking guitar lessons. She later focused on jazz singing and she currently participates in a contemporary choir.

Even though CPA has no music degree from a college or university, her knowledge of the subject is obviously wide-ranging and deep:

I have ‘thrown’ [engaged] myself into [with] several things, both with several instruments, such as the guitar, the piano and with voice, and with many styles of music, such as classical and contemporary Greek. For two years I studied jazz, I mixed with top musicians (you learn so much from such people) and of course I did theory.

Indeed, the fact that during the interview she repeatedly mentioned that she believes in putting in hard effort in order to become good at anything is something that reflects on her character. In general, she talked passionately during the interview about music, as a form of Art and as a subject in education.

Finally, there have been academic years in which CPA, as a general teacher, who does not teach music exclusively, was not asked to teach the subject. Her eight-year experience, however, gave her the opportunity to teach music from the first to the sixth grades of Primary education.
4.9.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

CPA made it clear that musical creativity, at least at a personal level, is a teachable skill:

Yes it can be taught, but if we’re talking now about whether something can become cultural heritage or not, it is a different matter. [...] However, because I firmly believe in hard work, I think that, yes, if someone listens to music for three hours a day, plays music for another three hours and studies harmony and theory, would it be possible that he won’t be able to compose something?

She furthermore clarified, however, that

...it’s not possible that everyone can reach the same aesthetic levels; [...] one [composer] becomes enshrined in history, the other does not. However, this doesn’t mean that the other didn’t create, [...] let me not talk about the mass aesthetic and that there may be something pretty in front of our eyes that we cannot appreciate.

It can thus be concluded that we all have the mechanism to be creative and we can be taught how to achieve creative performance in music, as long as we practise hard.

Invited to describe some of the activities that she considers creative and applies in the classroom, her response was that “...[they are] too many, I mean even listening to music is creative for me. [...] even when you listen to something, you experience some things and create some pictures in your mind which is also creative.” Considering listening as creative suggests the wide meaning CPA gives to
creativity, which will be further discussed in the following paragraphs. Another 
example she gave as a creative activity, which relates to the more ‘traditional’ point of 
view of musical creativity, that is, activities related solely to composition and 
improvisation, was that “...[It] may be that I give you a piece [of music] and I ask you 
to change two notes, explaining, however, why you changed them.” The fact that 
she needs the student to be able to justify the reason for making a change to a piece 
is related to the way she assesses creativity, as we will see below. Furthermore, 
however, the need for justification has to do with the fact that, as a practice in her 
lessons, she does not accept out-of-context, that is, random improvisation or 
instrumental experimentation:

I'm not going to ask them [students] from the beginning to write a piece 
without giving them some notes and letting them do that randomly. Since 
they don’t have any knowledge about harmony I will start by giving them, 
for example, just two notes if they are very young students. And if they 
have been taught [rhythmic] values, then they can make something out 
of it. It may be just one note so they can make something only with 
rhythms. So you gradually build it, [...] personally I don’t like the 
approach of ‘Get instruments and write something’; I don’t like this 
randomness, it’s not me [...]. I don’t consider that creativity.

Adding to the above, she explained the necessity for boundaries within which 
students may need to engage in a creative activity:

I will give them some restrictions, for example, we'll learn some notes 
and then they will use them to create something; or I may give them 
some notes that are related to each other and I know they will end up 
somewhere and ask them to use them, tell them, for example, this will be 
your first and this your last note in the piece you will make. Or if it's a 
song I may help them with the lyrics; [...] I don’t expect the student to be 
creative with no scaffolding, with no supporting context, because it is 
very hard then to have a result.
Therefore structuring, preparing, scaffolding, adjusting the requirements of an activity according to the students’ background and instructing for purposeful and justified change in a melody or total improvisation on the part of the students are important practices in any creative activity in order to achieve a result. This may also suggest that CPA may actually be concerned more with the result rather than the process of an activity. Further discussion on this issue takes place in the assessment paragraph.

Furthermore, CPA backed up her opinion about giving particular instructions or a framework to the students as her experience has taught her that “...when you assign them [students] an activity with no context and no instructions they are very unhappy and usually they just talk to each other and fool around.” As we will see in the assessment paragraph, the lack of a framework, that is, a set of particular instructions and goals, is what makes CPA consider an activity to be the least creative it could be.

To sum up, a creative activity for CPA needs to be assigned after preparation or provision of a supporting context with some boundaries or a framework of instructions in which students will have to work in order to achieve something purposeful.

In order, now, to teach students to be creative, the teachers need to have knowledge of various musical styles, to continue to evolve and to have well-developed instrumental skills: “I believe that you should not be allowed to teach music if you don’t keep learning music […] and, also, if I’m only good at one style of music, that’s also a problem.” Moreover,

…[the] teacher has to be able to play music, not necessarily at a virtuoso level, […] but he needs to be able to play music and listen to music, listen to… for example, I play something very hard [loud], the teacher should
listen to this so that he can soften it, to tell you, ‘See, listen to it, listen to it, it suffers’. If your teacher lacks musicality, let alone creativity, how far can you go? Not that far.

It can thus be suggested that, in addition to instrumental skills, the teacher needs to have an artistic approach to the subject and be able to nurture students’ aesthetic and tasteful criteria.

CPA also explained that the love of music, as a form of Art and as a subject in education, is necessary: “If your approach towards music is sterile, has no emotion […] [b]ecause, as I said at the beginning, creativity isn’t just writing down something, writing five notes […], there needs to be, at least, love for it… I consider that the love for music is creativity by itself.” Therefore, in addition to instrumental skills and an artistic approach, there needs to be love, enthusiasm and, as is also later explained, eagerness or passion about the subject:

If you go to schools you will see many colleagues who don’t even bother to change the tonality of a piece, who don’t even bother to listen to their choir and find the most suitable tonality for a piece. You see music teachers who take a piece of the 8/8 [metre] and teach it in the 4/4. This is unacceptable; it means that you don’t even listen to the piece. […]. You see musicians […] who use 10 instruments playing the same exact thing […] orchestration is actually creativity and they don’t even bother… you have a violinist who plays so well and you’ve never written a melody for him […]. So, how can the student progress if you are bored, if you are bored to do a transposition?

The successful delivery of music lessons which cultivate students’ creativity demands that teachers are knowledgeable, passionate, hard-working and creative themselves as they will often have to orchestrate or arrange music for their students.

Furthermore, CPA feels responsible for nurturing the creativity of her students, particularly when she teaches music for three main reasons. Firstly,
because of the aesthetic values that students may be enriched with by studying
music and from which aesthetic creativity is derived:

We carry this responsibility because we are those who create the
expectations; we are those who create aestheticism. [...] We are
responsible, because we are responsible for their aestheticism and out of
the aestheticism comes creativity. The tools are important but, as I told
you, the most important for me is to love their output. The output does
count because that's what the audience will receive, that's what you will
communicate to them, it's the words that you will eventually say.

Secondly, because of the 'poor', 'plasticised' music that students are almost
contantly exposed to:

I believe that I am there to create interests; I'm not there just to reproduce
the plasticised music they listen to. And also I don't beat about the bush,
I'm never going to say that it's all about taste, no, it's not all about taste; I
may tell you about something 'I don't like, but I can hear that it's valuable.'
It's not obligatory that we both like Bach, I may like him, but you may not.
But I ought to be in a position to recognise whether something is valuable
or not. There is the window, there is the margin of each one's personal
taste; but the trash is there, there is noise that is dressed up and music is
only there as a name, this exists. I can't stand this 'All is good', no, it's not
all that good. I don't accept it; just because the student listens to it at
home, [that does not mean that] he won't listen to it in the classroom. [...] You have to find the way to lead them, I mean, how did I approach Bach? I
approached Bach by playing a piece [of his] on the electric guitar; for
example, I picked an artist they like and I chose a special task of hers [the
artist's] that was very good. It doesn't mean that you will alienate the
students from it. So that's why I say that we are responsible.

Thirdly, there is the power of music to offer human beings relief or a form of
escapism: "I mean, music is important and there is responsibility because for human
beings it is an escape, it is a means of creating life where it may not exist: that is,
music is life."
In order to engage students’ interest in music, CPA referred to a couple of techniques, that is, building on students’ interests and using a structured ‘reward’ system. While the students’ interests may be used to structure teaching plans, which used to be a stream in the Cypriot education a few years ago, this should not be the teacher’s only pool of choices as students’ music preferences are very limited:

There used to be a stream in the schools […], the ‘literacy criticism’, in which there was a strong tendency to derive from the students’ interests. I was not in favour of this and I am not yet. This doesn’t mean you will not listen to the students’ interests.

In addition, she has a structured approach with which she tries to encourage their extrinsic motivation at first so that it eventually becomes intrinsic:

…you begin with extrinsic motivation, but the goal is always the intrinsic. This is something that particularly concerns me because many times I realise that […] motivation is me. […] [I]t is my failure that I didn’t achieve to make the students internalise motivation and put some effort into it, as they know they can do it, [and] they have expectations from themselves and they know that something will come up that they will enjoy; this inherent satisfaction in music is very important and usually comes at the result.

Therefore extrinsic motivation could be seen as a tool with which CPA encourages the students to continually put effort; this motivation eventually becomes intrinsic as students’ personal expectations are satisfied.

CPA noticed also that students are most of the time aware of the quality of their output: “As I have noticed, most of the students know when they do something nice, they realise it and that’s where they will start trying more; so you keep pushing them until they start believing in themselves.” However, while CPA strongly believes that music education needs to offer an enjoyable experience to the students, she
also believes that some musical activities may not always be fun from the very beginning; still, though, she insisted: “I may push him [a student] at some point, to force him to do something that he doesn’t want to, but the goal is to take him to a point where he starts asking for it.”

As for the actual motivation techniques that she adopts, CPA explained that it is more important to have structured ‘motivation routines’, rather than the stimulus itself:

It’s not what the stimuli are, it’s the way you approach it; it has to be structured. You can’t give spasmodic [thoughtless] stimuli when you are desperate, there needs to be a structure with which the student is informed about and you faithfully follow it. [...] [T]he extrinsic stimulus may be a word, it could be a ‘bravo’, it could be a sticker, it could be a symbolic token system, so that when the student reaches a particular quantity, he will receive something. Some time ago I did something that I hadn’t realised it was motivating: when learning how to play the flute [...] I assigned ‘learn this particular piece by next time’. [...] When they played it successfully, because it could take some lessons until they have learned it, they got a sticker and next I was telling them, ‘Those who got a sticker will play it together, [but] those who didn’t, will not play it along with the rest, because it will sound noisy’. Some time later on I realised that the motivation was not the sticker, the motivation was to play it along with me.

In addition, she explained that failure to convert students’ extrinsic motivation into intrinsic, that is, the students’ enjoyment of music for its own sake, is a personal defeat:

…if their only payback for what they did [performed] is a sticker or a pencil from me, for example, but they themselves didn’t find any meaning to what they did, it means that I failed. Even if they followed all the procedures, but they didn’t feel this satisfaction of creativity, [it means that] all, for me, was wasted and I have to try again from the beginning.
Stimuli, then, according to CPA, need to be structured and systematic. However, as it emerges from the above statement, it is more important that stimuli will ultimately drive students’ desire to practice and participate in in-class music activities and to enjoy music.

To sum up, for CPA, we all have the ability to be creative; acquiring creative skills, however, takes time and hard effort. A good music teacher needs to be musically knowledgeable, to continually evolve, to love music as a kind of art and as an educational subject and to have good instrumental skills and an artistic approach to the subject. Furthermore, the aesthetic values that students may acquire from studying the subject of music, the ‘poor’ music that students have available to them and the power of music to relieve people’s stress make CPA feel responsible for developing students’ creativity. Finally, she also feels that part of her duties is to find the means of inspiring and motivating students.

4.9.2. Assessment

In terms of assessing creativity, CPA acknowledged that during her university years, this was not something she touched on: “Assessing creativity, I can’t say that I particularly tackled this area.” However, as an educator, she explained that she does assess the creativity of her students guided by her aesthetic criterion:

Yes, based on my aestheticism, there may be some outputs that I may like more than others, but I will not dwell on this part. We’ll discuss it, they themselves will mention if they like it, but… grading it, for example? No, I will not mark it. I will not mark something in terms of whether I find it… No.
Obviously, her aestheticism influences her decisions about the level of creativity of the students’ output without, however, grading it. In addition, whether she likes or dislikes the students’ output is not the end of the story, but simply the beginning; this, as CPA explained, will initiate a discussion between herself and her students, asking them to self-assess their output and directing them to improve it: “…if the student has followed instructions and reached a point and it’s approximate, we’ll work it together to make it reach something better.” Therefore, no matter if the output is marked, the teacher seems to have a role in influencing students’ taste, aestheticism and artistic criteria in relation to music.

Furthermore, she explains that the way she assesses is a qualitative, rather than a quantitative practice:

> I don’t assess creativity as a measurable means; at least, if I was forced to do it […] I wouldn’t save the 20 [the highest mark] just for the student who distinguished, but I would also give it to anyone else who tries hard and achieves my goals. If I have five goals and one achieves 10, and the other achieves five, I have to give 20 to both of them. As for the other student, who achieves more, I will give him other targets but, I will not reflect this on the mark, because the mark itself has to do with what I’ve asked for, if he achieves what I’ve asked for. If he achieves more, good for him, I will mention it, but I will not compare him to the others so that he won’t receive all the glory.

What may also be concluded from the above is that, while CPA’s assessment criteria are based on her aestheticism, her assessment standards and expectations are influenced by the students’ strengths and capabilities: if a student performs well, she will set different goals for that particular individual. The assessment is based on each person’s strengths and to the extent the student has followed the instructions. What is again stated here is: “I assess each student separately; yes, if the instructions have been followed correctly, that is.”
Nevertheless, she makes it clear that comparative assessment is not a practice that should often find a place in education unless it has to do with encouraging the students:

I don’t often do comparative assessment; […] I personally do comparison when the discussion [topic] has to do with the effort and the compliance of the instructions: ‘Do you see this mistake? It’s because you ignored this instruction, which would have helped you to avoid this’. […] I believe that if you give your parameters, [and] the students understand and follow them, they will reach the goal. Some of the students’ [result] may be more simplistic than others, but it’s OK, because that’s also music.

The above quotation also reiterates the importance of parameters set by the teacher, that is, it helps the students to work within a particular range of choices and not get lost with regard to where to start and end; it also helps the teacher with assessment. Therefore issuing particular instructions and setting targets makes the activity controllable and achievable for the students, as well as convenient for the teacher when it comes to assessment.

Another topic that needs further discussion here, is the importance of the process or the product and whether CPA considers one to be more important than the other or both to be equal. As she explained, “…No, I can’t say one is more important than the other […]. [I]t’s because of the type of music knowledge, for which, even if you achieve some objectives with no effort, to some extent, it will lead you to a point.” While CPA declared that she maintains a neutral position about the process/product topic, her tendency to favour the product can be identified here: “What is of primary importance for me, though, is the student’s enjoyment of his output.” Apparently, there is no reference to the process, that is, to the students’ enjoyment of the activity; CPA’s emphasis was on the product. In addition, a
statement that has already been used above reinforces her leaning towards the product: "I don’t expect the student to be creative with no scaffolding, [and] with no supporting context, because it is very hard then to have a result" [emphasis added]. However, when invited to comment on the video vignettes and assess students’ creativity and that of the activities, CPA expressed difficulty in assessing an output without being aware of the preceding process:

This is the result; I don’t know the process followed. […] Merely because you don’t see the whole process. Therefore, when I see isolated things and I assess them, I always feel that I may be unfair to the other person… you have to see the process.

In particular, her comments on the first video were that:

I think it is important to acquire this [skill] […] it’s under strict instructions…and they are altogether. I consider it a preliminary activity for creation […] this is a performance. […] basically, the teacher was giving them rhythmic patterns and they were performing them. OK, it’s not creative, no, it’s not.

Prompted to rate it, CPA wondered whether the rhythmic patterns were coming from the students’ suggestions. Even though I was not in a position to answer, it became obvious then that it is crucial for CPA to know if an activity includes the students’ own contribution and, generally, their background. Not having received an answer, CPA concluded that the activity was based on given rhythmic patterns, which essentially does not promote creativity at all: "…the video, though, shows only the teacher. OK it’s not creative, at least at this stage, not at all." CPA emphasised, however, the importance of knowing what preceded in order to be in a position to assess anything: "I judge it out of context because, after this, the students
may give their own ideas; because this is something that I would also do as a preliminary." Nevertheless, it may be concluded that students' contribution to any activity is decisive when it comes to assessing their creativity. On the other hand, the activities that do not include the students' input are considered preliminary, preparing the students for what comes next.

Regarding the second video, CPA asked again whether the students were performing with given instructions or not, only to rate it as two, or three at the most, because "...nothing comes out of this for me." Her suggestion of how this could be more creative was to combine the activity shown in the first video, with the activity in the second one:

Connecting the two [activities] [...]. That is, [for example,] do the first part where the teacher gives some examples and then the students get the instruments and try something by themselves and make something out of it. I think the first one is the framework and the other is... but based on their result I feel that they don't have 'supplies' [i.e. knowledge], they just play randomly. So again, it is one, actually.

Therefore, pre-existing knowledge is necessary in order to be able to create, otherwise performing randomly or out of context is not considered creative.

Her comments at the beginning of the third video echoed her comments about knowing the framework, as mentioned above. In particular, CPA explained:

This is the result; I don't know the process followed. What I know is that they play the melody, both the violins and the piano... what's the reason? Why? Why don't you give something else to your violin? Why does the piano play the melody since the choir sings the melody? They sing it, [so] there is no reason to play it.

She went on to explain that:
Generally I believe that at a performance level of the choir or orchestra we can have a better result. On the other hand, this year I was responsible for the choirs of the school I was teaching at without teaching music; so I didn’t do orchestras because I wasn’t teaching the subject, but because I didn’t have time. So if someone came and asked me, ‘Why isn’t there an orchestra?’… I wouldn’t know why the other is doing what he is doing. Merely, though, in terms of creativity, she [the teacher] didn’t make good use of the instruments she had; she didn’t give to each one its potential: it’s meaningless to have three different instruments, the piano, violin, vocals, playing the same thing. […] Just sit down and write something.

Therefore the teachers’ creativity or, at least, the level of complexity or how sophisticatedly they arrange, orchestrate and set up their choirs and orchestras, if they are not using a pre-existing arrangement, seem to be important for the overall creative output of the students in any activity. In other words, a naïve arrangement is unlikely to yield a creative output for CPA.

The concluding comment was that

…[the first one is] not bad, it’s not bad that she gives them examples. I just don’t know if she will do something later. The second for me is completely wrong. What?… is it to get familiar with the instrument? Getting familiar with the instrument without having any idea about it beforehand? And the third, the teacher doesn’t make good use of the instruments she has.

Therefore the context the teacher sets up strongly defines the level of creativity in an activity, and thus the context also defines both the process and the output of an activity. Furthermore, questions were raised or comments and hypotheses were made when previewing the video examples, for example “…basically, the teacher was giving them rhythmic patterns and they were performing them. […] Does it also include students’ ideas or just those of the teacher?” and “They played with no instructions?” reveals how important the process, the background and the context are. Obviously, the information she asked for, (1) the
preceding process, (2) whether an activity includes students’ ideas and (3) whether they were playing following instructions, form the approach she adopts when assessing the creative behaviour of students. It can, thus, be suggested that both the process and the product of a musical activity seem to be important to CPA, as initially stated.

4.9.3. Creative students

As to whether she has noticed any characteristics that creative students share in terms of personality, age and intelligence, CPA repeatedly expressed her ignorance. At the same time, however, CPA stated her doubt, hesitation and disagreement with respect to this topic. Beginning with the characteristics, CPA said:

I’ve never thought about it, so I don’t know. Because I don’t see students this way. […] [B]ecause then you create particular expectations from particular persons and I don’t want to do this. I understand that introversion is sometimes […] related more to creativity but, on the other hand, I don’t take it for granted. Because in my opinion personality is very fluid, that is, someone that you see in a particular environment may be restrained, but in another environment may be an extrovert. […] I believe that there are some hard-core characteristics, but at the same time I believe that they are modified; as creativity progresses, so does personality. And an extrovertive person, for example, may realise that, yes, I need to turn to myself and I will achieve in order to create. So I wouldn’t relate it to personality characteristics, I can’t do this.

Therefore even though she points to introversion, for a moment, she immediately withdraws it, as personality is fluid and adjustable according to many factors. Creative behaviour for CPA, then, does not have to do with personality characteristics and she also disagrees with relating the two as this approach may create expectations for some students and thus, as a consequence, be unfair to others.
As for intelligence, CPA confessed that she has witnessed two kind of situations: "Look, I've seen very talented people in music who were not that clever. I've [also] seen very clever people who were not very talented in music." She immediately went on, though, to explain that this observation depends on the definition we give of intelligence, which for her is composed of three elements: concentration, perception and memory. In her own words:

It depends also on how we define central intelligence; that is, if we consider that central intelligence... [...] [is] perception, concentration, memory. If someone has good concentration, good perception and a good memory then, yes, he will get somewhere and he will increase his musicality. And he may never have a perfect pitch, but he may be a great musician because he was borrowing ‘supplies’ from somewhere else. And because a great part of music is based on these skills, which I consider intelligence is composed of, concentration, perception, memory, inevitably this does play a role. But I tell you, to my surprise, because most often, I have seen this but I didn’t believe it; I've seen people who are very talented in music, but try to chat about anything else with them, and you will say... [could this be possible?]; and you realise that they have a unique talent and I believe this, because... [...] it is similar to how a human being is born and he is ready to talk, he is born and he is ready to walk, he is born, he is born and he is ready to produce music. And that there is a direct connection of music outs in the world with our brain; there is direct mapping, let’s say. So, since there’s this direct mapping, some people will be better, they will have more ‘supplies’ than some others, as someone is more eloquent than someone else. But as I said before, I don’t diminish the effort and the hard work, as talented as you may be, talent will take you up to a point, it will not turn you into something special.

Therefore, every human being is musical by birth; some people may come to Primary education with more ‘resources’, such as a perfect pitch, but there are other ‘resources’, such as a knowledge about, and experience of, being a good listener, which can be gained with effort and hard work. Perception, concentration and memory give advantage to someone who studies music. Nevertheless, as CPA puts it, being clever or talented in music and having these three cognitive skills, does not
necessarily mean that an individual may also be clever in other subjects. Apparently, hard work, for CPA, is more important than just talent.

Lastly, CPA’s opinion about whether age influences students’ creative behaviour is neutral. She confessed that there is a rumor about Primary education killing students’ imagination: as she explained this applies when teaching is not done properly, that is, failure to teach students the individual characteristics of music. This, however, may not always be fun:

[W]e usually say that in Primary education we ‘kill’ children’s imagination […]. It is true if we don’t work correctly. I will tell you something: the reason I particularly hesitate about music…how? How can I develop his imagination if I don’t give him some tasks that are less enjoyable, that is, particularly in music, he listens to music and sings short songs; if I don’t teach him, though, the individual features of music, how can he reach creativity? How? So I think that we ‘kill’ their imagination when we don’t work correctly. So I don’t know if there is a certain age when you are more creative than someone else; I don’t know the answer to this question, […] I don’t have a strong opinion.

Concluding, creativity, for CPA, does not relate to behavioural characteristics and nor to age. Intelligence, for CPA, is defined as perception, concentration and memory; anyone privileged to have them well developed from a young age may, possibly, have an advantage in music learning. Being musically clever, however, does not necessarily make you generally clever, something that brings us to the domain issue below.

4.9.4. The domain issue

Knowledge and experience, according to CPA, are crucially important when it comes to someone being creative in any topic: “Creativity is creativity; if I acquire knowledge
on a topic, I will be ready to create” and “it is through experience that creativity gets better.” Therefore, for CPA, the ability to think creatively exists in all of us; creative skills are only transferable, though, if the student acquires knowledge and experience in a particular topic, which suggests that creativity does not transfer automatically to other topics; the ‘transfer’ occurs only after hard work. In CPA’s own words: “I have a very strong belief that creativity comes after hard work.” She also gave an example of how she herself is creative in one topic and less so in others:

I am much more creative in the subjects that I have more knowledge about. That is, in music, I can structure a lesson plan in my mind within three minutes. In a different subject, in physical education [for example], I may need three hours to prepare the lesson plan, because I don’t have the knowledge. In music it is very easy, I have a ‘bank’ in my mind and I can say ‘OK, I will use this and I will do this and this and the...’ and I know what to do.

This ‘bank’ of knowledge is what makes CPA feel that she is more creative in music, rather than in any other subject. In addition, this ‘bank’ of knowledge is usually hard to acquire as it requires, among other skills, concentration, perception and memory.

4.9.5. School environment

In terms of the school environment and creativity, CPA talked about (1) the relationship between other subjects and creativity; (2) how the streams in Cypriot education may change according to the political party that is in power at that time; (3) the official school policy about creativity and the numerous school events; and (4) her colleagues’ attitude towards her and her subject.

CPA believes that it is up to the educator to make any subject creative or not: “I believe that all subjects are related to creativity, as long as you give them a
chance.” Nevertheless, the fact that teachers in Primary education are general teachers (what in Cyprus are called ‘multifunctional’ teachers, meaning that they are trained to teach all the subjects of the curriculum) is a problem. While making a subject creative depends on the teacher, “…in Primary education there is the problem that we [teachers] are considered ‘multifunctional’, that is, we can teach everything; [but surely] I will be much more creative in the subjects that I have more knowledge about.” What may be suggested then is that being well informed about all the subjects taught in Primary education is very hard. It may also be implied that most of the general teachers, while they have been taught the principles of each subject in their studies at the university, are not experts in all of them. Therefore, as it emerges from CPA’s beliefs, the more educated and informed teachers are in a particular subject, in other words the more specialised, the more creative they may be in their teaching.

CPA talked also about school policy in terms of creativity, revealing that creativity development in Primary education is not actually what it seems to be, because of wrong academic goals, colleagues’ personal agendas and a heavy curriculum:

It [creativity] ’s promoted but without helping us to really promote it. […] Well, that is… that is, the [teaching] goals that are set are different from those being used. Goals, such as having well-presented workbooks, doing good school events, having well-designed notice boards, the personal agendas of each head teacher, of each teacher… so when doing something for the wrong reason, it’s harder to have the correct results […]. I don’t mind if the other person has his personal ambitions, but it bothers me to be against the students. So we may say that we are in favour of creativity, but when I load you with a very demanding curriculum, how can I achieve creativity? Since creativity is the last part of each chapter, I teach students a whole lot of things so that we are eventually ready to compose, right? [But] since you don’t give me time to do this, how do you promote creativity? Right? And one reason why I want to teach music is because there is no intense intervention regarding the curriculum approach, that is, you can twiddle with the curriculum since you teach music. This thing, this freedom appeals to me and I feel
that I can raise students to the level I want to; it is a motivation for me to teach this subject, rather than anything else.

Therefore, while school policy encourages the development of students’ creativity, CPA explained that the various academic goals and obligations that teachers have do not let this happen as they result in lack of time. Such an obligation is the preparation of the student choir and/or orchestra for the various school events. Head teachers who are responsible for their school event organisation, may, however, have personal agendas, and thus increase the workload. CPA’s position regarding school events is as follows:

Look, I’m not against the events; students benefit from the events, but they should be, up to a ‘healthy’ point, being aware of your teaching goals through the events. Namely, let’s say, the argument of whether you should have a choir or not; that is, if I will have to pick students or if I will not. I used to be in favour of picking students; now I’m not that much because, since I want my goals to be educational, it means that I want to work with all students and I want all the students to develop their approach into… their intonation. […] To be developed in terms of their intonation. And the choir helps students very much, listening to you and listening to each other helps very much, it helps them both in terms of rhythm as well as in terms of melody. So, everything that you do for an event has to serve educational goals. If you do it just for the show, or you choose a song just because you like it, this is a problem. Or, if I do it just for the show and I don’t teach students anything else, this is also a problem. Because an event will offer only some particular skills, [this means that] you can’t teach everything by doing events.

Despite the pressure of the academic goals, the subject of music seems to be among the least of those that receive intense intervention regarding the curricular approach. This freedom in the subject of music to adjust the curriculum accordingly means that CPA prefers it to anything else.
CPA notices also that 'traditional' creative activities, namely composition and improvisation, are the last part of each chapter in the music book and the lesson plan. The implication that may be derived from this is that, while CPA describes her wide understanding of creativity in music, as mentioned above, she still considers just the last part of each chapter to be creative which frequently includes composition and/or improvisation activities. In addition, the fact that she says that “I teach students a whole lot of things so that we are eventually ready to compose” [emphasis added] suggests that she may actually be more concerned with the product, rather than the process of the composition activity. In fact, music composition in Primary education may start even from the first grade, and it does not necessarily require great knowledge on the part of the student in order to benefit from the process of such an activity.

On another topic, CPA commented positively on her colleagues’ attitude and approach towards the subject of music:

Look, teachers, particularly of the third or the fourth grades onwards, feel awe because it is the subject that you can’t teach with no knowledge. This applies to all subjects but, if we are talking, for example, about geography, preparing before the lesson [what you are going to teach], gives you the illusion that you know that you have the knowledge. In music you can’t offer this illusion to yourself, it’s very hard. So, I believe that colleagues respect the subject exactly because it’s hard for them, they recognise the difficulty. And, as a music teacher, I have had very good [and] positive experience, a very good approach and respect from the colleagues. My experience was not bad in terms of this and OK... but I have been working hard for it. What I’ve heard about others [is that] they don’t talk the same about everyone, because even a naive person knows whether you work with your choir or not, he knows. So they respect you according to the work you do. […] [B]ecause your work is visible.

Therefore music, as a subject, presents particular challenges; educators with limited music knowledge seem to be in a disadvantageous position with respect to
teaching music. As a result, general teachers respect the subject because they acknowledge the difficulty in teaching it. Furthermore, the performance of the choir and/or orchestra is a reflection of the music teacher’s capabilities on which they (music teachers) are judged by their colleagues. What may be suggested then is that this can be a reason that the product may be more important for those teaching music. It is also important to mention CPA’s comment on her colleagues: “…even a naive person knows if you work with your choir or not, he knows.” This suggests that CPA takes for granted that her colleagues, the general teachers, are in a position to make accurate musical judgments. However, since not all of them have advanced musical knowledge and others may not have any musical knowledge at all, it is quite risky to let their opinion have a strong influence on any music teacher. In fact, we do not know how they assess their music teacher colleagues and, since this has an impact on the school environment, it may be a topic for future research.

Finally, while not directly related to musical creativity in Primary education, it is worth mentioning CPA’s reference to streams or tendencies in Cypriot education: “There used to be a stream in the schools, because streams in schools change depending on the government, the ‘literacy criticism’, in which there was a strong tendency to derive [topics] from students’ interests [to structure your teaching plans].” Again, while this may not have a direct impact on creativity, it should be noted here because it has to do with the school environment and how the system functions.

4.9.6. Definition

There have already been some points mentioned above in which CPA gave examples of how she defines creativity: “…I mean even listening to music is creative for me” and that “the love for music is creativity by itself.” While these statements
may be thought of as a romantic approach to the definition of creativity, which is related to the ‘traditional’ definition, they are quite the opposite: they actually relate to the ‘new’ approach to musical creativity in education. This ‘new’ approach to creativity encompasses a wide understanding of it, going beyond improvisation and composition, in which making music, original or not, has as a goal the students’ enjoyment and the cultivation of a positive attitude towards music as a form of art, instead of making the next Mozart. Nevertheless, CPA talks particularly about the creativity: “I define it as the potential to get something new, something slightly different from what I had; not necessarily something […] from scratch.” In contrast to the previous general ‘romantic’ comments, which do not suggest any output from the students, these comments refer to their potential for getting something new, even slightly different from the original song or composition, pointing to the result, that is, the product, rather than the process. In an attempt to clarify CPA’s position, I asked what her opinion was about the activities in which students do not have to devise something new, but only reproduce music, as in singing, for example:

Yes, it is creative for the students because they acquire skills and knowledge and expand their perceptions about music. Now, […] you may say that creativity is anything, even the slightest intervention in something that you perform; […] besides that there is no parthenogenesis. But, changing even a note in something that I try to reproduce, this is creativity, talking about a purposeful change, not a mistake [laughs], so yes, I think the meaning of creativity is wide-ranging […]. I mean it’s not just creating a song [or] a piece of music from scratch, it is also the intervention in something that I try to re-interpret my own way.

What may be concluded is that CPA has a wide-ranging perspective on music creativity. This perspective encompasses various activities besides improvisation and composition, for example, singing. Generally, however, activities, such as singing, in which students are not required to devise novel products are considered skills and
knowledge-builders for the students, in which, however, even the slightest purposeful deviation from its original interpretation and/or performance may be thought of as creative.

4.9.7. Methodological issues

The interview with CPA ran very smoothly and no significant problems arose. It should be noted, however, that the video example (Appendix XI) she brought and with which we started our conversation was quite long and thus we did not watch all of it. It still, however, served its purpose: to let us start the discussion with the participant commenting on her own example of what musical creativity is, why and how she uses that video in her teaching and how it is related to musical creativity.

4.10. Participant 5: KZS – General Teacher Specialising in Music

As a child KZS was in love with the music of Abba, the instrumental music of Jean Michel Jarre and Vangelis. At the age of 14 he bought his first keyboard and started experimenting with chords and original melodies. The ‘live’ experience of singing in front of an audience for the first time was a point of no return for KZS who, soon after, expanded his instrumental arsenal, started joining friends-based bands and recording in professional music studios. During his university years KZS was well known among the students because of his involvement in anything related to music at the Academy. The news about his interest in music had spread fast within the Primary school circles by the time he was called upon to teach professionally:

For some strange reason, however, as soon as I was appointed everyone knew that I am interested in music and they appointed me to teach it which, at the end of the day, was a blessing for me, I couldn’t say ‘no’, I
was very new, it was not a matter to be discussed whether I would accept it or not; it was only at the beginning that I was afraid of it.

Prompted to explain further his fear in music teaching, KZS stated: "As soon as I was appointed, I didn't feel ready to teach music, I felt I was lacking knowledge, lacking approach... I didn't feel I had the necessary knowledge to teach music." This hesitation, and even embarrassment, about the subject of music, does not seem to be an individual case; as KZS explains, the subject of music embarrassed his fellow students in general: "I feel that most [Academy students] were afraid of the subject of music." This hesitation to teach music at the beginning of his career was possibly due to the insufficient knowledge of the music professors of the institution:

Maybe because our teachers' knowledge did not have to do that much with education so they leaned on a 'conservatory' approach; that is, they taught us particular music terms of the music syllabus (...). They used to use the books we had back then and they were saying: "We have this, this is how you can teach it." Most of them didn't know what 'kalamatianos' [traditional Greek dance] is, what 7/8 metre is, or what music reading is.

In addition to the teachers' limited musical knowledge, KZS further explained that

...we were wasting months (...) learning two music pieces on the flute. (...) It didn't have anything to do with creative music activities, how you teach children, [or] how you take a term and convey it to the classroom. I don't remember anyone teaching me how to teach music in class, it was only because I was interested that I learned; and it also had, to a large extent, to do with my participation in the students' groups/clubs and choirs.
Therefore, it becomes obvious that the music knowledge the institution offered at that time, according to today's appointed music educators, was insufficient. As KZS explained, his musical knowledge was the result of his own interest and voluntary involvement in non-mandatory institutional activities. As a consequence, those students who did not have a strong interest in being musically involved in any activities, apart from those offered by the institution courses on music are, or were, hesitant and embarrassed about teaching music.

Nevertheless, despite KZS's initial hesitation and the poor music education he received at the institution, he counts more than 15 years in Primary education as a general educator specialising in music while also being active as a musician, writing songs and participating in song competitions.

### 4.10.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

KZS firmly supports the view that teaching music through evoking curiosity is necessary in order to engage in creativity: "I believe that in order to have creativity, first we have to touch...that thing we call curiosity." In terms of the practices he adopts to achieve this KZS tries

…to show [introduce] music performers to the students, [and] unusual musical instruments, beyond those they already know. Seeing concerts, we may see something live or you may invite a musician [...] or they may watch a film without its music score and [then] make them think how different it is when music is absent.

It may be suggested that KZS attempts to enrich students' experiences in listening to music through plentiful and, as he mentioned, appropriate stimuli:

Students need to be able to assess that there are many things around us [...] so that we generate the desire for us to create, [...] a child needs to
be able to recognise what is beautiful, what is good [noteworthy], [...] just for himself, not necessarily because I have to determine what is [remarkable] and what is not.

In fact, being in a position to identify what is noteworthy and what makes it so, is a decisive factor in the development of students' creativity:

Let's say we'll teach a song in the classroom, we may listen to various [recorded] interpretations; some students may like some of them, while others will not. They have to be able to judge why they like this better, why do I like this less? What is it that makes this one better and what is missing from the other that makes it less good? It's critical thinking that needs to be developed about what is nice... So, there needs to be as much stimuli as possible.

As for practices in which students are required to be involved by doing, rather than just thinking, like those mentioned in the previous paragraph, KZS expressed his belief that possibly all musical activities are creative:

I generally consider that creativity may be included everywhere (...). It's equally creative to make a minimal orchestration with tambourine and sticks, by adding many more elements, or making a short phrase or changing the whole song, it is equally creative, there is no more or less creative.

In other words, any kind of musical involvement nurtures creativity. Nevertheless, in terms of particular activities that he includes in his teaching, he refers to orchestration, mimicking, lyric-writing, composition and alternative instrumental performance. As he explained:

One more thing that we do with the musical instruments is to try performing with alternative [non-traditional] ways many times. That is, 'Try with the mallet, try with your finger, take out pitch-bars from the glockenspiels etc. Hit it with your hand, with the mallet.'
Therefore, exploration of instrumental capabilities is another activity that KZS applies in his teaching. In addition to strictly musical performance activities, KZS also utilises choreography, particularly for the very young students. Therefore interdisciplinarity seems to play an important role in the development of students’ creativity for KZS. In particular, as he explained, regarding the sample he brought with him for the purposes of the interview, the reason for considering it as a creative nurturing ‘tool’ was because “…it touches on many topics, if you see as inter-disciplinary, it may embrace several other subjects.” He further added that “[t]he creative point here is that they [the students] had to think of the concept themselves, I mean creative is not necessarily to be restricted within the music area, it’s all things together that make it even more interesting.” Therefore two points may be identified here: independence, that is, students think and act by themselves, and the fact that development of creativity needs to be multifaceted, that is, it require the involvement of other subjects.

It is worth mentioning the preparatory activities that KZS applies before letting the students act by themselves. As he explained, when the activity is about writing or re-writing lyrics,

…we discuss it [song] and then we try to find suitable words; some key words may be given and then we have to make the phrases that fit rhythmically, melodically. […] first you do some exercises so that they know what they may play and then you let them try by themselves. […] And after all this we will move into changing it, changing the lyrics, so it becomes their own.

Therefore, students act within a context that the teacher provides along with the instructions that the students are given as their base.
Finally, in addition to the above activities, the interpretation of non-original songs is another activity that KZS considers suitable for nurturing creativity and applies it in his teaching. The reason for considering this as a creative practice is because:

…if we've listened to a song with a particular interpretation, singing it along with a children's choir, is a very different approach. So, we'll see if it sounds good in our register and timbre; what is noteworthy in that interpretation that we may keep? Is there anything that we may add? Can we make it monophonic or polyphonic? How are we going to interpret it since we are non-professional singers? [...] What do we have in terms of musical instruments?

In other words, preparing to re-interpret a song gives an opportunity to activate students' creative thinking. Furthermore, the computerised process of recorded interpretation offers further opportunities for development of creative thinking. As KZS put it: "Reinterpretation may be for the purpose of sound recording, there is a software that we can use, we may add sound effects to our voice, [and] to our orchestration so as to get a very different output: this is creative in itself."

Therefore, creativity, for KZS, is not restricted to the ‘traditional’ music activities but, in general, he considers it to be the ultimate goal of all school subjects:

…creativity is something that generally exists as a concept in all subjects, it may be the ultimate goal, at the end of the day: children should be able to create, not just reproduce knowledge, by using knowledge to create something of their own, in any subject; [...] It just takes a different form depending on the subject.

Creativity then needs to be omnipresent in all school subjects, so that students become producers of knowledge and not just consumers and reproducers.
In addition to the practices and the activities that KZS applies in his teaching, a couple of interesting points emerged from the interview regarding KZS’s opinion about (1) whether creativity may be taught and (2) whether a music teacher needs to be creative in his subject in order to best nurture students' creative skills. Regarding the first point, KZS supports the idea of maintaining a supportive, non-competitive environment in the classroom to help students shape the concept of creativity and craft their creative skills:

Not to be taught; to be shaped as a concept, as a skill, basically... So you have to work on students' curiosity, which is present in everyone, you have to work with motivation, self-confidence, because, in order to be creative, this means that you believe in what you do. If someone's confidence is low, it means that he will not try for something because he is afraid that his output is not that good. So, it is very important for the student to feel that he is able to do it no matter what, or that he should not compare his output with someone else's.

Comparison, however, is unavoidable; the key, as he explains, is to convince students to feel free to create for their own satisfaction:

…This is hard, however, because there will always be different results [outputs], so, in fact, comparison takes place. So, you have to boost the belief that what you produce, in any topic, is actually good. That is, it depends on the skills of the children, some children are more capable than others, as it happens in all of us. The point is to [make him] believe that his product is very good for himself and that I am satisfied and I expect the best that he can do, not the best that I think he can reach, but the best that he can do. […] So, we have to convince him that what he does is actually good and he should not feel that he has to please me or his parents or whoever else.
Therefore developing students' self-esteem and self-confidence, as well as explaining to them that the comparison point is themselves, are important for an educator in order to teach creativity creatively. Interestingly, KZS is clearly not in favour of comparing students' outputs; his focus, at least as may be identified from the above, is the output resulting from the process that each one has gone through. In other words, the experience of making music and developing critical thinking is reflecting in students' outputs.

Regarding the second point, KZS firmly believes that being creative as a musician is necessary in order to nurture students' creativity:

…if I am not that enthusiastic about creating something or doing something that makes me feel great pleasure, [then] I can't communicate it easily to the children. It's something... I think I will be drier, I will not easily convince students... If I feel happy because I create, I know very well which points to step on, or I know how to mention it to the children. Or, depending sometimes on various activities that I may consider creative, you see that sometimes they work while at other times you may totally fail. While you may think that you could have been successful, you see that the children simply do not. Therefore there is an instinctive approach when you see that something works, you reuse it as an approach, you use it more often while, when something does not work, you have to stop it, even though you may think that it had to work.

Therefore, keywords associated with what a music teacher is considered to be creative and, thus, more suitable for nurturing students' creativity, are enthusiasm and experience in music-making. Therefore, in addition to self-esteem and self-confidence, being creative as a musician also means being passionate about the subject of music and conveying your excitement to the students; it also requires teachers to be in a position to assess their teaching approaches or choices.
In conclusion, triggering students' curiosity is one of the most important prerequisites for creativity. Introducing students to unfamiliar performers, performances and musical instruments are some of the means by which KZS attempts to spark students' curiosity, enrich their experiences and knowledge of the Arts and cultivate their critical thinking in what makes, for us, a piece of music remarkable. Orchestration, lyric writing, composition, interpretation, sound-recording process, in combination with other directly and non-directly related music activities, such as choreography and mimicking/acting, are some of the most frequently applied practices and activities that KZS uses in his teaching. Such activities are preceded by examples and a set of parameters that he gives, which students need to follow. These parameters form the major criteria with which KZS assesses the creative output of his students, something that will be discussed below.

4.10.2. Assessment

While KZS holds that there are no more- or less-creative musical activities (see above), he did assess and rate the creativity of the activities and the students' output in the video vignettes, when prompted to do so.

To begin with, KZS prefers to let students self-assess and peer-assess their outputs before providing feedback:

I ask the students themselves to assess their result. [...] I want them to be in a position to say if our creation is at a performance level, if there's something else needed to be done, if they enjoyed the whole process and if there is something that they didn't like.
What comes out of this quotation is that the criterion which students are guided to use to assess themselves is whether their output is at a performance level, something that emphasises the end product of the activity. Nevertheless, another criterion is whether the students enjoyed the making of the product, something that apparently points to the process of the activity. In fact, enjoying music making is a parameter that KZS considers vital in an activity: "...the enjoyment that the child will have, while creating. I want to believe that creativity and enjoyment, there needs to be something that fulfils you when you create." Therefore both process and product are taken into consideration in order to assess the level of creativity.

As for the video vignettes, KZS considered the activity of the first one to be very good: "First of all they all participate, the product [the 'play-a-long' music] is already there, they get the impression that they match with it and it is an easy way to put them into a song, to introduce them to the concept of orchestration." Furthermore, he explained that the 'play-a-long' music provides a 'safety net' for the students that allows them to enjoy their participation:

…they feel secure that there is something, they don't worry that it is just their own result. [...] In this way they feel they are more active and they enjoy it, they feel part of the song, they are part of what is being played, they are that additional touch: it is like a mini orchestra.

However, as good as KZS may consider this activity itself, he expects that another activity will follow in which students will have to act independently: "Of course it would not be just this, [...] you will develop it later. That is, later on they will try [to do something] without any music playback, [and] they will try to do [create] something by themselves." Therefore independence and initiative seem to be decisive when it comes to considering an activity and its result to be creative. In other
words, while introducing students to orchestration (an activity that in itself is considered creative, as explained above) is positively received, it is not enough; there needs to be further development of the activity, with students acting independently and producing their own output.

In terms of the second vignette, KZS asked me if he could have the instructions given to the students; as the answer was negative, he came up with his own possible instructions: "I don't know what instructions the children had; I think they had the instructions, “You have these musical instruments, don't start all together, just play what you want.”" It can be said, then, that in a 'non-straight forward' performance, such as that of the first video vignette, the instructions of the educator become decisive in terms of creativity. In addition, it is apparent from the hypothetical instructions that independence and initiative are determining factors in making an activity potentially creative. Furthermore, regardless of the instructions, KZS found this performance to be creative: "It is creative because they use, first, their own self-made musical instruments; this kid does not look as if he is having a particular melody in his mind, he is just exploring with the mallet; he also did the glissando." Therefore exploration, both in terms of the melodic ideas as well as in terms of the performance methods, and the making of self-made sound instruments contribute to the level of creativity.

Prompted to assess this activity, KZS gave it a high mark, yet not the highest, because there needs to be further progress; in other words, independence, initiative, experimentation and self-made constructions are not enough:

I think it's a very good activity: I would say 8. Of course I'm waiting to see what will follow. That is, if I simply give musical instruments to the children and ask them to just play, this is creative; something good may come out, or it may be chaos: there should, somehow, be progress
[development] of this activity; for me it is also a matter of how it will develop later on. How can I frame this in music terms? What is it that I want to teach with this activity? Is it just experimentation? Do we simply make sounds? Is it how the sounds blend? Is it... if there is a motive, that is, I go first, you go second and the other goes third? Or do you play solo and the other two play together? Or, sometimes, we play all three together and, for a moment, one goes solo. How about if we set a beat and they work on it? This would be the next stage for me: we provide a steady rhythmic motive and you work on it, but don't copy mine, or maybe just one of you may copy mine, or use just these three pitches or maybe all of them; but use different methods to get different results.

When asked to clarify why he did not give the highest mark to this vignette, KZS pointed to the students' lack of passion, performance interaction and engagement with the others:

Here it looks as if each one plays arbitrarily [mechanically], at least as I felt it. [...] It looks like each one is trying arbitrarily to play his own musical instrument. They don't all perform simultaneously; the kid with the glockenspiel starts first and then the rest of the kids follow. Well, it didn't look as if there was continuity in what they played in their percussion; this, however, does not seem to bother the kids, they created a sound picture.

It may be seen then that, in terms of aesthetic or academic goals, experimentation that does not necessarily lead anywhere and in which students do not function as a music ensemble, deprives the quality of a performance and, as a consequence, diminishes the level of its creativity.

Regarding the last video, KZS did not consider it to be a creative activity, mainly because of the arranging approach of the teacher:

There are some good elements, there are some elements that I could do differently; that is... there are many kids playing musical instruments, but I get the impression that those playing the instruments didn't learn how to
play them at school but in the conservatory [afternoon private music schools,] [such as] the kid playing the piano, the violins, the guitars, there is even an electric guitar. So, *I can hear that they all play the same melody, singing the same melody simultaneously* [emphasis added]. It's not bad, it's an approach. It could have been [for example] playing on particular phrases; [but] playing all together the same melody... is the safest choice to do.... I personally don't feel it's very creative; he plays the melody, the other plays the melody and the others play the chords [harmony] that they were given. What is the creative element in this?

Therefore the way a teacher approaches the orchestration and the arrangement of a performance has an impact on the creative level both of the process, and the end product of the activity. In general, however, as an activity, KZS finds it pleasant and amusing for the students, but not that creative:

It seems that it amuses the children, those engaged with playing musical instruments […], it's pleasant [reluctantly stated], OK, anything that comes from the children is pleasant [laughs], even if they are unorganised, let's say, still the creative result […] will be pleasant. […] I don't feel this particular one is very creative. […] I don't see it's very creative, that is, you learn this melody, you learn this other melody, [then] we play all together.

The performance, then, that is, the reproduction or reinterpretation of a non-original song does not contribute to the students' creativity. This, however, is inconsistent with KZS's earlier statement about reinterpretation: reinterpreting a song gives the opportunity to activate students' creative thinking, in addition to the computerised editing process that a recorded interpretation may offer. My understanding of this is that, in the same way that a song's orchestration impacts the creative level of a performance, the choir/vocals arrangement approach also impacts the creative level. Therefore reinterpretation for KZS may be creative as long as it is delicately and sophisticatedly arranged by the teacher. This is, in fact, supported by KZS's suggestion about making such an activity more creative:
As a first step, I would do this: we all learn the melody, as many of us could learn the melody, if there are some students who know how to play musical instruments, this makes the process a bit easier, than teaching it to them. [So] let's say that some children learn how to play the melody, some play the beat, or something similar. “Now how are we going to differentiate it? Is everyone going to play from the beginning?” I would try to make them think. “Could we find some spots in the song that we emphasise a bit more? Shall we make others less emphasised?” I would ask them to take out some instruments and somewhere else to add [within the song], somewhere that we can play all together and somewhere that we may not. Are we all going to play the same melody? Or can we find something else? Let's find a motive, since you can hear that there is something... [singing]. What about adding an ostinato, let's say.

He went on to add that:

I would ask them to do clapping in a section. We may do something easier, emphasis... or dynamics, shall we all together do the same from the beginning to the end? [...] there is no intro, there is no climax, there is not something clever in it. The strings [violins] for example, could do some call and response, there could be an instrumental section where all the orchestra comes in, there could be a solo section, they could be divided in two groups, one of them singing the melody and the other performing something with their mouths.

In general, the main issue KZS seems to have with this vignette is the arrangement of the song, which is the element that he would do differently and, in particular, he would try to develop this from the students' own ideas.

Finally, the ease with which KZS assessed the creativity of each activity in the vignettes, is in contrast to what he initially mentioned about no more- or less-creative music activities. This suggests that using video vignettes in the methodology helped the participant to unfold his perception which, otherwise, might not have been possible.
To sum up, we can see that the self- and peer-assessment methods are usually applied by KZS before providing his own feedback to the students. Also, both the process and the product have an influence on whether or not an activity is considered creative. Independence and initiative on the part of the student also play a decisive role in considering an activity and its result to be creative. Furthermore, the instructions of the educator are determining factors when it comes to allowing room for the students' independent action and initiative, thus making an activity potentially creative. Furthermore, sophisticated or, at least, non-simplistic orchestration and arrangement of a music performance, particularly if these are the result of a collective work with the students, influence the creative level both of the process and the end product. In addition, the activity of instrumental or sonic object construction, as well as sound and/or melodic exploration, which, however, has a particular educational goal, also contributes to the creativity level of an activity. Finally, passion, interaction and true engagement with the music ensemble while performing [that is what Csikszentmihalyi (Csikszentmihalyi and Csikszentmihalyi, 1992, Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, and Nakamura, 2014) refer to as the ‘flow’ which will be discussed further below] are considered indicators of high levels of creativity.

4.10.3. Creative students

As already mentioned, KZS believes that triggering students' curiosity is a necessary condition for engaging their interest and developing their creative skills. Consequently, students who demonstrate curiosity, with no external motivation or additional effort on the part of the teacher, are considered creative; this, along with shyness and quietness, emerged in KZS's comment:
...usually they are curious, they want to learn, they want to learn several things, not necessarily what they are taught. Or, maybe, they are children who want to escape from certain things in which they are not interested, so they find a way out with creativity, or they are children who have difficulty in expressing their feelings and through creativity many children, who may look shy, many children may be very creative.

He clarified, however, that this is not always the case, but only a pattern he has noticed: "OK, it's not a rule, it doesn't mean that a loud person or child may not be creative but, many times, I have noticed that those children who look quiet and isolated may be very creative, more creatively intense."

Therefore, in addition to curiosity, behind shyness, quietness and isolation there may sometimes be hidden creative students. In addition, creativity is thought of as a way out of boredom or indifference, as well as a way of expressing their feelings.

As for the relationship between creativity and intelligence, KZS believes that creativity is a form of intelligence. It is also important to note that intelligence for KZS is defined according to whether a student is good in subjects such as Greek and mathematics; however, doing well in those school subjects and thus being intelligent does not necessarily make that student creative:

I think being creative is a form of intelligence. If we are talking about how good a student generally is in [school] subjects, it doesn’t matter if he is also creative. It may be that a child whose performance in Greek and maths is low, is actually creative because he paints nicely, he may be good at making and narrating stories, but he may not be able to write them down, or he may create sounds... [emphasis added] I have seen many children being very good... at creating, expressing themselves through music much better than in any other subject. And because you discuss with colleagues, they are impressed that those children are very good at music, but they are not very good in other subjects, at maths let's say. Or they can't memorise terms, or they can't write essays.
Therefore creativity and intelligence do not go hand in hand. In fact, creativity is a form of intelligence that, as emphasised above in italics, does not transfer to other subject areas: a student who may be good and creative in music is not necessarily creative in other school subjects.

In terms of whether KZS has noticed an age at which students are more or less creative, he mentioned that "[m]any times, young children may surprise you about... they may have a result that is more pleasing, more sophisticated some times." Interestingly, the teacher’s surprise comes because of the students' sophisticated result. KZS went on, however, to clarify that this does not make them more creative:

I believe that the need to be creative is of the same level, regardless of the students’ age. Merely, however, younger students cannot concentrate for that long; there needs to be a constant change of activities to keep their attention. The older students may see it as a long-term project, so you work depending on how long they may be able to concentrate. Definitely older students may concentrate longer. But, in terms of how creative they may be, I believe it's the same for both. It's just the intensity with which they may work and the time they devote.

Therefore, while young students may surprise the teacher because of their pleasing and sophisticated result in an activity, the need to create is the same at all ages, as well as the level of creative performance.

What may be concluded is that students, who do not need the teacher’s push or external motivation, but from their own interest in, and curiosity about, something which is inherent and genuine, are usually creative. In addition, quiet and isolated students may be very creative, even though this does not preclude the opposite, that is, students exhibiting loud and extrovert behaviour may also be creative. Creativity is
also an escape for students who may not be interested in something, as well as a means of expression. Furthermore, creativity is thought of as a form of intelligence, measured here in relation to the students’ performance in the subjects of Greek and mathematics, but this fact does not necessarily make it transferable to other subjects. Finally, creativity is not influenced by age; the desire to create and the performance level are the same at all ages.

4.10.4. The domain issue

According to the conclusions concerning characteristics, creativity is not something that can be transferred, at least automatically, from one subject to another. This, however, contrasts with KZS's observation that students whom he considers creative in music are often creative in other subjects, as long as they find them interesting. His answer to the question of whether he notices such a pattern was: "Usually yes, that's what happens. Of course, if the student finds one subject more attractive, he may pay more attention to it. [...] It's a general perception of how a human being thinks, no matter whether he is 8 years old or 28." The key word here for resolving this inconsistency is ‘attractiveness’: musical creativity, as discussed below, comes under the big umbrella of human creative thinking; therefore, musically creative students will also be creative in other areas as long as they are attracted to, and interested in, them.

4.10.5. School environment

KZS explained that the developing students’ creativity is among the most important goals of the Ministry of Education, which, however, as is proved in practice, is a rather arbitrary priority because of the inconsistent policy of the Ministry and, perhaps
even more importantly, because of the numerous school obligations. Regarding the policy of the Ministry, KZS described it as follows:

Creativity as a concept, at least during the last few years, is one of the priorities of the school and the Ministry. But, even though it's there as a concept, I'm not sure if the application and the activities that take place always and really serve the need to create. That is, it has to do, let's say, with the particular educational service [in the Ministry of Education], because many times they change either the approach that needs to be generally followed, or the curriculum, sometimes they add, or take out, they experiment with overseas systems: they actually copy them without first testing them or without being sure that they are appropriate for our educational system, [that is] for the Cypriot reality.

KZS referred to an issue with the approach the Ministry follows in the curriculum design. Regarding how and to what extent the schools follow the policy of the Ministry, KZS stated that:

The school is overloaded with so many activities [obligations], with so many thematically various events, which means that the training time is much more restricted than it looks. For example, there are four different events that need to be done within a month. The fact is that each head teacher may be more interested in showing off his school, to look nice in the eyes of the Ministry inspector. This becomes very oppressive. That is, if my head teacher thinks that training time and curriculum material should not be wasted in order to prepare for an event [...] then there is a difference on how you approach your work. Theoretically, the Ministry says that [school] events for the students' parents should be scheduled only twice a year, in which there needs to be presented a more substantial work regarding the orchestra and the choir, for the Christmas and closing celebrations. This is not the truth. You have so many events which you have to present, that you need to find time, [and] patience, to collaborate with the colleagues, in terms of what they will give you or not... It's complicated, there are difficulties.

Therefore the problem revealed above has to do mainly with the numerous, time-consuming and oppressive school events, a problem that sometimes becomes
even worse because of the head teacher’s personal agenda and career development prospects. This last point, about the head teachers’ ambitions, may also be identified in this: "[h]ead teachers too like to have a good choir, a good orchestra, something nice to present; they think that it's part of the good functioning of the school by showing something nice, especially if it's something creative, it's even better."

Therefore music has an important position in the school events; it may be concluded then that the better the music of the choir and the orchestra in an event, the better the school’s educational quality, and thus the head teacher's management.

Since the school is overloaded with numerous events, a situation that seems to be impossible to avoid, KZS was invited to comment on whether these events could somehow be turned into something creative thus providing musically and educationally beneficial activities for the students:

They [events] could be. It depends on the educator. Some [teachers], including myself, will do it the easy way, that is, I will teach a song, [but] I will not try to embellish it, depending on the time I have and depending on the students I have. For example, if you have a very difficult class to manage that has other issues, [such as] behaviour, self-control, self-esteem, and you can't work with them because they haven't been taught to work in groups, or because they argue, or... depending on the students you have, you will act accordingly.

Therefore, even though the music teacher may have a desire to turn a school event performance into a creative process, the pressure of time, the demands of class management and the level of musical knowledge of the students are inhibiting factors. As a result, music teachers, most often, resort to the 'easy solution': teaching and presenting a song in a simplified form just to fulfil the obligation. However, while most of the music teachers turn to a song performance, the performances at the school events are some kind of a test for them: "It [the performance at a school
event] is a means of assessment; parents, by attending an event, get the message that we are progressing. That's where they often notice it.” Therefore a school event performance is like a reflection of the music teacher's work and capabilities. In fact, KZS explained that, even though he may sometimes choose the ‘easy way out’ for a school event performance, the result still needs to sound good, at least to his ears, as this has other impacts:

As a person I feel that in order to present something, I want it to be over a particular level that I have in mind. I want the result to satisfy me [and] I also want to feel that it satisfies the students. Often, if I feel the students don't like something, I drop it, I move into something else. I always manage to have a particular result and, because the result is something that will influence the others' opinion, therefore, in order to have more time, to get more money to buy musical instruments [for the school] many times there are musical instrument necessities, or to organise activities, or to invite a guest musician to show us something, it means that we'll need to take someone else's time. In order to do all these, it means that you have to show [prove] your result. Many times this works [but], if your head teacher sees that you don't use the musical instruments, he will not give you more money to buy more, he will not give you extra time to work with the musical instruments, he will tell you ‘No, since you don't use them, why should I offer them?’

Therefore a school event performance has to be at a musical level that satisfies both the teacher and the students. Also, the better the result of a performance, the more conveniences the music teacher will have from the so-called ‘others.’ Apparently, this clearly suggests that the result is more important than the process. Moreover, KZS explained that "[i]f we do this song just for fun in the classroom or we are going to perform it somewhere, how is this going to be prepared, how much more careful [diligent] are we going to be? What is it that we have to pay attention to?" This suggests that the performance situation influences the teacher and the students and it clearly makes them want to achieve to the best of their capabilities. Therefore, a performance is like a test, both for the teacher and the
students. This is also supported by the fact that if the result of a song performance does not satisfy KZS, when doing rehearsals, he will not do the event:

No, I will not present it. I need to feel that this satisfies the students, I first recognise this from the children themselves, when they come and ask me ‘When are going to rehearse?’ “Let's sing it again”, “We also want to do that”, because you can't use all the children of the school for the choir, you will pick some for that event and some for the other. I see the feedback that I receive, when they run after you and keep asking you to include them in the orchestra: “I want to play the drums, I want to do that...” It means that you ‘touched’ them, you ‘triggered their button’ and they want to get involved even though this may not be their main interest.

Therefore performing at a school event has more to do more with the result and far less with the process. However, it seems that KZS manages to balance the ‘result versus process' issue: by gaining students' interest and having them satisfied when preparing for the school event performance, it gives him satisfaction too, and he feels that he contributes to the achievement of a good result.

Finally, KZS mentioned a positive experience regarding his fellow teachers' appreciation of the subject of music:

Judging from my personal experience they appreciate it a lot. The same with the students. I can't say that they [students] are negative, they enjoy the result, they like to be involved. Teachers and head teachers also like to have a good choir, a good orchestra, something nice to present.

Therefore, the subject seems to have a good reception from all the participants of the school unit: the students, the fellow teachers and the head teachers.
To sum up, KZS describes a friendly and supportive school environment regarding the subject of music and the music teacher. In some ways, however, the school environment seems to require a ‘win-win situation’ management between the music teacher and the head teacher. As KZS explained, the result of a public music performance influences the opinion of others, such as that of the head teacher and the parents’ association. Therefore showcasing a good result in the school events that the head teacher and the parents’ association find pleasing while also achieving happiness for the students and satisfying the teacher’s ego, in terms of the level of musical performance, is a task that requires a combination of musical and non-musical skills. Furthermore, KZS expressed his annoyance about the numerous school obligations that require choir and orchestral performances, an issue that may hide the head teachers’ personal agendas and career development prospects. KZS also criticised the inconsistency of the Ministry's policy regarding the curriculum (re)design that is often adopted from other countries and is adapted to the Cypriot education system, often without being appropriate. It has also emerged that the better the music of the choir and the orchestra in an event, the better the quality of the school’s education, and thus the head teacher's management. As a consequence, school musical event performances need to be at the highest possible level and they also reflect the music teacher's work and capabilities. Accordingly, a music teacher often shifts his/her focus from the process to the result when preparing students for school events. And, even though the music teacher may wish to engage students in a creative process, while preparing them for a school event, the pressure of time, the difficulties of class management and usually the level of students’ musical knowledge, hold him back and drive him to the ‘easy way out’ of presenting a simplified orchestrated song, just to fulfil the obligation.
4.10.6. Definition

Keywords, derived from KZS's transcript related to the definition of creativity, are satisfaction and enjoyment, exploration and discovery, self-initiative and self-improvement:

Creativity equals satisfaction, creativity means I go a step further, creativity means that I discover things inside me, creativity means that I become better, creativity means that I assess what exists around me, what exists inside me... it is the most important element in human nature.

As for creativity in music education, the definition he articulated resembles that of creativity in general:

...children being, feeling free to use sounds, to enjoy the process, whether this is about orchestration or writing an original song, short melodies, experimenting with a given melody; being able to change the lyrics, the orchestration, the interpretation of a song, depending on the lyrics, [...] They have to come up with their own suggestions and ideas, I will definitely provide instructions, but they have to be in a position to assess what additions they will do.

Therefore, as is the case with general creativity, creativity in music education relates to experimentation, alteration of something that already exists and being aware of the aesthetic choices.

He furthermore added:

I can't imagine creating something, which makes me feel bad or makes me passive. There is enjoyment when creating, you are making something and this makes you feel that it's yours, it's part of you. It's like giving birth to something.
This resemblance between general creativity and musical creativity is not incidental; the following quotation suggests that for KZS musical creativity and general creativity are the same: "I don't think it's different than making something that has to do solely with music." In other words, he considers creativity to be a way of thinking (critical thinking, in particular, which he repeatedly mentions in his interview) that transcends domains. Therefore musical creativity, for KZS, is a branch of a man’s general creativity ‘tree’; it is also considered to be the application of students' own ideas, critical thinking and self-assessment in any musical activity which, ultimately, brings enjoyment and satisfaction to the student.

4.10.7. Methodological issues

As was the case with the other participants, KZS asked for details regarding the instructions the students were given in the second video; further information was requested about what would come next in both the first and the second vignettes. Apparently, this shows something: when KZS was unsure about what the performance was or he could not make any sense of it, particularly in the second vignette, he needed more information. In the other cases, in which the output performance was straightforward, he was easily able to make a judgment.

Finally, it should be noted that KZS had to be repeatedly reminded about returning the MDRPCP. As this was something that had already been encountered with the other participants, I adjusted my schedule and proceeded with the remaining interviews and transcriptions to avoid wasting time while waiting for this additional information.
4.11. Participant 6: TBR – Music Teacher

TBR has been teaching music in Primary education for 24 years. His love for music emerged earlier on in life and at the age of 10 he joined a children’s choir in which he also used to sing solo. His love for choirs impelled him to form and direct the Choir of Paraplegic and Friends in Cyprus, in which he participated in several national and international festivals. He graduated from the National Music Conservatory of Athens. His studies, as he explained, helped him to teach creativity:

…for example, the fact that I did ‘History of music’ or the approach to presenting [performing] music, as well as interpretation, helped me learn to create […], my studies, taught me, and particularly in the National Conservatory where we had particular time for this purpose, how to use music, how to present it, helped me stand on my feet and transmit music my own way so that the others would understand.

In addition, he has collaborated with the Ministry of Education, where he served as a facilitator for music workshops offered to Primary school music teachers and from which he also benefitted: "…to be honest, teaching those workshops helped me to feel comfortable with the topic [of creativity]." Finally, TBR has also released a music album for which he wrote both the music and the lyrics.

4.11.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

TBR believes that creativity may, to a great extent, be taught as long as the music teacher, who is responsible for nurturing students’ creativity, is also creative, clarifying that "…the creator is not just the person who composes music." However, "…the more knowledge a musician has from the whole range of music studies, the more important it is, as it is so helpful […]; and I believe that experience is an important factor." TBR explained also that the music teacher needs to be an
imaginative leader who applies collaborative learning by allowing the students to develop the teaching process:

I believe that in order to transmit creativity easily to the children, the teacher himself needs to be creative. And being imaginative, everything he will teach needs to be imaginative too, hoping that kids will be surprised with it and so give him the opportunity to guide them, even if they are wrong. Above of all, he has to be a leader; if he notes that students will be humiliated, he has to interfere, correct and guide them to get the best result. But he has to be creative himself.

Therefore teaching experience, classroom management skills, musical knowledge, imagination and application of collaborative learning are prerequisites for a music teacher in order to nurture students’ creativity.

Performing with music and non-musical instruments, improvising, composing, dancing or moving freely to a song, singing and doing various musical games, particularly with young students, as well as combining music with other forms of art, are the practices that TBR uses in his teaching and he considers that they contribute to the development of students' creative skills.

As TBR explained, creativity is the application of

…children's unrestrained thinking [based] on particular instructions that I will provide and the various activities, such as the performance of musical instruments and improvisation, which we need to do more of it in the schools, instead of just working with musical instruments or singing, but, you know, everything is interrelated, that is, you need to connect these in such a way that they bring results; results achieving the goal of the lesson.

Therefore, there is a need for more improvisation in Primary education; obviously it is an activity that he considers important and it also proves that TBR is
oriented towards the output of an activity. As for non-musical instruments and how he uses them, TBR explained that these include bottles, houseware and newspapers, which he uses as follows: "…they [children] may present their ideas with, an example that I often do in my lesson, sonic objects or junk material that may be used expressively"; for example,

I do a small ensemble of sonic objects, we present the quarter note or do clapping or even singing. [...] I use very much percussion instruments that I have plenty of in my classroom and I pair musical instrument ensembles with sonic object ensembles.

In relation to alternative musical instruments performance, TBR is also a firm believer in combining music with other forms of Art, such as painting:

I have also done painting, that is, I asked students to create listening to music, or to present... I did this in a music workshop [...] Well, I'm telling you, it was an unbelievable creativity, I combined music with arts [...] I think that pairing music with the Arts is very creative.

Therefore, in addition to ‘conventional’ music activities, such as instrumental improvisation, infusing musical activities with painting and the other forms of art is considered to be a great approach to developing students’ creativity.

In addition to adopting unconventional musical instruments in his teaching, TBR referred to singing along with a karaoke:

Another creative activity that I have been applying in the last two years is since the students themselves suggested ‘Sir, we'd like to do karaoke, we'd like to prepare something, if you could give us two lessons to prepare something following your instructions’ so we did dancing for 10 songs or part of a play and their schoolmates came and watched it. And
we prepared this within two lessons and the children sang solo; it was excellent.

Therefore TBR takes advantage of students' requests and combines singing with other forms of art, such as dancing and the theatre. What may also be concluded from this statement is that imaginative or, at least, unusual activities, such as singing along with the karaoke, motivate both the students involved in the activity, and the students of other classes who attend the in-school performances of their schoolmates. In fact, TBR considers students' performances to be creative, particularly when they come from the students' own ideas and preparation:

I gave them guidelines: I told them ‘I want the material we'll present to be descent'; you know, in Primary education kids are embarrassed to present something original; let the kid who knows dancing perform it. I taught children to present what they may do better than someone else, not because they are better, but because they are talented in that. A girl who knows dancing, why not present something in the classroom and get the applause of her classmates so that the others will feel that 'Our classmate is good at dancing?' This is something that we don't do in Primary schools.

As he further explains, students are often embarrassed to perform and to demonstrate their skills to others:

They are embarrassed, yes. This happens because the children don't have opportunities and as an educator I believe that (and this is something that I personally do) children from Primary school have to demonstrate their skills, whatever these are. If a child paints, he needs to demonstrate it. [...] The teacher needs to give him the opportunity to get away from the pre-determined form [restrictions] that say 'Do this, do that'.

Therefore, providing opportunities to students to perform is important in order to get used to demonstrating their skills and to inspire other students.
Nevertheless, regarding the question of whether there is an activity that TBR considers to be more creative than others, he points to composition and improvisation:

Well, for me [...], it is the topic of composition and improvisation. In composition, you let children create under no guidance; first of all, they listen to a piece of music, then children create either with percussion or they improvise; the process that follows is improvisation: children interfere and perform call-and-response with their classmates including also movement or vocal expressions, if they want to, that are related to what preceded. Then the musical instruments may be added and that's the process of improvisation and composition that the students present.

Therefore creativity is best implemented when students perform freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively.

In addition, making the lesson amusing for students is important for TBR: "I don't allow myself to have a child in my lesson who gets sad after the lesson." This suggests that ‘flow’ is important in maintaining a suitable environment for students to be creative.

To sum up, creativity for TBR, that is, students’ unconstrained thinking based on the teachers’ particular instructions, is best nurtured and demonstrated when they have opportunities to present their skills in activities in which they act freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively. These activities include music games, particularly for very young students, combined with dancing, acting and painting, singing, as well as composition and improvisation. The last two activities, in particular, are considered by TBR as the most creative and need to be adopted more often in Primary education. Finally, it is important for students to enjoy the lesson and, for this reason, the teacher has to listen to and implement their musical performance requests when possible.
4.11.2. The domain issue

TBR has witnessed students transferring their creativity from one subject to another:

I have noticed that students engaged with the arts are those kids who are very good at music. [...] I think those kids that are good at music are also good at health education, [and] they are also good at arts. They may not do so well in other subjects.

Invited to talk more about his experience, TBR repeated the importance of opportunities:

...it is necessary [however] to have opportunities. Let's say, when doing maths, OK, he will create in his own way in maths, he will use for example the cube, he will play with it, but he is actually creating. That is, everything that children do, I think, is creative, they come up with a result and inherent talents may be revealed through creativity.

Therefore, TBR makes a connection between the arts and music, as well as music and other subjects, suggesting that students engaged with activities related to the arts, including music, may transfer their creativity. In addition, creativity, for TBR, is a skill that all students possess, yet a particular characteristic in those he considers more creative is self-confidence.

4.11.3. Creative students

Self-confidence is the major characteristic of creative students that TBR mentioned: "...they [creative students] immediately face a problem [...]. It's self-confidence basically. And they handle situations cleverly." This prompted me to ask about the relationship between intelligence and creativity. TBR explained: "I believe that for some kids it is not a matter of intelligence, some kids are born with an inherent talent
which we have to nurture so that this talent comes out.” Invited to define the inherent talent, TBR said:

…you can easily tell the child who is musical; you can recognise the child who paints, that is, you will notice him during the [school] breaks; when I am responsible for the supervision of students during breaks I observe children who, instead of playing, do painting, and I ask myself “Why is he painting instead of playing?”, so, this kid has something to do with the arts. But children who have music inherently, also have a talent in other forms of art.

It may be suggested then that TBR thinks of creativity and an inclination to the arts as inborn human characteristics. In addition, musically inclined students transfer their creativity to other forms of art, something that refers to the domain-transcendent quality of creativity.

Sharing his opinion as to whether there is an age when students demonstrate greater creative behaviour, TBR pointed to preschool students suggesting, however, that this may be so because of his own preferences and personality as a teacher and not necessarily because of a generic characteristic:

…the most creative students I’ve met and I’ve worked with were in the kindergarten, preschoolers. […] Maybe this is because of my own character, the fact that I can do more creative activities with young aged students. Because I like to pair music with music games, [and] with music movement; basically it's the activities that a teacher needs to do to make children feel creative so that they will bring out their creativity.

To sum up, TBR holds that students demonstrating creative skills are usually self-confident. Furthermore, intelligence does not have much to do with it; he is a firm believer in inborn talents without, however, suggesting that the untalented ones
cannot evolve musically. He adds that those inclined towards music may easily also channel their creativity into other forms of art. Finally, while his experience has shown that young students are more creative than older students, he admits that this opinion may have to do with his own personality.

4.11.4. Assessment

TBR's approach to assessment urges students to assess each other: "...the results are always performed in front of all the students in class and they compare and make suggestions and perform again for a better result." He went on to clarify that assessment is made with good intention: "Definitely we don't make criticism that suggests the rejection of a group process." When it comes to providing his own feedback, TBR explained that the students' output is judged on whether and to what extent they implemented the main objectives of the lesson and if they moved beyond those targets:

Based on the objectives of my lesson I try to make the students get a result that shows they have understood the objectives and they even go a step further, that is, they use their imagination to come up with a result that shows they have enjoyed what they have done, that is, they have experienced the joy of learning and its outcome. For me this is important.

Therefore constructive feedback about each other is encouraged and pursued. As for TBR's feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. He also clarified that:
There are no written assessment criteria that you may adopt in the classroom. I believe that assessment should always be there [...] while students work out their result [...] I think assessment should be the result of their creativity but, in the end, students themselves should assess the work of the other group.

Therefore TBR encourages students to share their constructive comments on each other's creative output. In addition to providing his own feedback while students do their activity, TBR also comments on the final result of the students' work, which reflects students' creativity. It may be concluded then that, for TBR, the process defines the quality of the product and thus they are interrelated. Invited to directly express his opinion about the process and the output of a creative activity, TBR admitted that both are equally important and are taken into consideration: "Both, because with no process there is no result, without suggesting, though, that we shouldn’t give some instructions that the students may follow. [...] But with no process, without getting into the process of working it out, there will be no result.” Therefore the process, which shapes the final result, is obviously necessary in order to have a product. This final result is what students comment on and what TBR, in order to provide feedback, takes into consideration, in terms of whether it is based on the instructions and the targets he set and on whether the students moved beyond these boundaries. In fact, the following statement expands on this conclusion: “I may do it [an activity] for three or four or even five lessons, until I get a good result [emphasis added] and students feel the enjoyment of that result.” It may be suggested then that while the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is borne in mind when assessing students' creativity and their efficiency in general.

TBR's comments on the first video were negative, mainly because students did not have the opportunity to take initiatives or act by themselves: "The teacher
directed it all the time; I wouldn't do that [...] the kids themselves could have created and come up with the rhythm alone. The teacher should not be above them all the time." Therefore TBR considers the 'play-a-long' in this video as a teacher-centred approach, which did not allow room for creativity. He went on to describe what he would do to make it more creative:

You ask from the children to find the rhythm of what they listen to and improvise. [...] Kids could think of a movement by themselves when the teacher asks them to move left and right or, [while] sitting in a circle, a kid could stand up and do an improvised movement.

Therefore experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity.

Regarding the second video, TBR commented quite positively: "This was totally creative [...] because the teacher left the kids to create by themselves. They did it in their own way and built on each other's ideas and it was totally creative. This is also what I do in my classroom." Therefore, giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR.

As for the third video, TBR found it very creative and he talked about a different kind of creativity: "This is a different kind of creativity, we are talking about a higher level of creativity, that is, the kids’ performance. I personally liked both the maestro here who, even from her gestures, was creative." Requested to define the reason for thinking of this as creative, TBR explained "[b]ecause here all students' creativity is presented: those who sing, those who perform and the maestro." Therefore in contrast to students' autonomous activity in an improvisation activity,
such as that mentioned earlier, the choir and the orchestral performances are also considered highly creative, even though there is nothing to suggest that the output comes from the students' ideas and initiatives. Possibly, then, the aestheticism of the output does play a significant role. In addition, TBR did not mention any specific means of assessment of any of the activities he found creative; his criteria are the students' autonomous activity, experimentation, improvisation, body movements' implementation and the aesthetic level of the output.

4.11.5. School environment

TBR's opinion about his school policy, regarding creativity, is in some aspects, positive while in others negative. To begin with, TBR admitted that

It [creativity] is of great importance in my school and the truth is that the school management is very supportive, which gives me time and the opportunity to demonstrate my own creativity in my lesson, to proudly represent our school both in the events, but also in some particular lessons, where I invite the students' parents.

It is important to note that music becomes the medium through which the school is proudly presented in the events and represented in the local community. It is not surprising then that the management is supportive: music is one of the tools that serves the good image of the school. Moreover, while TBR recognises the exhaustive number of the school event obligations, he does not turn down requests for more:
They [school events] are too many, they are too many in Primary schools, even though there is a circular that says that they [events] are very specific [those to be conducted] but, I'll tell you what, I don't do this, I don't restrict myself just to those events designated by the Ministry of Education; if the parents' association asks me: “On Sunday we are going to take the students to this event”, why shouldn't I take the kids?

A couple of things that may be concluded from the above is the relationship of the parents' association with the music teacher and the school deviation from the designated events. Regarding the Parents' Association, TBR emphasises the importance of having good a relationship with it: "I think it is the foundation stone; as a musician and teacher, I pay much attention to the communication with the students' parents." He furthermore explains that there is a mutual help between the two as he receives support from the parents' association and thus he is willing to do more events than those designated:

They [parents' association] take me seriously and, thus, I do many events [performances], voluntary events, for which, for 24 years, I have always had the financial support of the parents' association and they have told me 'Move on and we support you.' And I consider it very important because they've told me ‘You'll have anything you need’.

Therefore the parents' association involves the music teacher in their events, thus increasing the music teacher's and the students' duties, providing in this support for the teacher. As for the school's deviation from the designated events, it unavoidably creates time problems: "When am I going to tune the instruments? During my break-time. [...] When am I going to dedicate time and pay particular attention to a student that may, let's say, have a difficulty in music?" In addition, TBR talked about problems with his colleagues:
I had trouble when I asked for additional rehearsal time ‘Could you bring the students [for rehearsal] because tomorrow we have this event that is important?’ and we have frictions because of time. That is, in order to have a choir ready for an event, a musician needs to have time to devote for choir rehearsal, something we don’t have in Primary schools.

Therefore as willing as TBR may be to do additional school events, problems will emerge.

Invited to describe his general relationship with his colleagues, TBR said that he generally receives support from them:

I have never felt rejection from my colleagues or never heard them say that the subject of music is minor. On the contrary, I have their support and I also advise colleagues who may be appointed to teach [music] in the grades that I don't teach, […] I have had great support and they don’t consider music as a minor subject [emphasis added].

While this statement suggests that the subject of music is generally positively received and regarded, TBR contradicted this with the following:

I have always been trying to upgrade the music subject during my teaching career, reconsidering the belief that music is a minor subject [emphasis added]. This perspective exists, among the educators too, that is, that music is a minor subject. I insist that it is not: I would say that it is a fundamental subject that needs to be taken into consideration in the school syllabi, because the music education conjures up characters from the first grade of the Primary school or even from the Kindergarten.
Prompted to clarify this contradiction, TBR politely declined to provide further explanation: “It's something I've experienced during the last years but, let's not generalise it, I wouldn't like to take a position.” Therefore, while the topic has its own importance, uncontested conclusions may not be drawn. Moreover, the contradiction and TBR's declining to provide clarification, raise questions about the reliability of his statements. Even though this may be an overgeneralisation, it should not be overlooked. Therefore the findings of his interview will be carefully applied when and where general conclusions are drawn.

Finally, TBR expressed his disagreement regarding the Ministry's policy on the appointment of music teachers:

Unfortunately, […] the situation is not as it should be; that is, if a [general] teacher is appointed to teach music in the lower grades, he will not teach it as a musician who has actually studied music. It's just the same for me: I cannot teach maths as a colleague who has studied general education.

Therefore TBR is in favour of specialisation, at least, in the subjects of music and mathematics.

Concluding, music has become the medium with which TBR’s school is represented in the events; in other words, the better the choir and the orchestral performances of the students, the better the quality of education and thus the management and music teacher's work. It is not surprising then that, first, the management and everyone else who might benefit from a good choir/orchestral performance is supportive and, second, it is one of the reasons for the numerous (more than the designated number) school events. What may be concluded then is that the school focuses on or promotes the product, rather than the process of music.
education. In addition, the question that is being raised is what a good choir and/or orchestral performance means to those who benefit from them and what pedagogical implications this has. These are questions and conclusions that will be further discussed in the following chapters.

4.11.6. Definition

Creativity for TBR is the application of students' unconstrained thinking based on the teacher's instructions in various activities, such as those mentioned above. To make this happen, TBR suggested that students should get plenty of opportunities to act by themselves: "The children need to be left free to demonstrate creativity either with movement, with their voice or with performing freely on a musical instrument; this means that we let children create by themselves." Moreover, TBR added that creativity means "...using their imagination to come up with a result that shows me they have enjoyed what they did, that is, they felt joy of learning and its outcome. For me this is important." This suggests that TBR focuses on the output and less on the process of an activity, even though he clarifies that students' satisfaction, which is related to the process, is important. Prompted to explain what makes TBR think of students’ output as special, he justified his opinion as follows:

This is because they create it by themselves, either individually or collectively. And, in this way, they have the opportunity to share opinions within the group, because that is what cooperative learning in music is all about, presenting their ideas and coming up with a result to perform.

Therefore the definition of creativity for TBR is connected to students' independent individual or collective acting, where they have the opportunity to apply their unconstrained thinking and imagination, either by using musical instruments, their voice, or their body, to come up with a result that they like.
4.11.7. Methodological issues

The interview process ran with no problems; one thing noted, however, which is seen more as an observation rather than an issue, was that TBR was laconic in his MDRPCP. Various interpretations may be given to this, such as being in a hurry to finish the additional interview process or simply not having much to say, which is beyond the main focus of this study. It is stated here, though, as a note to be taken into consideration in future research or as a research topic in itself.


STL studied general education at the University of Cyprus and, as a non-music-specialist teacher; she has no advanced music knowledge, “…only what I’ve been taught at the university and at school”, she confessed. In fact, during the interview earlier on she felt the need to clarify that her answers would be intuitive: “…OK because I don’t have much [music] knowledge, I answer intuitively.” Therefore, while this may suggest the participant’s embarrassment about the interview, something that I tried to eliminate, her opinion about creativity in Cypriot Primary education is considered honest and unbiased, at least, regarding the theories that she might have read or been taught. Among the other subjects she often teaches is art, in which she has a particular interest: “I have taken some painting lessons with a painter/visual artist and my horizons have been broadened.” As for the subject of music, STL seems to avoid making it a first teaching choice unless there is no one else to take it over:

Last year there was a colleague who had more music knowledge than myself and he took over the music teaching. Before the coming of this colleague […] I was responsible for the music teaching. This year, since
no colleague has any special music knowledge, [...] I've taken it over, [...] I knew there was no one else [with music knowledge]; because I already had some experience with the choir [...] I committed myself to this, it was my decision.

Therefore, as a general teacher, STL’s musical knowledge seems to have been mainly formed and enriched from her 10-year experience of teaching in Primary education, rather than from what she had been taught at university or any other private music institution.

4.12.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

Lyric-writing, reorchestration, letting students make decisions by themselves, making sound-stories, experimenting with various non-musical objects to make sound, combining other subjects with music, such as art, as well as listening to music and identifying the instruments, are all the activities that STL mentioned and considers to be creative. In particular, invited to talk about the video example she had brought with her which she considered creative, the participant stated that:

It is a video that we made with the students of the fourth level, [...] I thought that, as an attempt to attract their interest and to introduce them to the percussion instruments, we could do something that they wanted. [...] “Miss let's do 'Despacito', reorchestrate it, do it as we like”; anyway, we added original lyrics in Greek Cypriot, we used percussion and we made a video in which we made over Despacito.

Therefore STL uses students’ favourite songs as motivation, aiming to introduce them to the percussion instruments by employing orchestration, lyric-writing and video-recording, activities that, as we will see below, impel self-action and
independence. Furthermore, STL attracts students' interest and their feedback in the end: "I told them 'We'll do that song which we need for the event and then we'll devote time to work on the song that you want.'" In the end, STL explained that this 'deal' made the students feel satisfied: "...at some point a student told me: 'Miss, you are the best teacher ever;' because they had done this; because they had done what they had wanted so much to and because they liked what they feel so close to."

Therefore, STL uses songs that students like in order to stimulate their motivation, something that also brings satisfaction to the students and makes the teacher feel good.

In addition to orchestration, lyric-writing and video-recording, STL mentioned sound stories: "Making sound stories I, personally think, is creative, [...] you start with a story and you add sounds with objects, papers, or [...] we may go to the health education classroom and use the pots to make music." Therefore such an activity provides the opportunity for experimentation with non-musical instruments. STL further described the experience of the sound-story activity as follows:

Last year, when I did music in the first grade, we did the story of 'Little Baba', which is about the instruments of the orchestra; [...] the children watched the story which presents the musical instruments. As soon as they learn the musical instruments, they try to identify them, or the students extend the story, or they listen to the music and they realise that it's [...] 'here' where he [an elephant in the story named Baba] is happy, so that's where this instrument came in, where it [music] sounds happier. I consider this creative; or making sound stories, or sometimes scoring a song with the percussion that we have at the school with the students' ideas: “Miss, here we'll have...” or “Miss, the triangles don't sound well here, let's add the chimes”, I think these promote creativity.

It may be concluded then that various and alternative activities to teaching, such as listening to the music and identifying the instruments or the characters’
mood, are considered creative. In the above quotation STL mentioned again sound-story making and orchestration, which come from students' ideas, as creative activities.

  In addition, STL does not consider singing, by itself, to a creative activity:

OK I don't know, you may be more knowledgeable, but how creative is it to learn to sing a song, accompanied by music? It's not very creative and, most often, this is what music education is all about: teaching songs for the events, placing students in a line to sing.

  In fact, STL described a performance she did which combined singing with painting and movements; that was something that upgraded the whole activity to the highest creative level:

Last year, at the end-of-the-year [school] event, we were to sing 'Children painting the wall.' We included movements. I asked [the opinion of] a musician friend [...] and my friend asked me "Why don't you have a child painting while singing it?" So I asked a student, who doesn't speak very good Greek, [...] but he is very good at painting to do it. We put a canvas, I gave him colours and he was painting while we were singing; at the background we projected the students' paintings about peace. Our theme was about peace, [...] and all the students of the school did their paintings about peace, I used a movie-maker and we presented it in this way [...]. It was as much creative as it could be, I think.

Therefore the combination of subjects, such as music, art and dancing, raises the level of creativity.

Finally, STL explained that the activities she mentioned and she considers creative are those
...expanding the students’ horizons, that is, ask them 'What do you see here? A glass; well, is it only a glass, or if you knock it may make a sound?' [so] you evoke their [students'] interest in thinking that, 'Aha, maybe I can do more things with the objects around me.' But that's up to a point, I think creativity has a lot to do with what you inherit [emphasis added].

Therefore activities need to trigger students' interest and help them to develop divergent thinking. As she explained, "...realising that they can produce music with anything, not just with musical instruments, I think it's creative on its own." Moreover, STL's emphasised statement above suggests that creativity is an inborn skill. As she explained, creativity may be taught up to a point, what matters most is the students' background and inborn skills: "...it's a combination of the environment and what they are born with. [...] I don't think creativity is actually cultivated." This, however, is in contrast to her belief that teachers, and particularly, music teachers, are responsible for students' development of creativity: "I think it's our responsibility to promote students' creativity; music maybe allows this more. [...] I think I ought to promote their creativity because I do believe in creativity, that is, I believe we have to let the students be generally creative." What may be concluded then is that music teachers may contribute to students' development of creativity, and they do have such a responsibility because creativity is an inborn skill and possibly little may be done to help those born without it being well developed.

To sum up, STL believes that creativity has more to do with students' background and inborn skills, rather than how it is developed at school. Furthermore, the practices and activities that she considers creative and applies to her teaching methods are lyric-writing, orchestration, sound-stories, experimentation and music-making with various objects, as well as listening to music and identification of the
instruments/characters, and also involving interdisciplinarity. In order to stimulate students’ motivation, STL also uses songs that they like, something that satisfies both herself and the students. In general, STL’s choices are based on the belief that "We [educators] need to let the students free to... we should not ‘mould’ them"; this is something that relates to how she defines creativity, as discussed below.

4.12.2. The domain issue

STL’s perspective about creativity and music creativity is that the two are parts of the same thinking mechanism:

I wouldn't say it's different, it's part of general creativity. Because, generally, I think in all subjects you may and you ‘should’ let the students develop creativity. That is, even in maths, [...] letting them alone to find a solution to a problem is creative. In music, as well. [...] It's just part of creativity, not something different.

Therefore this suggests that the mechanism of creativity is the same regardless of whether it has to do with mathematics or music. While the above statement points to the transcendence of creativity across domains or knowledge subjects, STL's point of view on this is that, while it may happen, she, as a firm believer in multiple intelligences, considers that being creative in one domain does not make you capable of applying your creativity to other domains:

I believe in multiple intelligences and I consider that it may not... someone may be creative in music and not... OK he will transfer his creativity, he may transfer it to maths thinking of a problem that is very creative. But it doesn't mean that he is ‘able’ to do everything. I believe
that someone may apply his creativity to music, for example, but not to other subjects because it's not his domain.

In addition, when asked about whether ‘transference’ of creativity also has to do with student's interest in the domain or the subject, STL responded that it is quite possible: "[y]es. I think, yes, it may be.” Therefore, while a student's interest may be strong enough to make creativity transference possible, creativity for STL is primarily domain-specific.

4.12.3. Creative students

Prompted by the participant's comment on multiple intelligences, my next question was about her belief regarding the correlation between intelligence and creativity:

I think creativity is related to intelligence. Throughout the years that I have been working, I think that, as long as I believe that there are multiple intelligences and I think that creativity is [a form of] intelligence, yes, I think it's interwoven [with creativity]. Someone may not be able to solve a complex math exercise, but he can make a masterpiece, let's say.

Therefore, while intelligence is associated with creativity, it is not a necessary characteristic of creative students. On the contrary, STL believes that the ability of students to instinctively find the beat in a piece of music is a characteristic of creative students:

I feel that some kids, at least for what they did by themselves, understood, they were on the beat, [but] there were other kids who just couldn't... […]. Or kids who can't follow the rhythm, who can't get it from the beginning or even never get it. Meanwhile you see others who
immediately realise [get] it. You may say that it's not creative to follow the rhythm, but no that's not true.

This suggests that students who have difficulty in feeling the beat and whose performance level may thus not be rhythmically accurate are considered less creative. In other words, creativity, for STL, is associated with performance level: the greater the performance, that is, the product, the more creative the student is.

In addition, being self-driven and independent are characteristics of creative students, as it may be noticed in the following: "...some girls also tried to change the melody [...] while other students didn't even achieve to change the lyrics and make them fit the melody." Again, while this points to a product-oriented approach to music creativity, something noted below, it also indicates students whose independence and interest in the topic encourage them to go a step beyond the teachers' instructions. Furthermore, STL mentions that "...the students changed the lyrics [of a song] according to the subject of the unit [...] [a]nd some students, when we went into the music classroom, got the instruments and tried to arrange it differently, in order to embellish also the melody." STL talks also about observational, curious and alert students:

...those who are more creative are more observant, that is, they observe everything; maybe they have more curiosity [...] in music for example [...] they try to express it, [and] to apply it. I think they are more alert, they are more...with the stimuli around them.

Therefore, being self-driven, observational, curious and alert are other characteristics that STL attaches to creative students.
To sum up, creativity, for STL, is a form of intelligence, but intelligence is not prerequisite for being creative. In addition, an instinctive sense of rhythm is also a characteristic of creative students, as well as self-driven behaviour, independence, observance, curiosity and alertness.

4.12.4. Assessment

STL does assess students' creativity by taking account of the students' independence, self-action, age, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, students' enjoyment of the activity, the complexity of the orchestration and the involvement of other subjects.

In particular, STL explained that "...for me it's important to get something that is aesthetically pleasant, to be decently presented [emphasis added] and be something that I like, so that I can transmit it to the students to sing and enjoy it." It may be suggested then that STL's focus is on the students' output, something also supported by the following:

Well, even though it shouldn't be this way, because it [the students' performance] is something that you will present, at the back of your mind you always think of how it will be. And you feel the 'pressure' of the head teacher who will come and see the rehearsals "How is it going to be? Will it sound good? Is it good like this?" You feel this pressure [...] of how you will take it to the level that you want.

In addition, as has already been mentioned above, "...some girls also tried to change the melody [...] while there were other students who didn't even achieve to change the lyrics and make them fit with the melody, for example. I think that there... yes, not all students are creative." Therefore, STL's criteria for assessing students'
creativity are based on students' independence and self-action that result in an aesthetically pleasing output.

In addition, her comments on the videos did reveal some more influences on how she assesses creativity. Regarding the first video, STL found it creative "...because they try to find the rhythm with the sticks and it is a rhythmically driven and pleasant piece." The importance of pleasure recurs here. The fact that the students try to find the rhythm is also important. Prompted to suggest how the activity could be even more creative, STL suggested that "...maybe half of the students should play the beat and the others the rhythm. [...] [p]erhaps they should have two different instruments so that they don't all play the sticks, [and] maybe the seating arrangement [should change]." Therefore a different, maybe more sophisticated, orchestration could have made this activity more creative.

As for the second video, STL confessed that "...this is much more creative. [...] well, because they did their own orchestration... they collaborated with each other [...] they improvised trying to make something that sounds good to their ears and, indeed, they achieved it [or, at least,] they were about to achieve it." Apparently, students being independent, collaborating together and making their own orchestration made this activity creative. In addition, the age of the students influenced STL's judgment:

I take into consideration their age and the fact that they.... they didn't seem to make sounds independent of each other; it was as if they were collaborating to do something, and I consider it both creative and worthwhile; it may be highly assessed as long as an adult has to assess it. [...] I mean, considering the age of the children I saw, I think that what they've tried to do is much more creative for their age. It's something similar to what I told you about painting. That is, if a child of 6 to 7 years old can paint a tree the way he does, I will not compare it to that of a 12- or 14-year-old one. This is something that happens, educators do it, and tell him, "No it's not good, try harder." I think you
have to bear in mind the age of the children. This one [video] I think is very creative for the age of the children.

Therefore, in addition to independence, collaboration and original orchestration, students' age generates expectations for STL: the more the students surpass those expectations, the more creative the output is considered to be.

Finally, STL's comments on the third vignette suggest that some activities, such as the choir and orchestral performance of non-original music, do not allow room for creativity, unless other elements, such as movement, are added:

Well, OK, to the extent that a choir and an orchestra can be creative... the fact that she added movement, believe me, it's not easy; it's very hard to manage doing both, singing a rhythmic song and doing movement. It is something that I've tried myself, after suggestions of a musician friend and I know. The students seem that they enjoy it, I think it's creative. OK, as we said, it's a choir and an orchestra; this setup is as creative as it could be.

Invited to suggest how this could have been more creative, STL admitted that "...it's not easy. I don't know, maybe she could have done something more creative."

She then went on and described how she combines music, art and dancing, in a similar performance, something that contributes greatly to the level of creativity.

In general, it may be suggested that, for STL, both original and non-original performance activities and outputs are considered creative. However, when students perform non-original music, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, the students' enjoyment of the activity and the involvement of other subjects influence her judgment regarding the level of creativity. When it comes to activities that include
experimentation, improvisation, composition and original contribution, then students’ independence, self-action and age influence her judgment.

4.12.5. School environment

STL described how she came to teach music, even though she is not specialised in the subject:

…sometimes the head teacher may impose it, yes, as is the case this year, because last year there was a colleague who had more music knowledge and took over music teaching. Before the coming of this colleague, I was responsible for the music teaching. This year, since no colleague has any special music knowledge, the head teacher said “OK, each teacher will take over the music teaching of his classroom.” So I took it over, knowing that there was no one else [with music knowledge] to do it. Because I already had some experience with the choir I said, "OK, I will take over the choir." I committed myself to this, it was my decision and I asked to take over one more class, of the higher grades […] along with the fourth grade to work all together and assemble a rudimentary choir for the events. After all, this is what matters in the Primary education […] having songs to present at the school events [emphasis added].

Obviously, the subject of music requires particular knowledge and skills that the average general teacher lacks. Thus the subject is most often assigned to a specialised or, at least, a teacher with a bit more knowledge. Furthermore, STL’s ‘self-sacrifice’ in undertaking to teach music needs to be noted, something that suggests a collaborative environment among the colleagues of her school. Of more importance, however, is the last emphasised sentence that reflects STL’s opinion about the overall environment and policy regarding music creativity in Cypriot Primary education: an institution where the quality of the process of music education is sacrificed for the sake of the product, that is, the show, the events. As she
explained: "...we need to let the students free to... we should not 'mould' them [...]. [B]ecause it is something that I witness at our schools, we 'mould' students."

Requested to justify this opinion, STL explained that there is no room for students' self-action:

Music and, generally, the other colleagues who have more knowledge, are the most innocent in this issue [laughs]; usually we are more flexible in music but, generally, we 'mould' students. That is, it's this, it's this song and we'll learn it this way, we'll use these instruments, I'm talking about music, generally we don't let them free to come up with their own ideas: ‘Could this be different?’ […] We so much 'mould' students that we don't promote creativity in Primary schools.

Therefore, while STL and educators in general may be willing to let students act freely and offer their opinions and ideas on the subject and, thus, develop their creativity, this becomes unfeasible as most, if not all, of the teaching time is devoted to teaching songs because of the school events. In fact, STL describes music education primarily as a song-teaching subject:

...based on what I see in schools, because we have this timetable according to which we have to learn songs for the 28th of October; so we did one song. By Monday I have to think of songs for the 28th of October event. That is, it's mostly song teaching, which doesn't allow time and room for... [...] how creative it is to learn singing a song, playing along with instruments as accompaniment. It's not very creative, but that's what most often music education is all about; it's teaching songs for the events, setting them [the students] up in a line and singing [emphasis added].

Prompted to further describe the school event process preparation and setup, STL mentioned:
Well, OK, in school events there should be presented two to three songs. In smaller schools, like the one I currently am, because... high grade students are obliged to be in the choir and orchestra; there is no choice, "You will be in the choir, you will not" as it is in other schools. You have to find students of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades to form your choir... and in every event you have to [...] present songs that fit with the theme of the event. OK, usually if the end-of-the-year event is Cypriot theatre, you pretty much have to find Cypriot songs, for example, for the choir. For the Christmas event you usually do classic carols and some other songs.

It is also worth mentioning students' usual reaction to the school event repertoire: "...they are kids who...well, they kick against singing the more 'traditional' songs of the events and all that; [...] we start off [the year] and we have to teach songs for the 1st and 28th October [events]." Therefore, in addition to the music teachers' weariness about the school events, students also may lose interest. Invited to suggest how the events could become more creative, STL recommended that:

If it could be taken into consideration what students like, even though the teacher... well, I do try to do this, I try to choose songs that are more pleasant or that I do like and consider that the students will also like them [smile], but it doesn't always work like this. OK, in the previous years I had the opportunity... my former head teachers did trust me and let me choose [the songs]. I don't know what will happen this year, because the situation is different... or if she [head teacher] will give me specific songs and tell me: "You know, for the Christmas [event] I want you to do Cypriot carols, I want you to do this song." OK, well enough, I will do it; the song may not satisfy all the students; or the other problem is that, [...] the students are required to participate in the choir and sing, whether they like it or not.

Therefore STL's suggestion for making school events more creative, or, in fact, more appealing, is to teach songs that the teacher thinks students will find pleasant. It is also apparent that head teachers have a different approach as to the repertoire of the events. In fact, there is no possibility for students to negotiate their participation.
STL also explained what the consequences may be if the students' performance in an event is not satisfactory: "It may have consequences, for example, if the head teacher doesn't like it, neither will the inspector who may come to watch it, OK, he may reproach you or... however, this never happened to me." Nevertheless, she confessed that, as long as school events are so highly valued, inevitably her focus as a music teacher will be the result, rather than the process:

Well, even though it shouldn't be this way, because it is something that you will present, you always think of how it will be at the back of your mind. And you feel the 'pressure' of the head teacher who will come and see the rehearsals: "How will it be? Will it sound good? Is it good like this?" You feel this pressure, so you ignore the preparation, [and] how you will take it to the level that you want.

In addition, for STL, there is no restriction with regard to the subject of music, as there is in other subjects; consequently, music is offered to develop the students' creativity:

As we said there is no assessment in the Primary education, but in other subjects you may want to let your students be creative but you have to strictly follow the syllabus; in modern Greek, for example, the students have to learn the grammar and what's creative about it? OK, you may try to teach it creatively, which is fine, but you have a timeline, you are more restricted. In music, though, you don't have anything to restrict you, except what I told you before, the events, which must be done and I don't consider that... [...] in terms of the syllabus, yes, you are more free. And consequently, you may let your students cultivate their creativity.

Therefore, while there is no restriction in terms of the syllabus, and, thus, the teachers can be flexible in applying the approach and the activities they prefer, the heavy schedule of the events is an obstacle.
Finally, in terms of her relationship with colleagues, STL repeatedly mentioned that most of the time there is a supportive environment; there was an exception once regarding STL’s choice of a song presented in an event, but the case was resolved easily.

To conclude, teaching time in music education is devoted to teaching songs, most of them weariness for the students as well as for the teachers, for the numerous school events. Unfortunately, even though there is no restriction in terms of the syllabus, since school events reflect the school’s image and its educational quality, no time remains for allowing students to contribute their own input or try something different, thereby nurturing a creative process; unavoidably, the focus of the teacher remains attached to the product.

4.12.6. Definition

Explaining why STL considers the activities mentioned above as creative, she explained that:

…the fact that they would step, let's say, on the melody, find similar expressions [phrases] to match with the music, I think is a skill that they developed a bit and the percussion, because I provided them with the percussion box and I let them choose, I didn't assign them: "You will take this one, you will take that one;" it was by themselves, they did it alone, they said “We'll do it this way.”

Apparently, the fact that the students had the opportunity to act by themselves and do something original, in this case thinking up their own lyrics to match the melody of a song, is what makes a music activity creative. In fact, students’ self-action and original output seem to be crucial in what defines creativity,
as it repeatedly emerged in STL's interview: "...they changed the lyrics, they came up with their own, it's totally their own work"; in another case, STL mentions "...it was something they did alone", while in another, "...there are students who are creative, you will give them something, they will think and develop it." Therefore, students' self-action, independency and originality define creativity in a musical activity.

4.12.7. Methodological issues

The interview with STL did not yield any major issues. It has to be noted, though, that during the interview the participant gave the impression of having a sense of inferiority, something that I tried to eliminate, both at the particular moment I noticed it, when she said, "...OK, I don't know, you may be more knowledgeable," and throughout the whole interview.

4.13. Participant 8: NGL – Music Teacher

NGL has worked as a substitute music teacher in Cypriot Secondary education for eight years and she has been teaching for 19 years in Primary education. Even though she is now close to retirement, she likes to attend music seminars and participate in research studies: "My education keeps going, my desire has always been to learn new things. For about 12 years I have been attending the World Guitar Festival in Volos." Furthermore, she explained: "I personally consider it very important to participate in a research, despite my little contribution, so that someone may listen to my opinion." This relates to the aspects of her character, that include sociability: "I am a sociable, deep-thinking person, I am politicised, which, I think, defines me to challenge students to open up [feel comfortable and behave naturally]."
NGL comes from a village and her love and desire to start private music lessons was due to her teacher at Primary school. Financial difficulties and social constraints of the time delayed her music studies:

I wanted to start taking guitar lessons, but my father had objections, "You are too young, I'm not going to let you go to a conservatory to learn the guitar." There was also no money in the family and I was helping my mother collect mushrooms in order to contribute to the family income and start taking guitar lessons. The guitar was bought and I was in the second grade of the Secondary school when I eventually had the right to take the bus and attend a conservatory. [...] it's not that I wanted to study music at a university, my teacher, however, guided my thinking by giving me the opportunity to have a role in a play, to play an instrument, to play the flute, to sing.

Eventually, NGL did advanced musical studies in the Conservatory of Athens. Her life there had, in fact, a great influence on her personal development and on her perception of creativity

The only thing that helped me very much [was] my life in Athens. [...] I experienced things myself, from the theatre and the music performances. That's what broadened my horizons. My studies at the conservatory were very typical [...]: do your lesson, do your harmony, do this and the other.

Therefore, NGL's music studies did not develop her creativity; it was the social environment in the Greek capital that formed her personality and creative thinking.

Finally, NGL is generally very careful with her behaviour towards the students because of a negative experience she had in Secondary education:
I have traumas from school. Imagine that I never [emphasis by the participant], except in the Primary school, sang in a choir before graduating from High school. From the first grade of the Secondary school to the end of High school I didn't participate in the school choir, even though I was taking private music lessons.

This experience made her be very sensitive about rejecting students from performance participation, something that, as we will see, she likes to avoid and also reflects on her perception of creativity.

4.13.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

NGL believes that creativity is inherent in everyone and, even though it may be taught, the Primary school environment does not support this:

…it [creativity] may be taught... it lies within us, especially as I told you earlier, inside children. Children's imagination flourishes, but we suppress it. That's why I told you earlier, you see your childhood photographs in which you are smiling and you go to the sixth grade and you sit [rigidly] like that.

Apparently, this suggests that the younger the students, the more creative they are, something that will be discussed below.

Furthermore, nurturing creativity demands creative teachers:

The teacher also has to be creative [...] both as an educator, as well as a musician [...]. if you are not creative, if you are like that in your personal life, narrow-minded, how can you inspire the children? It's mostly inspiration, besides that there is the scientific approach where you will first have students imitating you, they will then do something by
themselves and develop it. Well, you also need to do things in your life [...]. For me this is creativity, being able to let myself free.

Therefore creativity calls for open-mindedness, inspiration and free spirit, generally in terms of one’s character but, also, as an educator and musician.

In terms of creative activities, those include instrumental experimentation, body movement and combination of music with dancing and acting. For example, an activity NGL applies in the first grades is to ask students to "...use their names and, instead of simply playing them as a rhythmic pattern, they do it with a movement; I will provide them with some guidance [...] without giving first an example, I may give an example later on." In addition,

with very young students I begin by letting them free to experiment with the mallets or the instruments. I do several nice things and we use them for fairytales, that is, I guide them through the fairytale so as to impersonate some roles and develop their imagination and create thinking.

Furthermore, the creative output may not necessarily relate to music but may be generated by it:

It could be through music, they create something through music. The output may be music or something else [...] with this you may stimulate them to move on and create other things; that is, ‘unchain’ their minds, not through the typical lesson in which we sit in the classroom and do this.

The importance of these creative activities is that they are good "for personal development, creating is satisfaction and it matures you, it matures [you] emotionally, it matures your behaviour. For children, this is very important, for their self-confidence." Therefore the activities that NGL uses aim to contribute to students' personal development, emotional maturity, self-confidence and to promote divergent
thinking, which they may apply elsewhere to their lives. This suggests the general
domain quality of creativity, as discussed below.

4.13.2. The domain issue

As already mentioned, NGL supports the view that creative persons may transfer
their creativity. According to her experience:

We see students in the arts, where it is easy to see their work. We don't
see that much how they behave in their personal lives, but they bring us
things that they make, you know, they may make jewelry or something
else and we see what they can do. And in other subjects, yes, [...] he is
creative elsewhere too and I think music should have given him even
more 'supplies' because it's something more immediate. That is, music is
constantly in our lives [...]. So, music is very helpful, therapeutic. [...] He
[the student] will just need encouragement because, with the current
school system, someone may have the potential, [...] but the environment
in the classroom may not be appropriate. While, through art, if he gets the
self-confidence he will assert it, he will assert his chance to show his
creativity.

Therefore creative students do transfer their creativity. Important parameters
are a supportive and encouraging environment in order to develop self-confidence.

4.13.3. Creative students

Self-confidence was one of the characteristics that was mentioned and which as also
frankly stated here:

if they [the children] have confidence, because their parents pay
attention to them and some children have 'nerve', [...] something
absolutely necessary and, fortunately, some children do have it; that is,
they can stand in front of the teacher, without standing in ceremony [much formality], which someone may not like.

Therefore a strong and outspoken character is much more likely to be creative.

Furthermore, NGL has noticed that younger students, whose spontaneity is vivid, are more creative than older students who are more restrained:

The older children are, the more hesitant they are, more hesitant to do things with their bodies. And this [...] is because we don't have suitable space so that they could have done it when they were younger, space for movement, so that they don't develop syndromes.

Therefore it seems that NGL considers older students' creative reticence to be a result of their unfamiliarity with body movement and expression. The older the students, the more restrained they are and thus less creative.

Finally, NGL provided her opinion about intelligence:

I can tell you what I've noticed: we've had children with disabilities, even with mental disabilities, who were creative. [...] it's not just intelligence; simply, it may be evident in their [low] self-confidence because, as a child, you can't... when you grow up you take decisions for yourself; children, however, are guided and don't have the courage to express themselves.

Therefore intelligence, for NGL, is not a prerequisite for creativity; self-confidence and the ability to express yourself and take decisions on your own are the most influential characteristics of creative students.
4.13.4. Assessment

NGL's comments on assessing creativity revealed that students' initiative to do more than what was required, or had been taught, influence her perception of assessing creativity:

...we made rain-sticks, [...] we had a plain roll that we had to decorate: some students painted it using just one colour, others painted music notes, others put ribbons, others made bigger size rain-sticks... so, you assess the child, let's say, who didn't merely do one that makes sound, [but] he tried to decorate it the way he liked it, to write letters on it, to put on it stickers. So, there, yes, you will notice it and write it down that here we had an attitude, a tendency to achieve his goal and go a step further, which still does not make him satisfied and he adds something again.

Therefore students' desire and the ability to go beyond instructions in order to come up with an output that satisfies them influence NGL's perception of assessing creativity: the greater the deviation, the more creative it is considered to be. As for the feedback to the students, NGL is always encouraging and careful to avoid causing distress: "...you should say 'bravo' to all children for their effort. To someone you may say, 'This is very good', but you try to avoid causing syndromes [traumas] to some children; I am very careful with it."

Regarding her comments on the videos, NGL found the first one to be "...a good and pleasant result" which, even though it helps students "...to be more receptive", to work as a group, feel relaxed and satisfied, still is not creative:

We have a guided process here [...] I wouldn't say there is creativity here because it is something guided, their [students'] actions are given. [...] As an activity it gets 10 [out of 10], as for creativity, though, I think not. She [the teacher] just guides [directs] them, helps them to be able to do something creative later on. They don't perform something original.
In fact, this is a preparatory activity for students to do something by themselves and, thus, becomes creative, later on: "If after this activity we continue with something else, that is, do something on their own, collaborate to adopt the rhythms they've learned or something, then [...] it will help them create by themselves." Therefore activities in which students merely follow instructions and do not perform something original, are not considered creative.

As for the second video, NGL mentioned that "...they [students] collaborated, they listened to each other and they did something very nice, they kept the beat, they used their hand-made instruments, I think it's a very satisfying result." Prompted to explain if she also found it creative, NGL answered positively:

Yes, because they were creating something from scratch, they were not performing something already known. [...] They didn't have guidance, but the kids showed that they did something, the older kid was conducting, but they were aware of playing together, but [...] it wasn't something that was written and they had prepared it. This is an improvisation, they may have had some instructions and they followed them [...] acting by themselves [...]. Well, this is creative, the fact that they acted by themselves. [...] it was a collaboration of their creativity.

Therefore collaboration and students' self-action make this activity and the students' output creative.

Finally NGL's opinion about the third video was that:

I'm aware of the process [preparation] you need to go through until you reach this point [laughs]. So, you may have a result that is presentable and the children are happy, [...] it's creative that each child learned the song, he had created, that is, the child who plays the guitar actually
creates. This [the performance] is very important, but it needs to be done with no pressure. [...] If you do this with no time pressure, children will really enjoy it, because they worry about those who will attend and listen to them.

Therefore two main topics emerged: the first is that even though at the beginning of the interview she mentioned the opposite, NGL found it creative that students learned the song and some of them even played the guitar:

...we have to do events, [...] something fixed, students will have to learn the songs in order to present them at an event. This is not creative; that is, I impose on the students to learn this and sing it, do it this way.

The second is the pressure students may experience: even though they will be satisfied at the end of the event performance, the possibility of the limited time for preparation, as well as the presence of audience add pressure to the students.

To sum up, NGL assesses creativity on the basis of the students’ devotion and engagement with an activity: the more the students go beyond the instructions they were given, the more creative they are. In addition, activities have to allow students to act freely, either individually or collectively, and to promote originality in order to be considered creative.

4.13.5. School environment

The preparation for school events, NGL’s relationship with her colleagues and the process whereby music teachers were employed were the major topics associated with the school environment and its policy that NGL discussed.
As already mentioned, the numerous events cause tension both to the teachers and the students:

...the events are some kind of pressure for us, meaning that it's not bad for them to take place, it's just that they take place on particular dates. Therefore I think this works against the children because there is the time pressure, which impels them to leave behind other activities that are important for them[,] [...] we push them to learn the song or play the instruments because they will present and they have to be perfect, standing, walking, being quiet and discreet while being arranged by height. So, these things are a bit restrictive. If, on the other hand, I didn't have to do national events and so on and if the school wanted to present the students' work only, it should let me have the students create freely and present their own stuff.

NGL recalled an event that took place without time pressure:

I remember once I did it with an arts colleague; they had a school project that didn't set a hard deadline for that event. [...] well, this gave me time to let the students create, [...] they danced, they created, they did dance improvisation, [...] we did a song they sang it; [...] they also had costumes. But the time you have for the events is very oppressive, is restrictive. And we have many such events.

Therefore the absence of a hard deadline provided the opportunity for engaging students in a variety of activities.

Furthermore, the problem with time and audience attendance at the school events is that the performances "...should be presentable" [i.e. of a satisfying quality level], as NGL put it. Even though NGL admitted that "[p]ersonally, I don't care if we'll have an audience, whoever that might be, honestly it doesn't bother me at all": students do feel the pressure. This, along with the time limit, used to, and sometimes still does, force music teachers to audition students. As NGL mentioned "[s]ome time
ago we had inspectors that asked us to do auditions.” This, however, is against her beliefs:

[Why] should I use the ‘good’ students to play for an event? I want the whole class to play, to have all the group participating when I do something; otherwise, I deviate from my educational goals [...] I can’t put the children in the process of “…You are not participating, you will not do this.”

Nevertheless, NGL clarified that she is not against school event performances:

I think it's very important for children to perform in an ensemble, in music ensembles, it just needs to be done with no pressure of time. [...] We don't let them enjoy what they play, what they experiment with and what they have achieved. We constantly tell them, "Come on, let's do it, let's finish it, we have run out of time." And we convey this [pressure] onto the children.

In the following excerpt NGL narrated another experience involving the preparation process for an event in which, again, the absence of time pressure yielded a positive memory for everyone:

…we did events that were very creative at the other school, [...] and the project was ‘What I carry in my luggage,’ for the children of the immigrants, [...] and it was presented in the Melina Merkouri theatre. So, the children worked during the whole process, they had plenty of time to paint, to play, to invite their parents and talk [...]. And the kids are here still remembering that event we did, because they were involved themselves, their work was exhibited and it was seen by the people of the Ministry [of Education] and it was not something sophisticated, it didn't come out of complicated work, it came out of the students' little hands: the songs they did, the paintings, the theatrical acts, it all came out of the children, who, this time, did not worry: "Oh God, we’ve run out of time, do it quickly! Oh God, I can't stand it anymore, enough!" [...] When you are
under the pressure of time... the pressure is the time, not that much the quality about what will or will not come out of it. OK, you pay attention to it because you are exposed [emphasis added] [...] but, depending on what kind of person you are, you will be careful so that you have a result that satisfies the children, so that they feel, they develop their critical [thinking] "Is it good this that I'm doing now? Isn't it good?" [...] "What did we achieve here? Are you satisfied? Could we do something more? Did we collaborate?"

Consequently, for NGL, performance at a school event is beneficial as long as its preparation is not done under pressure. Furthermore, while she initially stated that the audience is not something that she takes into consideration, we can see that, since she is exposed, it is necessary to pay attention to the level of quality of performance.

As for NGL's relationship with her colleagues, the comments were positive:

I'm happy that my colleagues share their knowledge. They don't keep it for themselves, despite the fact of the career progression issue, you know and they may want to keep it for themselves. [...] I've been fortunate enough to work and collaborate, with no problem, with my colleagues and with the students [...] I know, however, as I am the president of the Sectoral Music Committee, that many colleague musicians have had problems with other colleagues, [e.g.,] they underestimate their work, their time spent, their output, [...] but, each teacher thinks of his own subject: "OK, your subject [music] is not that important, they will not need it in their lives."

Therefore NGL described an overall supportive environment, even though she referred to the undervaluing of music.

Finally, NGL talked about how she and other musicians were appointed in Primary education: "Music teachers were employed [in the 90s] in the Primary education by necessity, with no service plan [...]. [T]here was a shortage of general teachers and music teachers." This, however, caused a reaction from the General Educators Union who, after negotiating with the Ministry of Education, agreed that
the music teacher employed through necessity will not be "...allowed promotion or anything else, and also when retiring, no other such musicians will be employed."

To conclude, school events are very oppressive, both for teachers and for students and this is due to time restrictions and audience attendance. As a matter of fact, students do not enjoy the process, which does not allow space for experimentation. Furthermore, while colleagues generally support each other, NGL has heard of cases in which music is undervalued. Finally, the category of music teacher, established about 30 years ago, will soon disappear, with the music specialised educators taking their positions.

4.13.6. Definition

NGL defines creativity as the process in which the students act freely, listen to music and use their bodies to express themselves, thereby, producing an output that, as we have seen, may or may not be related to music:

…to let our students be free, without being guided, as a first effect [step], to do things, either movement, moving with no guidance, and with musical instruments with guidance; with guidance and with no guidance sometimes. But, we have to let them relax, let's say, through a process and do things more freely, to feel that they are part of the lesson.

NGL clarified, in fact, that anything fixed or given to the students, such as songs for school events, which students simply have to reproduce is not considered creative:

…we have to do events, [...] something fixed, students will have to learn songs in order to present at an event. This is not creative; that is, I impose on the students to learn this and sing it, do it this way.
Once again, creativity is defined as students taking initiative without guidance and demonstrating self-expression.

### 4.13.7. Methodological issues

The interview with NGL ran smoothly, apart from the fact that she did not bring with her an example with which we could start off our conversation. However, as was the case with the other participants, the process continued without any problem.


KKS studied economics; his studies, however, in the violin, Byzantine music and theory led him to be appointed a music teacher in Primary education. Despite his classical background, KKS described himself as a non-traditional musician and teacher:

…as a character, I can't be framed; it's my nature, not because of being reactive or the smart guy, no. My style is that I can't imitate, if you ask me, something exactly: "Here it is, do exactly the same." This is very hard for me; for example, even though I'm a violinist, what I mean is this: I will emphasise other things, you see that I try to do something else.

He also advised me to

…keep in mind that I'm not 'traditional', that is, I know what's going on in schools generally, all the teachers do the glockenspiel, the xylophone and the vibraphone; I do this in the other school where I teach because it was my contact point, but this is not the solution, I just want to make this clear so that I don't baffle your research.
A couple of things that emerged here, and are further discussed below, are:

KKS’s belief in an alternative teaching approach, something that is different from that of his colleagues, which he described as not being the solution for the difficulties they have, regarding the limited time for teaching music. The second is his concern not to undermine my research, a concern that he repeated elsewhere: "But, I’m not going to say anything that I don’t use myself, because I don’t want to ruin your study;" "…I don’t want to say anything that’s not true" and "…but, I will not lie to you ‘You know, I use it [this kind of activity] very often since I have time every year’; it’s not possible."

These two points will be discussed further in the following paragraphs.


KKS believes that we all possess creativity, which may be developed as long as there is available time, so that students get the opportunity to practise creative activities from the very beginning of Primary education:

…to some degree I think everyone has creativity, at least to some extent. [...] It's like, for example, in improvisation, which we did at the Ionian University [...] musicians that used to play gigs every night or they did concerts, while they never did improvisation with percussion etc. said: "I will go for it and I will play something" while, some of us, who were more restrained, [and] with not much self-confidence [...] didn’t let ourselves free to follow our instinct and play on many instruments. [...] if I have time to play with the student to let this come out and if I feel that what I'm playing is not trifling, [...] I come to the conclusion of the ‘time frame’ [...] if from the first grade of the Primary education, there is some kind of "play with ‘ta’ and ‘titi’ and make a pattern," I believe that, gradually, until he [the student] goes to the fourth grade [...] we’ll have very good results.
Lack of time, experience and self-confidence emerged as important aspects. Lack of time deprives students of the opportunity to practise improvisation or experimentation from the lower grades (something that results in them being inexperienced and not self-confident) which are crucial for being able to create.

With regard to whether a music teacher has to be creative in order to teach creativity, KKS responded positively:

Of course, if you work with cliché, it becomes compulsive for yourself and you can’t think of something in any other way. For example, I use traditional instruments [in students' orchestrations] and find alternative ways, and sometimes I see it on the parents' faces, "Wow how did this crazy guy use them?!"[...] And this is not done intentionally, that's what I want to conclude. That is, it develops creatively and sometimes I get ideas from the students, even from their mistakes [...] So, sometimes students themselves may provide you with something that you can use.

Therefore the creative teacher is defined as someone who makes use of the students' mistakes or finds alternative ways to approach music teaching, something necessary for nurturing students' creativity.

While I repeatedly asked about the practices and the activities KKS uses in his classes, he returned to the time issue: “...the percentage of time [available for other activities] is so little” and this is because of the numerous school events:

...the situation in the Primary education and the limited time we have, we are always in charge of [preparing school events performance], you don't have time to pay attention and develop little things that may ‘click’ you, or, eventually, bring the student up to the standard that you may want, or see how far he can develop his ideas, but, unfortunately, you don't have time for this.
Therefore school events are not considered creative by KKS: invited to suggest how events may become a creative process, KKS stated:

First, doing the events with no parents in the audience. This means that I may let the children free and tell them: "an accompaniment [arrangement] as you like it" and we'll build on that. And we may start, for example, with the simplest: "What's the strongest [beat] that you feel here? Then do what you like, but by the end of the measure I want us to be altogether.

The fact that KKS mentioned the audience as the first thing to be changed in order to make events more creative, and the fact also that he actually repeated it in another answer, reveals the pressure he, and possibly the students, feel when preparing for an event, in order to reach a satisfactory level.

Nevertheless, KKS gave an example of a creative activity that he may apply if there is available time:

Sometimes we finish with the events of the 25th March and 1st April and we have much [free] time ahead of us [until the next event]; then I may try with more kids in the percussion, let's say: "You play the drums, try out something of your own" [...] [Y]ou may give a pattern, usually a cymbal and they play on the strong and weak beats steadily and, based on that, we may improvise using the sticks.

In addition, however, in relation to the overloaded schedule, KKS mentioned students' discipline as an inhibitor when it comes to using creative activities:

The second I want to mention which stops us [from applying creative activities] is the issue about children's discipline. That is, there are children who will try to play something for you and there are others who
will take advantage of that and will think “Aha, now that I have the bells I will drive him crazy.” So, you have to be careful with that.

Therefore, in the cases in which there is available time, the activity he may employ is improvisation, which he considers creative because the students come up with their own musical ideas.

4.14.2. The domain issue

KKS’s opinion about the relationship between creativity and musical creativity is that:

They are essentially the same, their structure is the same, the words ‘how’ and ‘why’ are there in any kind of creation. That is what Theodorakis said: “My visit to the Parthenon was what made me compose my greatest work” at the age of 10. He saw something and copied it, in a good manner and brought it nicely to the world of music.

Apparently, this points also to the ability to transfer creativity. When asked if he has noticed this, KKS replied positively:

Yes, this is true. Many times I have seen students of mine, who were good at painting or doing constructions develop thought and this year I have a student who is in the fifth grade and, in everything he does..., that is, he started with the guitar, which goes well, he switched to the ukulele, he continues doing both but, based on what I hear from his teachers, he has this creative thinking in some things that have to do with construction and he is also an active kid. […] Now, you may say that this is just one case, but I think that the average musicians are capable of seeing and copying something and transforming it later on; this is not just for music.
Therefore creativity, for KKS, is a mechanism that functions in any domain, and thus those who have it developed may apply it anywhere. From the above, we may also identify activeness, as a characteristic of creative students.

4.14.3. Creative students

In terms of the students’ creative characteristics, KKS has noticed that curiosity, being observant and active are characteristics of creative students. As he explained:

Most of them [the creative students] are charmed with the new, with the new that you offer. This is important; I mean a student who has no interest, even if he is creative, I can't recognise it, it's invisible. While some children who are charmed, in a good manner and observe something, you can see that if you ask them to do it again, you can see that the percentage of doing it correctly is greater than that of a child who is 'ordinary' and does not take anything seriously.

Regarding the age that students’ creativity may arise or diminish, KKS explained: “In the higher grades students are more creative, they have more stimuli and knowledge and so on.”

Therefore the younger the students, the more spontaneous they are, but not necessarily more creative; the older they are, the more knowledge they have and thus the more creative they are. Knowledge is thus more related to creativity than spontaneity.

4.14.4. Assessment

As asked about whether KKS assesses students' creativity, his answer was: "I don't want to sound like an omniscient [smiles]; statistically this is minor because of the very loaded schedule. I will put it differently, from the very moment I am [with the
students] in the orchestra, I can recongise students' creativity." Therefore the full schedule of events does not allow time for activities, nor for assessment. However, students' rendering of orchestral performance helps KKS recognise the creative ones. Prompted to explain ‘how’, he mentioned that: "You can see some children who, even if I didn't ask them to reach a climax or raise the tambourines etc. they may suggest it themselves: ‘Wouldn't it be nice to do this here?’" In an attempt to confirm that I have understood correctly, I asked whether he meant the students’ initiative and his answer was:

This is what can make you assess students, but if I tell you that I can do this throughout the year, it will be a lie; you can't do it all year round. Simply, some children that express themselves, will help you make up your mind.

Consequently, students' initiative and self-expression influence KKS in assessing their creativity.

Regarding the videos, KKS considered the activity of the first to be preparatory and its output as reproduction, thus suggesting minimal creativity regarding the activity and its output:

We introduce the beat, because there are kids who, literally, can't do this. So the point is, what comes next. […] where would creativity be? I would say to the students: "Keep on with this beat, do what you like here with this [singing a rhythm]" but they are on the beat; and that's where it starts to be creative. Or play ‘titi’ [eighth notes] wherever you want; that's where creativity begins. Now, this [video] is a very good introduction […], because it's 'copy and paste', that's why I don't think it's creative; that's the only reason.
For KKS then, playing on time and following the time signature are crucial; as long as this happens then it starts to be creative. It also enriches the performance with the students’ own melodic or rhythmic ideas.

As for the second video, KKS found it creative because, despite the students' young age, they did express themselves: “This looks creative, definitely it is. […] I personally liked the fact that all three expressed themselves […]. For their age, doing this is amazing, that is, it activates the mechanism.”

Finally, the third video, for KKS, also depicted a preparatory activity which, in contrast to the one of the first video and even though KKS was not aware of what preceded, introduces students to unusual or, at least, non-standard and boring music pieces:

I will tell you something, I call it ‘fuel oil’ for creativity, I mean all these children, at this age, learning about rock’n’roll, its characteristics and information about it, I mean creativity is at its best. But also it's ‘fuel oil' for creativity later on. […] I don't know what preceded this, how creative this work is. […] The result, though, I believe is creative in terms of children learning and playing other music than that of Mozart, Beethoven etc. or two traditional songs or a commemorative song [those played at school events].

In conclusion, students' initiative and self-expression when performing influence KKS in assessing their creativity. As for the activities, as long as they provide opportunities for students to contribute and produce original output (introducing them also to music with which they may not be familiar), then they are considered to be creative.
4.14.5. School environment

Regarding the school environment and how it influences creativity, KKS mentioned that his head teacher's trust in, and support for, his ideas contribute very positively to the development of students' creativity:

Once, the head teacher heard of my intention to embed the ukulele in my teaching [...] he, first of all, trusted me and, second, he decided to give the budget he had for other needs for purchasing the ukuleles, so that more students can be involved. [...] the fact that we bought ukuleles and we had them here in the school was a challenge for me to do something. [...] if I tell the head teacher now that we need this, he takes it seriously into consideration.

While the relationship with KKS and the head teacher is well-balanced, KKS also referred to friction with colleagues that may arise, as well as to the undervaluing of music as a subject:

About two years ago [...] I took the initiative to sing Christmas carols in the church for charity. [...] A colleague, who devotes so much time for preparing students for poem recitation, and I don't underestimate poems, kicked against. [...] She wanted to rehearse everything with the microphone and she told me "You've done so many rehearsals for the carols"; but what rehearsals? I devoted my free time, from the two schools where I teach, moving the instruments by myself.

Therefore preparing for school events may give rise to tension among colleagues.

Finally, the greatest issue regarding the school environment that negatively influences creativity in music is the numerous school events: "[The events] are so many and that's almost the case in all schools. And the other problem is how they use music. [...] [T]he school itself, then the parents' association want you to... now we have PA.SY.KA.F. [cancer hospital] waiting [for another event]." Therefore, besides
the in-school events, there are additional ones requested by the parents' association.

Consequently, this obliges KKS to prepare student performances all-year round:

Everything that we do will be presented somewhere. And that's why I said before that I have great ideas that I would love to implement, such as the reggae and other beats that I believe will offer much to our students but, then I ask myself: when?

Some of the songs that KKS taught when he found time are

'Sailing' by Ron Stewart, I also did 'Boat on the River' two years ago in the other school, 'Blowing in the Wind'... What was the problem there, I couldn't present them in events. [...] The reason was this: on the one hand I have this issue: I don't trust students' parents, as there are parents who will tell you off. [...] Parents are waiting for your mistake.

In fact, KKS admits that audience attendance is a great pressure for him:

Parents will attend [the events] and there you will not, the music teacher will not be relaxed, he has to achieve to produce a high standard, 'worth-listening-to' piece of music; so he will not include in the choir and the orchestra second category [musically weak] students [...]. They [students] think that we are being video-recorded now and many times it happens that we see ourselves in the YouTube and, personally, I carefully try not to listen to them, honestly, I can't stand it. I will find mistakes, it's impossible that I will not. But it doesn't matter if the audience applauded and I was flaunting myself and the students. [...] The fact that parents attend adds another dimension, it's as if you are then on air; however, the events that are only for the students are maybe one or two, the most.

Furthermore, KKS explained that his musical experience sets high standards for his students' performances:
The first thing I try to avoid is not be ridiculed [...] because with the experience of violin lessons and participating in orchestras you learn that, in order to present something to an audience, there is a structure, there are some elements that you have to achieve.

This suggests KKS's emphasis on output, since the output defines his own capabilities as a music teacher.

4.14.6. Definition

Invited to talk about how he perceives music creativity in education, KKS explained:

First, the children have to be able from the beginning to play along with what they listen to, to this part of creativity, so that they could later do something that comes out of them. That is, for example, being able to rhythmically accompany 'Milo mou kokkino' ['My red apple”, a Greek traditional song. [...] The second step is the creative part. The first is that they can accompany [play along] and then they may be in a position to create. Because if a student, for example, cannot accompany a 7/8-metre song by hand, he will not be able to do anything else.

Therefore creativity, for KKS, seems to be a confusing term. What may be derived from the above is that the ability of a student to play rhythmically on time and to accompany someone else is a prerequisite for taking the next step, which is the creative one, but KKS left this unexplained. At another point, he added:

Those of us teaching in Primary schools are always under pressure because we have to produce events. Creativity starts as soon as it sounds good with the whole class and, I mean, in terms of rhythm and intonation [...]. [But] once it gets out [of these] it becomes noise.

Therefore, keeping in mind that performances at school events are the primary goal of KKS's teaching, then, being able to reach a musically satisfactory
result in terms of rhythm and intonation is, in fact, creative, something that causes him to focus on the result, rather than the process.

4.14.7. Methodological issues

A couple of points noted here are: first, KKS did not bring with him an example he considered to be creative; second, the information he provided in the MDRPCP was very brief. Finally, while not directly related to methodology, it should be stated that, as mentioned in the introductory paragraph about KKS, he repeatedly expressed his concern about being a suitable participant. This relates to the issue frequently referred to in KKS's interview about school events and the time they demand; consequently, and as mentioned by KKS himself, he does not do any activities besides preparing students for the school events.

4.15. Participant 10: MRA – Music Teacher

MRA has had a 31 year of experience of teaching music. She was appointed by the MoEC because "...some years earlier, Primary education needed teachers for specialised subjects, such as music, physical education, etc, [because] most teachers [that is, general educators] didn't want to teach them." MRA studied piano at the National Conservatory of Cyprus and advanced theory, harmony and counterpoint at the National Conservatory of Athens. In addition, she "...studied education at the Kapodestrian University and, after being commissioned [in Cypriot Primary education], we did the so-called 'brushing-up training' at the Ionian University." As she admitted, however, her studies did not meet her expectations: "To be honest, they were not helpful for my subject. They were about general education
which, in terms of communication with children and behaviour etc. yes OK. But in terms of my subject, nothing special."

4.15.1. Practices, activities and beliefs

Prompted to share her belief about nurturing creativity in Primary education, MRA emphasised the importance of the environment, the available tools and imagination:

I can't think if it could be taught... It depends on creativity I think; first of all, it requires the environment in which you are to support creativity, to have the equipment to create, to be imaginative. It's as if during the lesson the children didn't have musical instruments; how could they create?

This belief, however, contradicts the activities she applies in her teaching and which she considers creative: "...singing; learning a song, the simplest, kids clapping along with the rhythm, isn't this creativity?" Apparently, singing does not require any equipment. Distilling the essence of the participant's contradiction, it may be suggested that, for MRA, creativity may not be taught but, indeed, it may be nurtured through any possible music activity.

On another note, MRA believes that being creative in one’s teaching subject is not necessarily a prerequisite for nurturing students' creativity:

...if I have some thoughts, ideas about creativity, I don't think that without applying them I will not be able to communicate them to the students. It's a matter of experimentation, imagination, I mean... you just need to possess these without necessarily applying them yourself.
Invited to be more precise, MRA pointed to imagination and willingness to experiment.

In addition to singing and rhythmic clapping, MRA mentioned instrumental accompaniment as a creative activity: "[a]ccompanying the song either with percussion or melodic instruments? Or playing an ostinato that sounds good with the song? [...] But, in terms of rhythm, they can find by themselves which rhythm or rhythmic ostinato may sound good." MRA described another creative activity she recently did:

…within the topic about learning the musical instruments of the classical orchestra, which we have already been taught, later on as an extension, I thought they could do something that is more creative, even though the lesson, in which we talked about those instruments, had something creative to do, [that is] make musical instruments by themselves [...] I thought that the next we could do was ‘Carnival of the Animals’ in which we did further exploration of the orchestral musical instruments, [...] the story was more appropriate in that they could express themselves and create more easily.

Urged to provide the reason that she considered that to be creative, MRA mentioned inter-disciplinarity: "It was inter-disciplinary, yes, it was creative because we combined it, let's say, with painting, making their own masks, so that they could impersonate roles based on each music piece of the Carnival."

To conclude, creativity, for MRA, may be nurtured, regardless of whether or not the teacher is creative with respect to the subject of music, as long as there is an appropriate environment, where students may apply their imagination through experimentation, singing, instrumental accompaniment, the making of musical instruments and combining music with other subjects, such as art and acting: all are means of ultimately expressing themselves.
4.15.2. The domain issue

MRA has noticed that creative students may transfer their creativity: “The more gifted students are creative in everything, that is, their creativity is multifaceted, it's not only in music.” Invited to explain what she means when saying ‘gifted students’ she stated:

I mean cleverer, [...] they have more experience in their lives, more talented, I would say, something like that. If a child, because of his social environment, [...] doesn't have the necessary experience and means that another child may have, you see that he is deficient.

Therefore having experience is crucial for developing creative skills, which may then be transferred to possibly every domain.

4.15.3. Creative students

As already mentioned, a characteristic of creative students is experience. Consequently, older, and thus more experienced students, are generally more creative:

I believe, without having much experience as I told you with younger children, that the older the students, because of their experience and skills, the more creative they definitely are. I mean, because they will have more things to do, because some things cannot be done with young students, it's much easier for older students.

Apparently, the skills and the experience of doing more things and much more easily point to a greater focus on the output, rather than on the process of an activity, which will be discussed further below. Finally, MRA described creative students as gifted and intelligent, with experience in their lives.
4.15.4. Assessment

To the hypothetical scenario of how MRA would assess students failing to achieve a performance that is satisfactory for her, MRA's initial response was negative: "No, it's not productive. […] it will not be productive for him [the student] because he didn't make it, he couldn't perform what was required." However, to my question: "The fact that he got into the process of trying?" MRA reconsidered her answer: "No, I think it is [productive] because, even by just thinking, I believe it makes it creative; it's not simply performing the action." Invited, then, to explain what is more important for her, MRA concluded ‘both’:

The product of course, but the process, too. […] I think the product. […] [Y]ou may say that you feel good about the goals that you set, that is, they're evident, more obvious. Even though the process is equally creative, I still think that when the teacher sees the result is more emotionally satisfying; shall I put it this way? He reached his goal – goal accomplished.

Therefore, while she recognises the process as being as creative to the product, the latter obviously has more value.

Invited to explain what her assessment is based on, MRA stated that:

I would assess based on what I require, […] the ‘supplies’ and the knowledge that I provide for the student, if he makes good use of them, then “Yes”, I would say… but if it's someone who already attends a music conservatory, for example, and he performs something, I will not say it's creative… yes, I would appreciate it: "Good for him, he did this composition", but I would have appreciated it more if he had created based on what I had provided him with.
Therefore the more the students make good use of the knowledge that the teacher has provided, the more creative MRA would consider the output. In addition, the students' background does have an influence on MRA's assessment: "I could say the effort [of a weak student] is more important than that of a [musically] knowledgeable student."

As for the first video, MRA found it to be creative because students do something different from what is usual:

This is a very nice activity with the sticks and having all kids participating [...]. The fact that kids break away [do something different than] the usual playing, let's say, clapping and the fact that they hold a stick, something else to express [perform] the rhythm with, I believe this is creation.

A more complicated rhythmic pattern could have made it even more creative.

Regarding the second video: "It definitely describes something; yes, it's creative. [...] I would like to know the subject they describe so as to be more precise with my assessment." As for the elements which make this activity creative, MRA explained: "...the fact that the kids themselves try to describe a sound, a situation according to how they think of it, by using also various means to express this situation." Therefore more details about the instructions and the goal the students had been set would have been helpful for MRA. Nevertheless, students' independence and effort to produce an output, as they think of it, makes the activity and its output creative.
Finally, the third video is creative, but it omits the students' own voice, something which occurred in the second video:

This is also creative. [...] they play various musical instruments, there is movement, another form of creativity [...] but, I would say the second [video] is more creative for me. [...] I believe creativity is what the kid gets out of him. This one [the third video], yes, they play various instruments, either because they learned them, after guidance or pre-existing knowledge, while the other activity was more like I listen to something, or describe something, according to my thinking; it's myself that comes out, my inner world, my own opinion.

In conclusion, the product of an activity seems to be important for MRA. Furthermore, the more the students make good use of the knowledge that she provides in an activity, the more creative she considers the output. The students' background is also an influence on MRA's assessment of creativity. Furthermore, unusual activities or elements in an activity contribute to the development of students' creativity. However, students' independence and effort to produce an original output through which they externalise their personality, is what influences MRA's assessment and perception of creativity the most.

### 4.15.5. School environment

Regarding the school environment and its policy, MRA defined her role in the school, the great difficulty she has with the school events, the limited time they have, the pressure she feels in order to produce a good result and the support she has from her colleagues.
MRA explained that as music teachers, rather than general educators, they are usually appointed to the higher grades of the Primary education to prepare students for the school events:

...because in the fourth, the fifth and the sixth grades we have to assemble choirs and orchestras, something that the non-specialised teacher, who doesn't have a degree [in music] [...], finds it more difficult to do [...]. So, we the musicians, are assigned for the obligations of the higher Grades.

Therefore music teachers are considered more capable of preparing students for the performances in the events, in which older students participate, something that relates to the emphasis the schools place on the outcome.

Furthermore, MRA acknowledges the MoEC's renewed interest in creativity; however, the time needed for the preparation for school events does not allow much time to be devoted to other activities, other than the rehearsals:

Recently I think they [people in the MoEC] pay more attention to creativity [...]. [T]ime is not enough to do both my lesson, as I want to, and to prepare the choir and the orchestra. Time is too short. At some point, however, by necessity, we neglect the subject, the teaching that takes place with all the children and has to be done. We devote our time to events, particularly if it's a school with demands, as such schools, have high standards; as a matter, of course, you can't appear with a choir and an orchestra like... let's say, I don't like having the children singing without caring about what the result will be and every child that plays an instrument 'just play' resulting in a... how should I characterise it? As a musician I want a [proper] choir and orchestra. Therefore, this presupposes very much time. Teaching time is not enough; I also work
during my break for this purpose. Therefore I would really like the events to be limited and concentrated more on the substance.

Therefore the time issue obliges MRA to sacrifice music teaching time for the sake of rehearsals, because the performance she will present is very important both for her, who wants to have a proper, well-sounding choir and orchestra, and for the school, of which the two ensembles are part of the its image.

Invited to explain what she means when stating "...if it's a school with demands, as such schools have high standards", MRA portrayed the broad image of such schools:

I will talk generally, not just about music, about other subjects too, such as school plays, for example, where kids constantly do rehearsals, again and again; the costumes that they will wear also have to be nice and impressive... and I believe that somehow this ruins our relationship with the kids because, having them always for rehearsal, kids get tired and we also get tired, and at some point you will come into conflict with the kids, you may say something that you don't mean because of the tension and I think this ruins our relationship with the kids. And reasonably, as kids, they get tired, but we have expectations, [...] and [so] there's tension. [...] [A]nd because there is comparison among schools, “The other school did that thing for that event, we should do something better” and so on.

Apparentl, the school quality and image are reflected through the events and, more particularly, through the ‘quality’ that their music and theatrical performances will demonstrate. As a result, there is pressure on students and teachers to come up with a satisfactory output, which is often compared to that of other schools, thus, resulting in weariness and tension among the participants, namely the students and the teachers.

In fact, MRA is very careful always to achieve a worthy result and avoid any criticism or questioning of her abilities:

I try not to end up there, [that is] to have a bad result. [...] I know it's stressful, it's very stressful, but I try in every way that I can, that is, I
may go back and forth from one school to another to have the students rehearse again and again with the students, or to present in such a way so there is a good result. Personally, I've never been in that position to say "Oh, what a bad performance" and anyhow be criticised. But I've heard other colleagues received bad comments, because they themselves didn't achieve their goals.

While MRA stated that: "I would really like the events to be limited and concentrated more on the substance", suggesting that events are not as substantial as other activities are, she explained:

…this [event performance] is also helpful by playing more instruments... they [events] are creative in other areas too; we have to learn to play in an ensemble and not by oneself. This is also a form of creativity: being in time with the others, watching the others and coordinating with the others, participating in a social group, something that will help them later on in greater... participating in a bigger ensemble. But it's that: too much time is wasted, not wasted, devoted and leaving behind other important things.

Finally, while MRA finds support from her colleagues, she admits that music is not generally appreciated as it should be:

Yes, I do have support. Due to the fact that the school has many requirements, music may sometimes be considered a minor rather than a major subject. They will schedule, for example, four teaching periods for plays, or the other colleague may ask for this number of periods for something he considers more important. OK, they will ask me, "What time do you want the rehearsals for?" But I believe that music has a second place, that is, they can't understand how much time and labour are necessary for this thing.

To sum up, music teachers do the ‘donkey work’ by preparing students for the school events with numerous rehearsals, which absorb most of the music teaching time. The reason for this issue is the importance of school events, both for the music teacher, who wants to have a proper, good-sounding choir and orchestra so as to avoid criticism, and for the school, for which the music performance typifies its image and the quality of education. Consequently, students and teachers feel the pressure
to produce a satisfactory output, which is often compared to that of other schools, thus causing weariness and tension among the participants. Finally, MRA expressed her annoyance about how music is considered to be a minor subject.

4.15.6. Definition

As already mentioned, students using their imagination and expressing themselves through activities, such as those stated above, is defined as creativity. This is elaborated here:

It's the student's expression, that is, through creativity you see that unique element that defines a kid; which kid, while creating, he will externalise his inner emotional world. And through creativity, either experimenting with an instrument or creating something else, you can see that he externalises himself.

In addition, MRA shares another point of view of creativity that is related to the school events:

…they [events] are creative in other areas, […] learn[ing] to play in an ensemble and not by oneself. This is also a form of creativity, that is, being in time with the others, watching the others and coordinating with the others, participating in a social group, something that will help them later on in greater… participating in a bigger ensemble.

Therefore creativity, for MRA, takes more than one form: while it is defined as the mere participation in a musical ensemble, it is also perceived as an inner, emotional expression that is best achieved when students have the opportunity to experiment and use their imagination.
4.15.7. Methodological issues

Besides the fact that MRA did not have with her an example of a creative activity with which we could start off our conversation, the interview with her did not give rise to any issues.

4.16. Summary

This chapter was devoted to the analysis of my data, including the stages I followed, that is, data familiarisation, identification of significant statements, formulation of meanings, groupings of themes, exhaustive description, formulation and verification of fundamental structure, my approach to dealing with the participants’ contradictions or inconsistencies and an exhaustive, thick and rich description of the findings (for a summary of the participants’ answers in terms of the major findings see Appendix XII). In the following chapter I present the themes that my analysis yielded, connecting them with the research questions.
Chapter 5

RESULTS

5.1. Member Checking

As Ellenberger (1958) explains,

> Whatever the method used for a phenomenological analysis the aim of the investigator is the reconstruction of the inner world of experience of the subject. Each individual has his own way of experiencing temporality, spatiality, materiality, but each of these coordinates must be understood in relation to the others and to the total inner ‘world’ (p. 116).

Therefore the major findings from the analyses of empirical research data were put together in a holistic text and returned to the participants to verify that the essence of their interviews had been captured correctly (Groenewald, 2004). Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe this process, known as member checking, as "...the most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314), an opinion also shared by Hycner (1985) who suggests that "...the first validity check is the participants themselves" (p. 297). Nevertheless, member (or validity) checking is also a controversial technique (Morse, 1994; Angen, 2000; Sandelowski, 1993). Being aware that it could be a double-edged sword, my decision to proceed was based on the following: firstly, I was never bound to honour the participants' criticism and feedback; I was only bound to hear them and weigh their meaningfulness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 315). Secondly, I have no reasons to doubt my informants' integrity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thirdly, in an attempt to bridge the transactional/transformational gap (Cho & Trent, 2006) in support of a holistic view of validity, and to minimise the problematic features of member checking, I adopted Koelsch's (2013) method: "In addition to suggesting whether or not I 'got it right,'
participants were able to reflect on how participation in the study affected their thoughts" (p. 175). Fourthly, member checking is part of Colaizzi's (1978) method and, finally, I wanted to prove my knowledge and skills as a researcher in conducting research that is consistent with qualitative research ideals. Participants were thus contacted and invited to validate the accuracy of the initial findings and to reflect on their participation, that is, whether their subjectivities changed during the interview process. Furthermore, member checking was conducted with interpreted 'polished' particles from the narratives, rather than the actual verbatim transcripts (Creswell, 2009).

According to Creswell (2012), a phenomenological study “…describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept […] describing what all participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon” (p. 76). Therefore, once the participants’ accurate representation and interpretation of their views were confirmed, each one’s main points were grouped together. They were then compared to each other in order to interpret the findings in a consistent way and help me form meaning from each theme/section of the theoretical framework or any additional ones that emerged. Finally, it should be mentioned that the level of the participants’ consensus was not always the most important criterion for arriving at a conclusion, even though it was always taken into consideration. After all, quantifying the participants’ answers or providing support for an idea is beyond the constructivists’ goal. In fact, describing the variations within the phenomenon guided my approach to synthesising the themes and reporting the results.
5.2. Process Theme

Music teachers adopt a wide range of activities and practices that they consider creative. The most important elements an activity needs to contain in order to be considered creative is to promote students’ self-action, autonomy and initiatives.

While the participants' general belief is that creativity may not be taught, they all agree that it may be nurtured through practices and activities that promote the students' self-action and autonomy and, as music teachers, they feel responsible for this. TBR mentioned the importance of letting students act freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively. ELN, KSN and STL emphasised that activities need to challenge and motivate students, using songs that the students are familiar with, so that activities are fun and offer enjoyment and satisfaction. Apart from students' enjoyment, KSN and KZS added that creative activities need to promote students' critical thinking. STL called for activities that promote divergent thinking and, along with KKS, she mentioned the importance of providing opportunities for the students to make their own decisions, act independently and apply their own ideas, so that they produce an original output. NGL also mentioned the need for activities that promote divergent thinking, in addition to personal development, emotional maturity and self-confidence. KKS stressed the need to introduce students to music styles with which they may not be familiar. Finally, a general consensus among KSN, CPA, KZS, TBR, STL, NGL and MRA was the need for an appropriate, supportive and encouraging environment, both familial and educational, where students may use and develop their imagination and express themselves. To achieve this, SKR, ELN, KSN, CPA, KZS and STL explained that students need to enjoy music activities and therefore have fun.
While KZS and TBR supported the view that introducing students to various activities and opportunities for music exposure enriches their experiences and knowledge of the arts, it was improvisation, composition, orchestration and lyric-writing that dominated the activities that all the participants mentioned as the most appropriate for nurturing students' creativity. In addition, the idea of combining music with other forms of art, such as dancing, mime and acting, thus making the lessons inter-disciplinary, was supported by SKR, ELN, KZS, STL and MRA. Furthermore, MRA, NGL, KZS, TBR and STL referred to experimenting with sounds made with standard musical instruments, as well as non-standard ones, such as sonic objects or self-made instruments. Finally, SKR, KSN, TBR and NGL held the opinion that presenting students' work, without the process becoming compulsive, as revealed below, is important as it cultivates their motivation, helps them to be expressive and open to music and it promotes their critical thinking when used as an assessment activity, either for self-assessment or peer-assessment.

On the other hand, ELN, CPA, KSN, KZS, NGL and KKS believe that activities, in which the students' potential for gaining something different from the original is limited, are considered preparatory, providing the students with knowledge and skills that they may later apply to more creative activities. Singing, or interpretation, is considered creative by SKR, ELN, CPA, KZS and MRA. For STL, though, singing is preferably combined with other subjects, such as dancing and painting, in order to be creative.

In conclusion, all the participants appeared to feel responsible for nurturing students' creativity when teaching music. This may be achieved through activities that promote students' self-action, autonomy, divergent and critical thinking, allowing them to act freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively, with aim to providing an output that demonstrates students originality. It is also important that
activities challenge and motivate students, using songs that students are familiar with, while others might introduce students to musical styles that they may not be acquainted with. In either case, activities need to be fun, offering enjoyment and satisfaction. Particular activities mentioned as ideal for enhancing creativity in the classroom are improvisation, composition, orchestration, lyric-writing, sound experimentation with standard and non-standard musical instruments, in-class or out-of-class performance of students’ work for self-assessment or peer-assessment, as well as a combination of other subjects thus making the activities inter-disciplinary.

5.3. Person Theme – Teachers

The creative teacher has been described as imaginative, open-minded and capable of recognising creativity, without, necessarily, being themselves creative in music. However, musical knowledge and skills are needed. Self-confidence and the love for teaching music are also very important for a music teacher in order to be considered creative.

All the participants highlighted the role of the educators and ELN, KSN, KZS, TBR, NGL and KKS agreed that it is crucial to be creative in their subject or, in the case of CPA, to love music, as loving music is creativity in itself. In addition, CPA mentioned that music teachers need to have musical instrumental skills, wide knowledge of the subject and of music as a form of art, as well as an artistic approach to, and zeal for, the subject. All these elements were found to be important for developing students’ overall creativity. MRA and STL were reluctant or unsure about confirming the educators’ creativity, particularly in music, but they were both in accord about being open to ideas. SKR described the creative educator as an inspiring figure, while ELN mentioned the music teachers’ creative behaviour and
desire to challenge students and update their teaching material and approach. KSN considered that it is essential for teachers to be creative as persons, meaning that: firstly, they recognise its value; secondly, they are in a position to inspire students; and thirdly, they can make creative choices when it comes to orchestrating and/or arranging a song for their students. KZS mentioned that self-esteem and self-confidence, enthusiasm and experience in music-making and passion for music are necessary characteristics for educators aiming to nurture their students' creativity. NGL pointed also to open-minded, inspiring and free-spirit teachers. KKS described the creative teacher as capable of making use of students' mistakes or finding alternative ways to approach music teaching. Finally, MRA believed that music teachers need to communicate their creative ideas with the students but not necessarily be able to apply them themselves; being imaginative and willing to experiment is what matters the most.

Of great importance for the participants is the supportive environment and the music teacher's profile. While for some participants it is crucial to be creative as musicians, being imaginative, open to ideas and recognising the value of creativity without, necessarily, being creative in the subject, is more important for others. Furthermore, creative educators have been described as self-confident and inspiring figures, with passion and enthusiasm for teaching, as well as a desire to challenge students. In addition, music teachers need to be knowledgeable and skilful, capable of making creative choices when it comes to orchestrating and/or arranging a song for their students. Finally, they also need to frequently update/refresh their teaching material and teaching approach.
5.4. Person Theme – Students

While the palette of characteristics that compose the creative students’ portrait is diverse, confidence and curiosity emerge as the most popular. Controversy appears regarding the relationship between intelligence and creativity, as well as the relationship between the students’ age and creative performance.

All participants believe that creativity lies within every student; they also share the same belief that some students are more, while some others are less, creative. The characteristics of those the participants consider creative vary: a common characteristic, which emerged among ELN, KSN and TBR, is confidence, that is, being willing to share an opinion or perform something without being embarrassed. Curiosity, being observant and self-driven with an inherent interest or motivation are also common characteristics that KZS, STL and KKS mentioned. NGL and KKS noted vividness as another characteristic. SKR also talked about organising skills and sensitivity (emotional intelligence), while STL referred to the intuitive sense of rhythm/pulse. Finally, CPA believed that no particular characteristics relate to creative behaviour; good perception, concentration and memory may greatly contribute to the creative behaviour of students and it is hard work that will help a student to become sufficiently knowledgeable and experienced in order to be able to create.

Furthermore, while SKR and MRA believe in intelligence, or intelligence as a characteristic of creative students, the rest (ELN, KSN, KZS, TBR, NGL and STL) do not. It is important, however, to explain that intelligence, for KSN, KZS and STL, is defined according to whether a student is good at subjects, such as Greek language
and mathematics. This perception, they further asserted, is generally held both by colleagues and students’ parents, and will be further discussed below.

The participants' opinions vary even more regarding the students' age in terms of creative performance: for SKR, creativity seems to flourish in young children in Primary education. A similar approach is shared by ELN, NGL and TBR, who consider students of a young age, such as those in the first and second grades, to be more free and spontaneous, characteristics that, according to NGL, students lose as they grow up. On the other hand, for KSN, KKS and MRA, the older the students, the more creative they are: the older they are, the more knowledge they have and thus the more creative they are. Therefore, for them, knowledge is more related to creativity than spontaneity. Finally, for CPA, no particular age makes a difference in the students' creative performance; the same applies to KZS.

In conclusion, the palette of characteristics that compose the portrait of creative students is diverse: confidence, curiosity and self-driven or inherent interest/motivation, spontaneity, vividness, organisational skills, sensitivity and intuitive sense of rhythm. Furthermore, intelligence is not necessary for the creative performance; the opposite view, in contrast, was also supported. Controversy appears also regarding the relationship between the students' age and creative performance, with half of the participants believing that creativity is at its peak in the students in the first grades of the Primary school, three believing the opposite and two rejecting the students' age as a factor in creative performance.

5.5. The Nature of Creativity Theme

There is inconsistency regarding whether students considered creative can ‘transfer’ their creativity to multiple areas.
The participants' opinions about domain generality or specificity with regard to creativity are inconsistent: for SKR, ELN, TBR, NGL, KKS and MRA, creative students ‘spread’ their creativity into almost anything they undertake regarding education. For KZS, musical creativity falls under the big umbrella of human creative thinking; therefore musically creative students will also be creative in other areas as long as they are attracted to and interested in them. However, for KSN, CPA and STL, being creative takes time and hard practice, described as the accumulation of one’s knowledge and critical thinking. It does not matter if one has developed creative skills in one’s own area, practice and hard work are still necessary to perform creatively in any other.

5.6. Assessing Creativity Theme

Music teachers assess creativity based on the nature of the activity (that is, whether it involves original or non-original performance in which students may take initiatives, act independently, collaboratively and imaginatively), the location in which it takes place, the teacher's instructions, the implementation of other forms of art, the aesthetic pleasure, students' genuine involvement and enjoyment, as well as students' age and musical background.

All participants value the process used by students in a creative activity; and while some hold that both process and product/output are important and should be taken into consideration when assessing students' creativity, the school environment (discussed below) obliges music teachers to be oriented towards the output. SKR and TBR initially supported the view that the final product is a reflection of the process that students have followed and, thus, the more creative the process, the more creative the output. However, after discussing the video vignettes, it emerged...
that the final product is what teachers take into consideration when assessing students' creativity and their efficiency in general. In fact, while they value both the process and the product when teaching, their focus shifts when it comes to preparing for school events and for activities that do not allow students' self-action and the elements mentioned above that comprise creativity for them. For ELN, KSN, KZS and STL, the focus in assessing students' creativity seems to be variable: sometimes their focus is on the process while, at other times, on the product. For ELN in particular, 'formal' or 'ceremonial' on-stage performance seems to act as a catalyst to focus on the creativity of the final product, rather than the process, of a music activity when it comes to assessment. Regarding KKS and MRA, while they seem to value the process, their focus is mostly on the product.

Therefore the participants' approach to assessing creativity seems to change depending on whether the activity involves original or non-original performance or exercise. When students perform non-original music, then the aesthetic pleasure of the output, students' enjoyment of the activity and the implementation of other subjects influence teachers' judgments regarding the level of creativity. When it comes to activities that include experimentation, improvisation, composition and, generally, students' original contributions, then the students' initiative, independence, self-action, originality, age and background influence participants' judgments.

ELN, KSN, CPA, TBR and MRA base their judgments on the extent to which students have followed and the way they have applied the teacher's instructions; in other words, the more the students do good work, that is, they produce work that satisfies the teachers, making use of the knowledge and the instructions the teacher provided for an activity, the more creative the students and the output are considered to be. In fact, the students' initiative emerged as one of the most decisive influences for all the participants in their judgment: students taking the initiatives to go beyond
the teacher's instructions, acting independently and approaching the activity
alternatively and imaginatively including, for example, using body movements and
other related elements or forms of art (such as dancing), but still remaining within the
assigned topic, are considered more creative. It is also important to mention that the
aesthetic pleasure of the output emerged as another influence for SKR, KSN, CPA,
KZS, TBR and STL.

Following initiative and aesthetic pleasure, the students' effort to do
something new by themselves, points to originality as an important influence for ELN,
KSN, KZS, TBR, STL, NGL, KKS and MRA. Therefore students' initiative to do
something original, out-of-context/instruction-bound activity, plays a crucial role in
assessing creativity.

Apparently, teachers' expectations and personal taste define students'
initiative and originality levels, as well as the aesthetic pleasure. For SKR, ELN, CPA
and STL, student's age, background and musical knowledge influence their
expectations. As for the aesthetic pleasure of the output, this is something informed
by the participants' personal taste which, in turn, links back to their musical
background and experience.

In addition, students' enjoyment of an activity is another influence for SKR,
KSN, CPA, KZS, TBR and STL when assessing the level of creativity. Furthermore,
students' engagement and genuine involvement in an activity are also signs of
creativity, as KSN, KZS and NGL mentioned, and are taken into consideration when
assessing creativity.
5.7. Place/Environment Theme

The subject of music suffers in the Cypriot Primary education as a result of being undervalued and its exploitation as a reflection of the quality of the school services and the negative consequences this brings: lack of time, pressure on music teachers and students and focus on the output of music activities.

All participants described a school environment that is not ideal for nurturing creativity in music education. The undervaluing of the subject, but more importantly, the excessive amount of time devoted to the preparation for school events are the two greatest issues according to all the participants.

In particular, SKR, ELN, KSN, NGL, KKS and MRA explained that while music and the other art-related subjects are considered more suitable for nurturing students’ creativity, music is still not considered as an important subject as, for example, mathematics and Modern Greek are. This undervaluing is evident both in the students’ parents’ attitudes, as well as those of the school management or, sometimes, even those of colleagues.

According to CPA, KZS, STL, TBR and MRA, the proliferation of numerous school events, because of wrongly prioritised academic goals and sometimes because of the head teachers’ personal agendas, such as career development prospects, hold back the general development of students’ creative skills. The preparation of the choir and/or orchestra for the school national and religious celebrations and other kinds of event was extensively and repeatedly mentioned by all participants. The issues that arise are: (1) the minimum remaining time for non-school-event-related activities; (2) the pressure exerted on students and teachers; and (3) the focus on the product, ignoring the process of music activities. Firstly, the
numerous school events reduce dramatically the teaching time available for almost all other activities but singing. While ELN, STL and CPA supported the view that making the music teaching creative is up to the teacher, the number of, and the importance placed on, the events tied the music teachers' hands in terms of the range of activities they can adopt. As a result, they are restricted to preparing students for the choir and/or orchestral performances. The emphasis devoted to choral singing and orchestral performance has to do with the importance of the school events, which, as it emerged, are thought to reflect the educational quality of the school. This brings us to the second problem, which is the transformation of the subject of music as the medium through which schools are represented to the outside community: that is, the better the choir and the orchestral performance of the students, the better the quality of education, as well as the management and the music teacher's work. Moreover, ELN, KSN, CPA, STL, KKS and MRA explained that because of the misconceived importance of the choir and orchestral performance, the music teachers' image and appreciation depend on their ability to deliver appropriate choir and/or orchestral performances. Consequently, music teachers are under the pressure to produce a satisfying output, which is often compared to the performances of other schools, resulting in weariness and tension in themselves and in the students. It is remarkable to note that the level of satisfaction of the output is judged by the head teacher, the colleagues and the event attendees, in other words, those the music teachers have to please. Of great importance is KKS's statement about the pressure he feels because of the presence of an audience at numerous school events, something that makes him, and all the other participants, focus on the output of their teaching.
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5.8. The Creativity Definition Theme

Creativity for Primary music teachers may be defined as the combination of students’ self-action, autonomy, initiative and unconstrained thinking in activities they enjoy, in which they also take initiatives to go beyond the teacher’s instructions, to act independently and collaboratively, to approach activities alternatively and imaginatively and to try to produce an original output that expresses their inner and emotional world, while staying within the teachers’ assigned topic.

The definition theme is presented last because it takes into consideration all the above findings in order to draw conclusions about how creativity is defined. As already mentioned, activities that provide students with the opportunity for self-action, autonomy, initiative and enjoyment are considered nurturers of creativity. Moreover, students taking initiatives to go beyond the teacher's instructions, to act independently, to approach the activity imaginatively and in alternative ways and to try to produce an original output, staying, however, within the assigned topic, are considered more creative.

Furthermore, for SKR, KSN, KZS, TBR, STL and MRA, the definition of creativity revolves around the application of students' knowledge, including alternative approaches, own original ideas, unconstrained thinking and imagination, in an activity. From a similar point of view, NGL's definition proposes students' unguided initiative for self-expression. MRA believes also in students' inner/emotional expression emerging when they have the opportunity to experiment and apply their imagination. For ELN creativity is anything that students do, which breaks rules and brings forth new knowledge, a definition that relates to CPA's consideration that merely any engagement with music is creative: for her, even the slightest intervention
when making or reproducing music means creativity, as long as the intervention is purposeful and not a mistake. As for KKS, having in mind that school event performances are his primary teaching goal, then being able to reach a musically satisfying result, in terms of rhythm and intonation, is in fact creative, something that makes him focus on the result, rather than the process.

5.9. Connection to Research Questions

Creativity is supposed to be among the prime goals of Primary education (see above), with teachers being responsible for its nurturing (Al-Dababneh, Al-Zboon, & Ahmad, 2017). While all subjects are considered potential nurturers of creativity (e.g., Craft, 2003), art-related subjects, including music, are viewed as likely to provide greater opportunities for its development (Robson, 2014, p. 122; Aljughaiman & Mowrer-Reynolds, 2005, p. 31). Thus music teachers form a key group, whose understanding of creativity throughout their experience constitutes the phenomenon under investigation that is at the core of this study. My goal is to make meaning of this qualitatively unexplored area in the literature, which signals also my contribution to the field of knowledge. The research questions with which I set out guided the course of this study, without, however, confining it, in order to explore the meaning of creativity through the lived experiences of music teachers. The following paragraphs connect my findings to the two main research questions.

5.9.1. Research question 1

1. How do music teachers perceive creativity in music education?
   1.1. How do they define creativity?
   1.2. How do they define the creative student?
1.3. How do they define the creative teacher?

1.4. Does the school environment influence students' and teachers' creativity in music education?

Participants described creativity as a multifaceted process, that is, the combination of students' initiative, autonomy, unconstrained thinking, original ideas, alternative approach, as well as inner/emotional and self-expression in the activities they enjoy performing. In particular, participants defined music creativity in education as the students' initiative or self-action to go beyond the teacher's instructions, to function independently and collaboratively, to approach an activity in alternative ways and imaginatively, also applying original ideas and to trying to produce an output that expresses their inner and emotional world, while still staying within the teachers' assigned topic and enjoying the whole process.

Figure 1: ‘Ingredients’ of the definition of creativity
Another inference is that participants' perceptions of creativity only took shape after having gained teaching experience. Therefore the perception of creativity seems to be an evolving concept, with music and teaching experience and knowledge, as well as situation, being decisive influences in its evolution. In other words, there is an assumption that the context or situation within which we function, our music and teaching experience and knowledge all influence the 'ingredients' that comprise the music teachers' perception of creativity. Apparently, these 'ingredients' also influence the music teachers' assessment of creativity, as discussed below.

It is also remarkable to note the variation in the participants regarding the domain issue of creativity (e.g., Plucker, 1998; Baer, 2016): on the one hand, there is the belief of SKR, ELN, TBR, NGL, KKS and MRA that creative students 'spread' their creativity into almost whatever they undertake in education. Musical creativity has a place under the big umbrella of human creative thinking and productivity/doing; therefore, musically creative students will also be creative in other areas as long as they are attracted to, and interested in, such areas. On the other hand, for participants, such as KSN, CPA and STL, who believe that the creative performance comes after hard work and presented a hard-working image of themselves, being creative takes time and hard practice and is related to a combination of one’s knowledge and critical thinking. In other words, it does not matter if someone has developed creative skills in one area, practice and hard work are necessary in order to be able to perform creatively in any other.

Regarding the music teachers' understanding of creative educators, these have been described as imaginative, open-minded and capable of recognising creativity, without, necessarily, being themselves creative in music. However, musical knowledge and skills are needed. Self-confidence and the love of teaching music are also very important for a music teacher to be considered creative.
As for describing the creative students, while the palette of characteristics comprising their portrait is diverse, confidence and curiosity emerged as the most popular. Controversy exists, however, regarding the relationship between intelligence and creativity, as well as the relationship between students’ age and creative performance.

Finally, a strong theme that emerged among all participants was that the subject of music suffers in the Cypriot Primary education as a result of being undervalued and its exploitation as a reflection of the quality of school services and the negative consequences this engenders, namely, lack of time, pressure on teachers and students and a focus on the output of musical activities.

5.9.2. Research question 2

2. How do music teachers adopt creativity in their teaching?
   2.1. What activities do they consider creative?
   2.2. How do they apply these?
   2.3. How do they assess students’ creativity?

While it was repeatedly stated that all school subjects may provide opportunities for developing creativity, all participants feel responsible for nurturing students’ creativity, particularly, when teaching music. One of the reasons is that they are more flexible when it comes to teaching the syllabus because of the undervaluing of music as a subject, which is not seen as an important subject for students’ overall education, in contrast to others, which have a full and demanding syllabus. It seems, then, that this undervaluing gives teachers the freedom to allow students to think in alternative ways, using, for example, their bodies as percussion instruments, and this may result in activities that promote creativity.
Furthermore, even though the participants' general belief is that creativity cannot be taught, they all agree that it may be nurtured. This nurturing may be achieved by adopting activities that promote students' self-action, autonomy, divergent and critical thinking, allowing them to act freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively, in an effort to produce an original output. It is also important that activities challenge and motivate students, using songs that students are familiar with, but also introducing students to musical styles that they may not be acquainted with. In either case, activities need to be fun, offering enjoyment and satisfaction. Particular activities mentioned as ideal for enhancing creativity in the classroom are improvisation, composition, orchestration, lyric-writing, sound experimentation with standard and non-standard musical instruments, in-class or out-of-class performance of students' work for self-assessment or peer-assessment, as well as combining with other subjects, thereby making the activities interdisciplinary.

Finally, the assessment of students' creative output is determined by the following influences: (1) the nature of the activity, that is, whether it involves original or non-original performance, in which students may take initiatives and act independently, collaboratively and imaginatively; (2) where the activity takes place; (3) the teacher's instructions; (4) the implementation of other forms of art; (5) the aesthetic pleasure; (6) students' genuine involvement/engagement and enjoyment; and (7) the students' age and musical background. In addition, the ‘ingredients’ or ‘elements’ involved in the music teachers' perception of creativity also influence their approach to assessing the creativity of the process that students follow. It has, thus, emerged that the more the students include these ingredients during the creative process, the more creative their process is considered to be.
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Figure 2: Influences on the assessment of students' creative output

- Students' age & background
- Students' genuine involvement/engagement & enjoyment
- Activity's nature
- Location it takes place
- Implementing other forms of art
- Teacher's instructions
- Aesthetic pleasure
5.10. Summary

In this chapter I have presented the themes derived from analysing the participants’ interviews and I have answered the two main research questions. In the following chapter I take a closer look at my findings and provide a discussion of their meaning and importance, as well as how they fit in with other work that has been done in this field.
Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

6.1. The Meanings and Importance of the Findings and how They Connect with the Literature

In this study I explored the experiences of 10 music teachers teaching in Cypriot Primary education through in-depth interviews and with the help of a video elicitation technique in order to understand how they perceive and approach creativity. It is one of very few studies, if not the first, to be conducted, particularly in the Cypriot context, using a qualitative methodology on such a niche sample. My intention was to explore the participants’ understanding of creativity from the perspective of the ‘new’ concept (see paragraph 2.2.5.), across music genres and in activities other than composition and improvisation. This offers relevant insight for researchers in music education, general and music creativity, comparative educationalists (as Cyprus is a former British colony), policy-makers, curriculum designers and university and training programme facilitators. Following roughly the order in which I reported my findings in the results chapter, that is, with no significance attached to the order, below I explain the meaning and the importance of my findings and the reasons I believe these occur, putting them also in context with what other studies have reported.

6.1.1. Creative activities and practices

This study revealed the range of activities and practices that participants consider creative. Improvisation/experimentation, composition, orchestration and lyric-writing dominate the activities, while respective practices include challenging and motivating
students, strengthening critical and divergent thinking, using songs that students are familiar with, to provide them with enjoyment and satisfaction, as well as songs with which they are not familiar, in order to enrich their music and artistic horizons. These findings are broadly in line with studies mentioned in the literature review focusing on the importance of improvisation and composition for nurturing creativity in education (e.g., Addison, 1988; Collins, 2005; Dunbar-Hall, 1999; Fratia, 2002; Hickey, 1997; Koutsoupidou, 2005; Nolan, 1995; Reynolds, 2002; Rooke, 1990; Rohwer, 1997; Sætre, 2011; Wiggins, 1999; Wilson, 2001), as well as the inclusion of music that students listen to at home as a motivating force (e.g., Abrahams & Head, 2005).

However, there was also an unexpected consideration of lyric-writing as a creative activity. Even though research focusing on this activity is evident (e.g., King, 2018; McQueen, Hallam & Creech, 2018; Söderman & Folkestad, 2004), it is by no means close to the research on the duet of composition and improvisation. What makes it interesting here is that lyric-(re)writing was mentioned repeatedly and extensively in the findings, something that highlights its importance for this particular group of participants. My explanation for this somewhat unexpected finding is that the participants have a wider general educational background than that of music. Therefore, without diminishing the value and difficulty of such an activity, they find lyric-(re)writing closer to them and, thus, easier to apply. However, the fact that improvisation and composition are considered creative does not in itself suggest that they are consistently applied in the classroom; in fact, the lack of time due to the demands of the educational system that the participants highlighted, which I will discuss further below, is seen as the greatest barrier to adopting such activities. This confirms the tension between creativity and education (Maley & Kiss, 2018) and the need for a mentality change on the part of the agents that constitute the educational system (Cachia et al.; 2010).
6.1.2. Interdisciplinarity

Furthermore, the participants’ emphasis on integrating other art-related disciplines, such as dancing, painting, miming and acting, into their music lessons, thus making their lessons interdisciplinary and more creative, was another finding consistent with the studies of Cuervo (2018) and Henriksen (2016). It is also resonant with Eisner (2002b), who supports the motivational role of the arts. As mentioned above, the participants’ strong general, other than musical, education background, apart from the group of music teachers only, justifies their efforts to cultivate students’ creativity through activities which are alternative or complementary to composition and improvisation. This by no means devalues their work; on the contrary, it shows an approach towards a holistic nurturing of creativity in education and highlights the participants’ creative habits of mind and thinking skills. In addition, it confirms Wang and Kokotsaki’s (2018) argument for adopting art forms and playful activities, such as the use of dramatic activities and storytelling, to facilitate creative teaching, finding new ways, forms, content and methods of familiarising students with music (Sydykova et al., 2018).

6.1.3. Self- and peer-assessment

The findings indicate also the value that the participants place on assessment. As it emerged, presenting students’ work to their classmates or even to the school community, without the process being compulsory, cultivates students’ motivation, self-esteem and feeling of contributing to/paying back the community, it helps them to be expressive and open to music and it promotes their critical thinking. In particular, the participants highlighted the significance of giving pupils the opportunity to assess their peers’ performance (formative assessment) by providing targeted and
constructive feedback, in order to help them understand what they had to do next time in order to achieve a better outcome (Fautley, 2010). The participants referred also to students' self-assessment, comparing their latest performance to a previous one (ipsative assessment) in order to let pupils themselves locate their progress (Fautely, 2010).

This is an interesting finding for, as mentioned already, creativity in music education is most often associated with improvisation and composition. Taking advantage of such creative learning opportunities, music teachers develop students' ‘creative learning conversations’ (Chappell & Craft, 2011), self-esteem (Hallam, Creech, & McQueen, 2009), critical thinking, musical tastes and self-criticism, which, as other researchers have mentioned (e.g., Blamires & Peterson, 2014; Hallam, 2006), is a strategy of assessment for learning.

6.1.4. Applying technology

Another important point is the absence of reference to the use of technology by most of the participants. It merits recognition that in all the schools where I visited participants for the interviews (as well as from my personal experience as a music teacher in Cyprus) are equipped with computers and speakers. However, besides using YouTube and recording for self-assessment, only KZS mentioned the application of technology for editing and processing students' recordings and thus developing their creativity. This may be explained by the music teachers’ lack of technical proficiency, when it comes to using the technology tools and content imaginatively (Cachia et al., 2010). However, I have to acknowledge that the fact they did not mention technology does not necessarily mean that they do not use it; nevertheless, it does give rise to suspicion. Suggestion for future research, then, would include examination of the embedding of the technology in music education to enhance creativity.
6.1.5. What makes a creative activity creative

This study also brings to the surface the elements that an activity needs to have in order to be considered creative. This gave me the opportunity to explore how the participants define and assess creativity, as well as how the school environment influences their teaching of it, as will be discussed below. In particular, these elements include the promotion of students’ self-action, autonomy and initiatives, enabling them to produce output that, for the students, is original. This means that activities, in which students’ potential for gaining something different from the expected prototype is limited, are considered preparatory, that is, less or non-creative, although their usefulness should not be underestimated. Such activities have been described as knowledge- and skill-builders which the students may later apply to the so-called (more) creative activities. This also explains why the participants believe that creativity cannot be taught, but only nurtured: self-action and autonomy are not teachable, but can be cultivated. This finding is compatible with that of Myhill and Wilson (2013), whose participants believe that creative techniques may be taught, but creativity cannot, or with that of Zbainos and Anastasopoulou (2012), whose participants consider creativity as partially teachable.

6.1.6. Responsibility for creativity

Since the subject of music provides space for self-action and autonomy possibly more than any other subject does, as participants themselves mentioned, this explains why they all consider themselves responsible for developing students’ creativity when teaching music. This finding runs counter to Aljughaiman and Mowrer-Reynolds’ (2005) report that “…teachers are not responsible for helping students develop their creativity” (p. 28). This is explained by Aljughaiman and
Mower-Reynolds's (2005) participants (regular classroom teachers) association of creativity with 'art products.' In the case of this study, findings show that all the participants felt responsible for students’ creativity, whether they exclusively teach music or not, but, as they highlight, although creativity cannot be attached solely to music, the subject of music is most suitable for this purpose. In effect, this confirms Catchia et al.’s (2010) survey finding that creativity could be applied to every domain and school subject (p. 30). Nevertheless, even though music is considered suitable for creativity, it is important to examine why this kind of nurturing does not really take place in the Cypriot educational system (more about this in subheading 6.1.15).

6.1.7. Creative teacher’s characteristics

This study has also brought to light the participants’ perception of the creative teacher: imaginative, open-minded, musically knowledgeable and skilful, self-confident, hard-working and passionate about teaching, creative as a teacher, as well as capable of recognising creativity, without necessarily being musically creative him/herself. These characteristics are broadly in harmony with those of Bramwell, Reilly, Lilly, Kronish, and Chennabathni (2011), Brinkman (2010), as well as Parsons et al. (2018), who emphasise adaptive teaching, characterised by the teachers’ knowledge, experience, thinking and beliefs. Furthermore, the fact that being creative as a musician is not a prerequisite for nurturing students’ creativity, yet being creative as a teacher is, suggests that arousing inspiration and passion for music in students is enough to light the spark of their creative fire. In other words, a creative teacher delivers creative teaching, which equals teaching to develop students’ creativity. This finding recalls Sawyer’s (2004) suggestion with regard to conceiving teaching as disciplined improvisation, which requires teachers to be knowledgeable and expert professionals, with the creative autonomy to improvise in their classrooms (p. 18). It
relates also to Abramo and Reynolds’s (2015) ‘pedagogical creativity’ framework, which differentiates creative musicianship from creative pedagogy: “Becoming a creative musician or composer is not the same as, or a guarantee of, becoming a creative educator” and vice versa (p. 38). This, however, makes the suggestion about the development of ‘creative partnerships’ (CCE, 2018) necessary: from my personal experience as a music teacher and composer, I understand the benefits of this combination, and I can see that occasional collaborative teaching with artists would be beneficial for both teachers and students, something that Hall and Thomson (2017) advocate. In fact, inviting artists into their classrooms is mentioned by STL, KZS and NGL, while the other participants, including STL, KZS and NGL, suggest collaboration with other colleagues. This suggestion is also made by Seashore et al. (2010) who claim that planned collaborations “allow staff members to make the most of their motivations and capacities” (p. 68).

6.1.8. Self-confidence

The need for self-confidence, that has been noted as necessary for creative teachers, is also important. In fact, participants confessed that becoming confident in music teaching has taken them many years of practical experience. Before comparing this finding with those of other studies, it needs to be mentioned that this justifies my decision to define the experienced teacher, and hence appropriate participants for this study, as one with at least seven years’ experience. Going back to self-confidence, prior research has revealed that lack of confidence is a common phenomenon in Primary school teachers (Jeanneret, 1997; Kane, 2002; Mills, 1989; Seddon & Biasutti, 2008; Hennessy, 2000), particularly when it comes to creativity (Alter, Hays, & O’Hara, 2009). Interestingly, the lack of confidence was not mentioned by the participants in the group of music teachers with no responsibility for
general education. In other words, general teachers specialising in music and those non-specialists reported lack of confidence when they had to teach music as newcomers, in contrast to the music teachers. Apparently, the factors influencing the teachers’ confidence vary; according to Hennessy, Rolfe, and Chedzoy (2001) these factors are prior experience and beliefs, having taken a university course, teaching ideas, opportunities to teach and, most importantly, support and observation in school. Music specialist and non-music specialist teacher participants have all of these factors: (1) they have prior experience in musical instrumental performance, as well as music theory, some participants, such as SKR, KZS, CPA and KSN, more than others; (2) had taken university music courses, even though they expressed their disappointment in them; (3) they have numerous teaching ideas; (4) they receive support and observation; (5) they had opportunities to teach as part of their university studies. In contrast, music teachers, whose academic background is more music theory and/or instrumental-oriented, had less general educational knowledge and less experience of Hennessy, Rolfe, and Chedzoy’s (2001) factors, at least on an official/university academic level. The only factor in which they probably excel, based on their MDRPCP and the information drawn from the interviews, is their prior musical and instrumental experience and beliefs, which seem to explain why this unexpected finding emerged. One more explanation may be that, in contrast to the other groups which had to do their field placement as part of their general educational studies, music teachers, who lack this experience, as well as general education knowledge, do not realise and/or appreciate the significance of their pedagogical role and the teaching challenges that may arise in a classroom. However, whether music teachers, with no general educational background, feel greater confidence as newly appointed educators than general education teachers do and why may form research questions for future studies.
6.1.9. Creative students

The findings point to creativity as a capacity that all students possess, a conclusion drawn also by other researchers (e.g., Odena & Welch; 2009; Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Singer, 2004). Furthermore, confidence, curiosity and experience are mentioned as the most important and frequently noticed characteristics of creative students. These characteristics are in accord with those presented in other studies (e.g., Chan & Chan, 1999; Oleynick et al., 2017; McCrae & Costa, 1985; Mullet, Willerson, Lamb & Kettler; 2016). Interestingly, even though a link between creativity and misbehaviour was made in the interviews, students demonstrating such behaviours were not found to be less welcome in class, something that contrasts with Kettler, Lamb, Willerson, and Mullet’s (2018) work. Without suggesting that participants welcome such behaviours from students they consider creative, nonetheless, as SKR explained, the subject of music helps teachers find more ways of controlling students, more activities to engage them with, as opposed to the situation with other subjects. It is also interesting to add that some participants were surprised by the question of characteristics; for example, CPA confessed,

I’ve never thought about it, so I don’t know. Because I don’t see students this way. I don’t like… because then you create particular expectations from particular persons and I don’t want to do this. [...] in my opinion personality is very fluid, that is, someone that you see in a particular environment may be restrained, but in another environment may be an extrovert.

This observation, in fact, agrees with the conclusion of Bruner (1973) about ‘connectedness’ and Henry’s (2006) explanation that our behaviour is adjustable, with creative persons operating along a wide spectrum of personality dimensions depending on the situation. In addition, KSN insisted,

I feel that my role as an educator is not to categorise students; of course, there are students who are smarter than others, but I don’t want to say
that this student is smarter and more creative for they may be the opposite.

This brings us to the next topic, that of intelligence and creativity.

6.1.10. Intelligence, age and creativity

Controversy among the participants' opinions emerged regarding the relationship between (1) intelligence and creativity, (2) students’ age and creative performance and (3) the ability of students who are considered creative to ‘transfer’ their ‘power’ to multiple areas. As already mentioned in the literature review, the influence of intelligence on creativity and the nature of the creativity domain are two issues that have been extensively discussed. Beginning with intelligence, the participants’ opinions abound, no matter which group they come from. In particular, the opinions expressed are that (1) creativity is related to intelligence; (2) creativity is not always and necessarily related to intelligence; (3) creativity is not related to intelligence; and (4) creativity is just one form of intelligence, an opinion that espouses Gardner’s (1993b/1993c) theory of multiple intelligences. The relationship between the two is not clearly understood or, at least, generally accepted among participants, a finding that agrees with that of Neubauer and Martskvishvili (2018) about disagreement. The explanation I can provide for this dissimilarity of opinions is obvious: the different participants’ definitions of intelligence and creativity generate different beliefs regarding their relationship. In fact, participants themselves called for the need to define intelligence in order to answer this question. From their responses, it is apparent that intelligence in Cypriot education is closely associated with being successful at mathematics and Modern Greek. Head teachers and, most importantly, students’ parents perceive intelligence in terms of academically successful performance, particularly in mathematics and Modern Greek, that is, the ‘traditional
intelligences’ (Gouws, 2007, p. 61). In fact, subjects based on these two intelligences have dominated traditional schooling (e.g., Lynch, 1992; Hanafin, Shevlin, & Flynn, 2002; Alter, Hays, & O’Hara, 2009). This finding has several influences on the subject of music and will be discussed next.

Regarding students’ age and creative performance, participants are divided: half of them consider younger students, whose spontaneity, imagination and vividness are unconstrained, to be more creative, as opposed to older students, who lose their spontaneity as they grow up, because of ‘social restrictions’ and conventionality in their beliefs. This opinion is also shared by Runco (1991), who notes a decline in children’s creativity as they grow up and acquire evaluative skills. On the other hand, there are those who believe that the older the students, the more musically experienced and knowledgeable they become and thus more creative. Support for this opinion has been expressed by Smolucha and Smolucha (1985), who suggest that creativity peaks as we grow up. Davis (1993) reports a U-shaped development of creative performance: children’s creative ability declines with the onset of school and even disappears by middle childhood, only to mature in an artistic minority (p. 1). Interestingly, one participant shared a neutral opinion about the relationship between age and creativity, admitting, though, the existence of the rumour about Primary education killing students’ imagination and thus their creativity. Again, as was the case with intelligence, no relationship between the participants’ groups and their opinions was observed. Attempting to explain the heterogeneity of this finding, I can think of two possible explanations: (1) those participants focusing on the output of the activity consider older students to be more creative because of the students’ knowledge and experience in music; (2) the experience of the participants regarding a particular group of grades (for example, MRA was rarely appointed to teach in the first grades) may dictate their opinions. This, however, merits further research and is a another possibility for future studies.
6.1.11. The domain issue

Regarding the creativity domain-general or domain-specific attribute, my findings contribute to the ambivalence of the scientific research mentioned above. Regarding age and intelligence, the participants’ opinions vary: on the one hand, the majority believe, and have witnessed, that creative students ‘spread’ their creativity into whatever they undertake in education, with KZS supporting this view, but clarifying that this will happen as long as they are attracted to, and interested in, the new area. This finding supports the view that such researchers as Plucker (1998), who approach creativity from a psychometric perspective and uphold the domain-general nature of creativity. In contrast, there is the opinion that being creative takes time and hard practice. According to this view, it does not matter if a person has developed creative skills in an area; practice and hard work are necessary in order to be able to perform creatively in any other sphere of activity that may take years of effort. This perspective has been advocated by such researchers as Baer (2012). Interestingly, participants supporting domain-specificity are KSN, CPA and STL, who repeatedly mentioned that they generally believe in commitment and hard work. This is in line with domain-specificity supporters, and this is what makes me believe that this is the reason they share this position. Furthermore, it may be suggested that those espousing domain-generality will focus on the creative process or potential of their students, while those supporting specificity focus on the product. This, however, does not explain the opposition here, because, as we will see, all participants are product-oriented in practice, because of the needs of the school, something that is discussed below.
6.1.12. Assessing creativity

This study also sheds light on the music teachers’ approach to assessing creativity. In particular, the participants’ judgments are based on (1) the nature of the activity, namely, on whether an output is a result of an activity that gives the opportunity for original performance, the extent to which it allows originality, as well as the way it allows students to take initiatives, to act independently, collaboratively and imaginatively. (2) The location in which an activity takes place: music teachers are influenced as to whether an activity is for in-class experimentation, in which creativity is welcome and expected to result, or an on-stage school event/celebration performance, in which the purpose is to impress some particular groups for non-educational reasons. (3) The teacher’s instructions; as is the case with the nature of an activity, following or even going beyond the teacher’s instructions, though remaining within the given topic (that is, not doing something that is totally unrelated to the goals of the activity) influences music teachers as it leaves room for students to develop their imagination, sensitivity/aesthetic approach and autonomy. (4) The implementation of other forms of art: this goes along with students’ alternative and imaginative approach, as well as with the participants’ belief that combining musical activities with arts, such as dancing, acting etc. increases the quality of creativity. (5) The aesthetic pleasure of the output: in the arts, aestheticism has a prominent role, thus the participants particularly appreciate it if students produce, or are in the process of producing, something they consider aesthetically pleasing. The association between creativity assessment and aesthetic pleasure may even involve an assessment of whether the output follows or breaks the conventions of a genre. However, aesthetic pleasure is probably one of the most subjective aspects of the assessment process. (6) Students’ genuine involvement and enjoyment, which relate to the ‘flow’ of creativity: the more the students enjoy doing something, the more
willing they are to try harder, to devote more time, to experiment and, thus, the more satisfied the teachers themselves feel. (7) The students’ age and musical background: it obviously matters if an output results from an experienced individual in the field, rather than someone who is new to it. In fact, experience is one of the characteristics mentioned as very important for the creative performance.

6.1.13. Contribution to the field

Analysis of the participants’ judgments signals another important finding of this study because, as mentioned in the literature review, studies on assessment of creativity have so far focused on designing tests that measure cognitive processes, for example, divergent thinking, non-cognitive aspects, motivation and personal characteristics, and independence (e.g., Torrance, 1968; for review, see Cropley, 2000; Kaltsounis, 1971). Other approaches are based on raters, such as CAT, suggested by Amabile (1983) and developed by others (e.g., Baer, Kaufman, & Gentile, 2004; Hennessey, 1994), in which domain experts judge whether an output is creative or not. Clearly, teachers function as raters of the students’ creative outputs, thus investigating how their judgments are formed was one of this study’s purposes, namely, to qualitatively explore the music teachers’ perceptions. This also gave me the opportunity to draw conclusions regarding their definitions of creativity.

6.1.14. Definition

Creativity according to the the participants is a multifaceted concept, which pertains to students' autonomy, initiative and application of imagination and unconstrained thinking in activities they enjoy doing, as well as the effort made to produce an original output that expresses their inner and emotional world, while staying within
the teachers' assigned topic. While elements of this definition may be found within other scientific definitions, such as “imagination successfully manifested in any valued pursuit” (Odena & Welch, 2012, p. 30), what is more important here is the orientation towards an applicable educational definition that escapes from the duality of originality and usefulness (or the various attached synonyms), as well as forming generalisations and oversimplifications. Instead, it encompasses both process (i.e. autonomy and initiative) and product (i.e. imaginative and original) dimensions of creativity; it contextualises itself within a framework (i.e. teachers’ instructions) and it takes into consideration the person involved by embracing non-Western viewpoints.

This means that the emphasis shifts on the revelation of “…emotional, personal and intrapsychic elements” (Lubart, 1999, p. 342) thus encapsulating Eastern notions of creativity, which involve “…a state of personal fulfillment, a connection to a primordial realm, or the expression of an inner essence of ultimate reality” (p. 341).

Another inference related to, and derived from, the formation of definition, is that the participants' perceptions of creativity have only taken shape after they had gained teaching experience. My interpretation is that this is due to the evolving concept of creativity, which relates to Csikszentmihalyi's (1988) contextual view, where the definition of creativity depends upon “…criteria that change from domain to domain across time” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 198, emphasis added). In fact, decisive influences on the evolution of creativity across time have appeared to be music and teaching, experience and knowledge, as well as other possibly internal constructs, such as motivation and/or expectation about which I cannot draw conclusions as this suggestion demands further research. This assumption is in line with Bruner's (1957) ‘new look’ of perception, which Erdelyi (1974) describes it as a “…vast [constantly] processing region” (p. 14) influenced by both external factors, such as music and teaching experience and internal ones, such as one’s expectations and motivation (Shrum, 2015). My suggestion for an evolving concept
of creativity is also justified by Amabile's (1983) CAT, in which experts, that is, very experienced and knowledgeable individuals, have been proved to be the most appropriate judges to assess creativity and are thus appropriate ‘perceivers’ of creativity. Apparently, no one is born an expert; every expert was once a novice. However, after gaining experience, they have become experts, and their perception develops along with their expertise. Hence, my suggestion about creativity perception being a non-fixed entity. Understanding the factors that influence our perceptions of creativity over time warrants for further research.

6.1.15. School environment and system

This study also unearthed the inappropriate use of music in the Cypriot Primary education. In particular, its undervaluing and exploitation as a reflection of the quality of school service carries negative consequences: lack of time, pressure on music teachers and students and focus on the output of music activities. Admittedly, undervaluing seems to be an oxymoronic description of the subject as nowadays, as I explain, the subject of music is adopted to reflect school services. This is explained as follows: according to the participants, and my own experience as a music teacher in Cyprus, finely tuned music ensembles, which are ubiquitous throughout the school year, appear in almost every school event. The reason for this is that head teachers, with career development prospects or aspirations to maintain a self-image of successful management, at least, in the local community, acknowledge the power and resonance of music, namely, the emotional charge, the excitement, the overall atmosphere and even the admiration it brings to a festive or ceremonial event. However, head teachers do not really do anything to support the subject holistically. Head teachers, in other words, only care (and put pressure on music teachers) about the output of music education: the good-sounding, good-looking, finely tuned,
repertoire-rich orchestras and choirs, which will appear in school events. As a result, performances become compulsory and the music teachers’ attention focuses on the output, cutting out or minimising time devoted to creativity, such as sound experimentation and improvisation, activities that in the short term will not yield the head teachers’ desired outputs. Consequently, as Aljughaiman and Mowrer-Reynolds (2005) report, since creativity is not appreciated, head teachers will not support it. Therefore music is a low educational priority, in contrast to language and mathematics and it is used to achieve non-educational goals. This phenomenon, however, contradicts the purpose of music education; Pitts (2017) recognises that “one of the many things music education is for […], is fostering a creatively engaged society […] leaving opportunities open, not closing them down; offering routes and role models for lifelong engagement” (p. 166). Apparently, music development, with its plethora of benefits (e.g., Pitts, 2000; Rainbow & Cox, 2006; Hallam, Creech, Varvarigou, McQueen, & Gaunt, 2014; Hallam & Council, 2015), takes time or years of practise; if something is not well prepared, head teachers do not wish to present it at the school events, particularly at those to which students’ parents and distinguished personalities from the community and/or the MoEC are invited, as that would not reflect well on the school management. In other words, music education has become a tool for political/strategical interests, more about the implications of this finding are discussed below. This finding, which aligns itself with studies that reveal the lack of time for music education, contributes to the study of the barriers to creativity (Cachia et al., 2010; Bresler, 1994; Byo, 1999), as well as to studies that generally highlight the lack of time and the poor status of the subject (Pascoe et al., 2005; Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Alter, Hays, & O’Hara, 2009; and Russell-Bowie, 2009).
6.1.16. Consistency among the groups

Finally, it is worth commenting on the consistency of the participants’ answers, no matter to which group, or working status, they belong. In other words, the three groups that make up the sample of this study, general teachers specialising in music, general teachers and music teachers, share more or less the same or, at least, not diametrically opposed, opinions regarding the topics discussed above. Admittedly, there are disagreements, but they do not have to do with being specialised, general or music teachers. This finding is contrary to the general belief/research conclusion that general teachers assigned to teach music lack the subject knowledge (e.g., de Vries, 2015). It furthermore disagrees with Mullet et al.’s (2016) conclusion that the teachers’ conceptions of creativity are uninformed regarding theory and research. My explanation for this relates to the participants' academic backgrounds, the induction training they have from the Pedagogical Institute and the ‘refreshing’ training and resources the MoEC offers to them. Regarding the participants’ background, six of them, the music specialists and general teachers, graduated from the University of Cyprus. The other four, however, have different academic backgrounds. As for the MoEC training, this pertains to music workshops and seminars organised throughout the year, with some of them being mandatory, as well as online teaching material. Therefore, since most of the participants have undertaken the same undergraduate studies and they have all been attending the same music workshops and seminars, their opinions have also been shaped accordingly. This is in accord with Bereczki and Kárpáti’s (2017) conclusions that teaching experience and training for teaching creativity may positively influence the teachers’ beliefs on the topic.
6.2. Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study constitute the knowledge base of how a group of music teachers experience creativity in Cypriot music education. Drawing from the richness of my analysis, the results and the discussion, in this section I locate the narrow findings of this study in a broader context to support policy and practice change. In particular, this study provides implications for potential improvement at individual level (music teachers), institutional level (schools and policy-makers), academic level (research) and societal level (students’ parents).

6.2.1. Individual level

At an individual level, the results of this study may inform pre- and in-service educators inside and perhaps outside the Cypriot context. The participants’ understanding of creativity is generally well-aligned with the findings of scientific research. In particular, participants acknowledged creativity as a capability of all students and referred to a range of activities and practices they consider creative and apply to their teaching, as well as to the integration of other art-related subjects into their music lessons in order to enrich their lesson plans and make them interdisciplinary. In addition, they articulated a holistic approach to the nurturing of creativity, in which they take advantage of creative learning opportunities, something that proves their creative mental habits and thinking skills. However, issues have been raised about the frequency of activities involving improvisation and composition, the need for the development of the lyric-(re)writing into full song-writing activity, the need for more frequent collaborative teaching with artists, as well as the absence of reference to the use of technology. Therefore, music educators, both pre-
and in-service practitioners, as well as head teachers and curriculum designers may benefit from the findings and suggestions of this study provided by a group of experienced music teachers. In particular, the suggested range of activities and the practices they consider creative, the elements that an activity needs to contain in order to be considered creative, the need for an inter-disciplinary approach when teaching music, and the lack of music-teaching-time lead to the limited application of various activities.

6.2.2. Institutional level

At an institutional level, this study acknowledges that the music seminars and workshops that the MoEC provides for the music teaching community do have a positive influence. The study, however, calls on school directors to pay attention to the newly appointed music educators' lack of confidence, which may require substantial time for orientation and adjustment until they reach their full potential. Furthermore, the study reveals a parallel practice between the Cypriot music education and 'sausage factories', calling for attention from policy-makers and head teachers. As already explained, music education has become a vehicle for head teachers to promote themselves through the construction of an image of well-functioning school, part of which is a good-sounding choir and/or orchestra that performs at school events. Hence, my reference to parallels with the 'sausage factory': a place that produces deliciously tasting food, hiding the processing of its ingredients during production, with the output being, on the one hand, tasty for the majority of the community, but quite unhealthy for the students and music teachers. In other words, this study reveals a highly strategic manipulation of music education: it has become the product of an impression-making factory (the school) produced by the workforce (the teachers) using tools (the students) with the aim of satisfying the
consumers (the attending audience). The reason I make this odd parallel is because by placing so much emphasis on performances for school events, students miss out on a huge part of the benefits of music education, including creativity. Music teachers are required to have the choir and/or orchestra ready to perform at any time. Here it is important to mention that since the school events have such a strong influence on the school image, the teachers have the extra pressure to prepare something that will be satisfactory. Failure to do so may not have destructive consequences for the teachers’ career, but it will most likely create an unpleasant atmosphere between themselves and the head teacher, or possibly with other colleagues. Thus school events represent a kind of test for music teachers. Bearing this in mind, music teachers then do not usually risk devoting much, if any, time on developing creativity during their lessons. They naturally resort to what will help them achieve their goal, namely, to have a satisfactory choir and/or orchestra. Consequently, the time left for creativity is minimal and unfortunately Cypriot music education mistakenly aims at good-sounding orchestral and/or choir performances to satisfy the attending audience, that is, the students’ parents and, occasionally, members of the community or the Ministry’s prestigious guests. In other words, an orchestral/choir performance is the good-looking/sounding product of music education that I compare to a sausage. However, the product of music education, no matter how good it sounds to the ears of the attending audience, is produced through a rather unorthodox, or even non-pedagogical approach, which leaves the students’ music education incomplete. In the long-run, the output of music education is unhealthy for the students, their parents and the society, a warning also given by Hallam et al. (2014). This inappropriate use of music should definitely be taken into consideration by education managers, including head teachers, policy makers and curriculum designers, in addition to the need for more support to newly appointed music teachers and the suggestions provided in the preceding subheading (6.2.1.).
6.2.3. Academic level

At an academic level, which includes researchers interested in musical creativity, Primary music education and, generally, in creativity and the so-called Four ‘P’s’, the contributions of this study are diverse: first, they offer a synthesised definition of creativity to researchers and theorists interested in the definition of creativity that is applicable to the educational environment, with an emphasis on ‘personal’ creativity which, as mentioned in the statement of the problem, is one of the goals of this study. In addition, it reports the participants’ approach to assessing creativity and their beliefs about the elements an activity needs to include in order to be considered creative. Furthermore, it suggests the variable nature of music teachers’ perceptions of creativity and reflects the controversy among researchers regarding the relationship between: (1) intelligence and creativity; (2) the students’ age and creative performance; and (3) the ability of creative students to ‘transfer’ their creativity. Finally, the successful application of this study’s methodological framework demonstrates an appropriate alternative, complementary to the approach of the interviews, that is, VET, to explore the music teachers’ perceptions.

6.2.4. Societal level

At a societal level, including the preceding groups and the students’ parents, in addition to the ‘sausage factory’ analogy and its non-encouraging prospects for the broader society, the study reveals a misconception about language and mathematics being superior to the subject of music and indicators of the students’ intelligence. In fact, this notion is a social representation of the views of the parents and the school system, and is transmitted to the students as pressure to develop ways of thinking into which students may not naturally fit. Therefore, active and future educators,
institutional leaders and educational decision makers, as well as the students’ parents need to be alerted about this misconception and the pressure that may be exerted on students. Finally, a suggestion for researchers: the question of who constructed this notion is quite interesting, yet action to overcome it is quite urgent – another avenue for further research.

6.3. Limitations and Further Suggestions for Future Research

"[T]here is no perfect study. All studies face limitations" (Chasan-Taber, 2014, p. 246) and so does the present one. Clearly, the length and spectrum of my experience as a researcher, as well as my understanding of the knowledge and approach to practice, including philosophical, ontological and axiological assumptions, determined the epistemological choices I made and their possible impact in terms of effectively answering my research questions and drawing conclusions. In this section, I reflect on the decisions I have made and make further suggestions for future research.

6.3.1. The participants’ statuses

This study interviewed music teachers with three different statuses: general education teachers who teach music only, general education teachers who may/occasionally teach music (along with other subjects) and music teachers. My intention was to have a rich source of information from the agents constituting the music educational system in Cyprus, in order to obtain a complete picture of it. Afterall, this is one of the few studies, if not the first one, conducted in Cyprus on the topic of creativity. Therefore the impact of this limitation in this study pertains to its role, presenting it as an introductory study that scans the area in order to lay the ground for further research. However, I understand that this approach may be
accused of a lack of homogeneity in the groups of participants, since their backgrounds define, to a great extent, their working statuses. I acknowledge this limitation and thus I suggest the need for a future qualitative research study focusing on each group separately.

6.3.2. The participants’ age and experience

Furthermore, the age range of the participants extends from early thirties to early sixties, something relating also to their teaching experience. As explained above, the criterion I set for selecting the participants was that they should have at least seven years of teaching experience, which excluded those with less. However, working as a permanent full-time music teacher in Cypriot Primary education before the age of 30 has not been possible due to the appointment system which is based on lists of candidates, although that has recently been changed (World Bank, 2014). It is possible then that, today, younger teachers or, at least, teachers with less experience, may have different perceptions on creativity. Therefore one of this study’s findings, which concerns the change/evolution of the music teachers’ perceptions of creativity over time, suggests the need for future research on how, when and how often this occurs.

6.3.3. The participants’ employment

The other limitation has to do with the participants’ employment in public education. Arguably, music teachers in private education have different teaching and working experiences, something that, as the findings of this study demonstrate, influences how they assess the students’ creativity. Therefore another suggestion for future
research would be to explore the private music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, musical creativity.

6.3.4. The method of employing participants

In addition, the chosen recruitment methods set limitations in this study: the participants were recruited via a combination of sampling techniques (i.e. selective, snowball and convenience and opportunistic methods), ensuring that participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study. This, however, introduces two challenges: (1) whether those who participated did so because they actually have, or think they have, knowledge about creativity; and (2) whether the participants tried to embellish their answers regarding what they do and believe about creativity. It is important to note here that two music teachers, who were approached but eventually decided against participating, did so because they did not, or believed they did not, have such knowledge. Regarding the first case, setting criteria for what I personally think is a knowledgeable participant in order to collect more accurate data would actually contaminate the data with my own beliefs. The suitability of the participants was not based on what I believed their knowledge on creativity was, but on their experience, regardless of what they themselves believed their knowledge of the topic was. By extension, the participants were not identified and thus invited to participate, on the basis of their creativity or success with respect to it. Thus a couple of suggestions for future research may be (1) to research the participants identified as creative and explore how they have successfully achieved this; and (2) to purposely deceive participants, as an integral feature of the study’s design and under certain conditions (Boynton, Portnoy, & Johnson, 2013), in order to avoid participants fabricating beliefs about the topic. Regarding the second case, one could reasonably argue that the data collected through this particular method merely represent
rhetorical perspectives, which may differ from what music teachers do and how they behave with regard to their day-to-day practice. To a certain extent, this may be true; the objective of this study, however, has been to explore and understand the participants' perceptions and the meanings they ascribe to specific cases out of context using the VET. Whether there is a gap between the participants' answers and the day-to-day reality of their practice methods cannot be ascertained and forms one of this study's limitations. As Barter and Renold (1999) explain, even though “…some studies have concluded that responses to vignettes will reflect how individuals actually respond in reality, (...) the problematic relationship between belief and action must be heeded” (pp. 3 - 4). Therefore drawing inferences from educators' rhetorical responses to what they actually do in their teaching raises questions. Investigating the music teachers' in-class daily approaches, merely through observation, or combining observation and video recording with interviews, might be a goal for future study. Still, however, there is no guarantee as to whether what teachers demonstrate during observations is actually what they do in other lessons, unless, of course, this is a longitudinal study. After all, the various, or even possibly infinite, 'what ifs' of the human imagination are what drives researchers to conduct studies with alternative sample sizes and methods (Thomson, 2011, p. 80) sustaining the scholarly pursuit of knowledge.

6.3.5. MDRPCP and the participants’ video/audio examples

Limitations stemmed also from my decision to ask participants to do more work by themselves, something mentioned already in the methodological issues of each participant. Such requests involved: (1) filling out the 'Music Development River & Professional Career Path' (MDRPCP) and (2) bringing their own examples with which we could start the interview. As already mentioned, some of the participants were
quite ‘parsimonious’ in their descriptions of the critical music incidents of their life in the MDRPCP or it took them several weeks, and only after polite reminders, to return the MDRPCP. However, once noticed, this made me ask about that kind of information (such as their music backgrounds) during the interview, to supplement what was in the MDRPCP. As a result, interview time had to be devoted to an aspect I tried to avoid in order to let participants reflect as naturally and qualitatively as possible, as well as to save time. Moreover, some participants came with no videos, something I had anticipated when designing the study, so I provided the participants with my own video vignettes. Furthermore, when participants were requested to express their opinions about the video vignettes, most asked for further information about the activities. While some of them made their own assumptions, others asked for more information. As already mentioned, this reveals how they perceive and assess creativity and was taken into consideration when extracting themes or answering the research questions.

6.3.6. The interview location

Another limitation was the place where some of the interviews were conducted. As mentioned above, I allowed the participants to choose where they preferred to be interviewed. Thus some preferred to meet in crowded and noisy venues, for example, a café, something that made the transcription process difficult, as some phrases were inaudible or unintelligible. Again, once this was noticed, I was very careful about the suggestions by others to meet in similar places.
6.3.7. Identifying the ‘ingredients’

Furthermore, a limitation of this study has to do with identifying the ‘ingredients’ that comprise the music teachers’ perception of creativity without digging deeper, for example, specifying whether one of those ingredients is more important to the participants than others. This, however, allows the opportunity for future research to be conducted on whether any of those has more weight. In addition, based on the identification of these ‘ingredients’, a future study may be conducted on designing a model for creativity assessment and nurturing.

6.3.8. Generalisability

Regarding the limitation of generalisability due to the small sample size, as mentioned above, the findings of this study do not claim wider application to other contexts; my intention was to gather in-depth views from a specific group of people in certain situations about a phenomenon they have so far experienced.

6.3.9. The researcher’s bias

Finally, the researcher’s bias is a strong limitation to any qualitative research. This is the reason I extensively commented on my background and beliefs on the topic, so that the reader is well informed about my position and the direction of the analysis. In addition, while the full list of techniques confirming this study’s validity is mentioned above, techniques that were applied to minimise risk include the interview transcription approval and member checking. As already explained, both cases are, to some degree, unpredictable when it comes to feedback and thus risky in terms of the direction the research may take in the case of negative feedback or even of the participants’ withdrawal. Fortunately, the participants’ feedback was all positive, yet
the number of them responding was only four. Arguably, even though I could have reattempted to contact the rest, due to time restrictions and the fact that their participation was voluntary, I preferred to proceed with those I had and mention the silence of the others here as one of this study’s limitations.

6.4. Summary

In this final chapter I have highlighted how my research reflects, differs from and extends current knowledge in the area of creativity. In particular, I have discussed the meanings of my findings, the importance and relationship to previous studies, while attempting also to explain their emergence. In addition, I have offered implications for policy and practice at an individual, institutional, academic and social level. Finally, I have acknowledged the limitations of this study, reflecting on my decisions with regard to design and general implementation, suggesting further possible research areas.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

The lack of qualitative research on music teachers’ perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity in Cypriot Primary education formed the objective of this study. To fill this gap in the literature on creativity in education, I explored how music teachers experience creativity in their teaching, their students and the school environment, investigating their perceptions of, and approaches to, the phenomenon. The design of this study deployed phenomenological methodology to generate descriptive themes. I conducted 10 in-depth face-to-face interviews, assisted by the video elicitation technique, with music teachers who have been employed in public Primary education in Cyprus for, at least, seven years. Participants came from the three categories that currently exist in Cypriot Primary schools: general education teachers, who teach music only, general education teachers, who may teach music (along with other subjects), and teachers of music (only).

The exhaustive, rich and thick analysis of the participants’ experiences of creativity in Cypriot Primary education revealed multiple findings that contribute to the field of knowledge. In particular, this study offers suggestive evidence of the tension between creativity and education and the need for a change in mentality on the part of the agents that constitute the educational system. The participants proved to be well informed about the range of activities and approaches that may be used in the classroom for the students’ holistic development of creativity. Even though they believe that creativity is not, or at least not fully, teachable, they do feel responsible for its nurturing in the subject of music for the benefit of all students. A creative teacher, one characterised by imagination, open-mindedness, self-confidence,
passion for teaching and ability to recognise creativity, is necessary to provide creative teaching and thus teaching for creativity. As for students who are considered creative, these are characterised by confidence, curiosity and experience.

However, this study has also revealed the inappropriate use and approach of music in Cypriot Primary education and has provided an understanding of how the teaching of the subject has been transformed into a ‘sausage factory,’ whose primary goal is to produce successful choir and/or band performances at the numerous school events in order to reflect the school's, and the head teacher’s, good functioning and quality of service. The findings also confirm (1) the lack of substantial music teaching time; (2) the poor status of the subject of music; and (3) the perception that intelligence is strictly linked to successful performance in the two main subjects of the Cypriot educational system, namely, modern Greek and mathematics.

Nevertheless, this study’s findings are significant when it comes to illuminating the music teachers’ understanding of the elements an activity needs to contain in order to be considered creative. This provided access to the participants’ perceptions of creativity and its assessment, marking two more scientifically significant aspects of this study. In particular, the findings provided an applicable educational definition of creativity that escapes from the duality of originality and usefulness (or the various attached synonyms), as well as from generalisations and oversimplifications. Such a definition encompasses both the process (i.e. autonomy and initiative) and product (i.e. imaginative and original) dimensions of creativity, it contextualises itself within the framework of the teachers’ instructions and takes into consideration the revelation of “emotional, personal and intrapsychic elements” (Lubart, 1999, p. 342), thus resonating with the Eastern notions of creativity. Moreover, and in relation to this finding, this study suggests the evolutionary nature of the participants’ perception of creativity, as it has been influenced by music and
teaching, experience and knowledge, as well as other possibly internal constructs, such as motivation and/or expectancies. As for the second scientific significance, this study sheds light on the music teachers’ approach to assessing creativity and the factors influencing their judgments: the nature of the activity, the location in which it takes place, the teacher's instructions, the implementation of other forms of art, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, students' genuine involvement and enjoyment, and the students' age and musical background. This is another important finding of this study, as studies on creativity assessment have so far focused on designing tests that measure the cognitive processes, ignoring also rating-based studies, such as the CAT.

In addition, the findings of this study support the scientific debates regarding the relationship between creativity and intelligence, students' age and creativity, and the domain issue.

Finally, this is one of the first studies, if not the first, reporting 10 music teachers' perceptions of, and approaches to, creativity in Cypriot Primary education. It sets the basis for further research into this topic by providing a general sense of the broad image of music education in Cyprus in relation to creativity. It is hoped that it will raise awareness of the improvements that need to be made at individual, institutional, academic and social levels, so as to amplify the quality of the subject and aptly reframe its purpose in Cypriot education and beyond it.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Allett, N. (2010). Sounding Out: Using music elicitation in qualitative research, 17. Realities working papers, 14, Available from:


Lapadat, J.C., & Lindsay, A.C. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: From standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry, 5*(1), 64-86.


Bibliography


Appendix I

Approach Letter: Information for prospective participants

This leaflet provides information about the study of my research with focus on music creativity, which is under the supervision of Professor Graham F. Welch and Dr. Evangelos Himonides. Should you have any questions after reading it, I would be pleased to answer them.

Why is this study being done?

Even though music has been recognized as an important venue in facilitating creativity in education, little attention has been paid to how music teachers assess music creativity. Teachers' beliefs pertaining to music creative activities are integral to how such activities are taught and assessed. This gap in the literature as to how teachers in Primary education view creativity and how they assess it is what this study wishes to examine.

Who will be in the project?

Participants are deliberately selected based on their educational and professional backgrounds; in addition, in order to satisfy the standards of “good informants”, participants need to be qualified, experienced (at least 5 years), and currently involved in teaching.

What is the process of the research?

Participants will first need to read this Information leaflet and, if they are interested in participating, they will be asked to sign the Consent form and fill out the “Music Development River & Career Path.” Furthermore, participants will be invited to provide video(s) featuring what they consider to be creative music activities (it could be videos of them teaching, performing, or of anyone else, e.g., their students, or videos coming from YouTube or any other source). The videos of each participant, as well as other YouTube videos provided by the researcher, will be used as starting points of discussion/interactive conversation about how participants perceive music creativity and what define their criteria for assessing
creativity in music. It should be made clear here that there will be neither trick questions, nor will the discussion/interview be used to test the participants' knowledge. The aim of the inquiry is completely non-judgemental. In addition, in case needed, participants will be kindly requested to allow the researcher sit in their classroom and observe a lesson. Finally, participants are kindly asked to be available for any further questions that may come up after the completion of the interview.

Could there be problems for you if you take part?

The study has been carefully designed to anticipate any problems and make the process as smooth and enjoyable as possible. In case, however, you would like to drop out for any reason, please let me know and the process will stop immediately.

Who will know that you have been in the research?

Your participation, the Music Development River & Career Path, as well as the audio recordings will remain confidential throughout and after the completion of the research. Names will be changed in case they have to appear in the reports' analyses so that no identity is revealed. A short report will be sent to any participant who wishes to know the results by the end of the research.

I would be deeply grateful to your willingness to share your experiences and knowledge!
Thinking back over your life experience, please reflect on specific instances, critical incidents, and important periods, which you consider that have influenced the direction of your musical development and professional career. Using brief annotations that ‘tell’ about any experience that precipitated a change of direction or any influential incident, please reflect upon your experiences of music studying, making/performing and teaching, at school and university, with friends and family as well as within the community, and elicit particular incidents and experiences, which have influenced your professional career path. While recalling the memorable experiences and events of your musical and professional history, please locate each one on different bends along the length of the winding river (found on the next pages), where each bend represents an influential incident. Examples of others’ Musical Career Paths¹ are provided below.

Extract from Patrick’s Musical Career Path:

When about 5-6 years old I used to play around on the piano at a neighbour’s – eventually I persuaded my parents to buy a piano and I started lessons […] I started the violin when I went to secondary school and after a year changed to the viola. I played in the orchestra and the wind band and performed in the regular concerts.

At 15 I joined the [County] Youth Orchestra - went on a tour to New England, USA - some of my happiest musical memories: the conductor’s teaching style had a great influence on me. Studied A-level music at a specialist music course - lots of playing (especially piano accompanying) and concerts.

I studied for a music degree at [Oxford] - very academic course but I had an outstanding tutor who again influenced me as a teacher; lots of orchestral playing and opportunities to conduct which I really enjoyed.

After graduating I went to [an English university] to do a PGCE - I have always wanted to teach ever since I was about 6 years old! The course was excellent - introduced to many different styles of music - and I had two very contrasting but stimulating teaching practice schools. Both heads of department were very influential on my own teaching.

Started teaching in an inner-city boy’s school - learnt a lot, mainly about how not to run a music department! After 18 months I went to be a head of department at another school. After 4 years I came to [this school] where I am now Head of Department. I really enjoy working here and am very proud of what we have achieved over the last four years. I find my teaching very creative and stimulating and my musical skills are continually being developed and stretched.

Extract of Laura’s Musical Career Path:

With a degree in Music and Drama, and composition being a strong interest, using music technology as an instrument was very exciting. Music making with youngsters at degree level led me to work with hearing impaired children in a [city] comprehensive school and at children’s camp in [an Eastern country].

Living in [a North African country] was a strong link with teaching music at a school and playing Irish folk music at a regular venue.

Returning to get the PGCE at [an English university] and ending up running a secondary music department at a [city borough] comprehensive school (still there!!).

Travelling to South Africa on a music tour with youngsters has been an eye opener. Creativity in youngsters is alive and prospering […]
Extract of Sarah's Musical Career Path:

I was brought up in a musical environment in that there was an abundance of classical music played (recordings), along with folk music + Abba! Neither parent plays an instrument.

In Primary Education I took part in every event possible as singer. I took up recorder at the age of 5, clarinet at 9 and cello at 11.

In Secondary Education I started to teach myself keyboard skills. I joined three orchestras – 2 youth and 1 adult, where I was asked to play Double Bass.

A major turning point was when I went to college at 16 on a Pre-Professional Music Course and studied Music for 28 hrs a week! I received piano lessons for the first time and played in many concerts (almost 1-2 a week). This experience cemented my commitment to music. I met some people who are still close friends and a source of inspiration. I decided on teaching as a career.

I studied for a BMus and continued to actively participate in as many concerts-ensembles as possible. [...]
Appendix III

Participants' Consent Form

- I have read the information leaflet about the study  
  □ (please tick)

  According to the descriptions and explanations provided in the Information leaflet:

- I agree to fill out the “Music Development River & Career Path”  
  □ (please tick)

- I agree to be interviewed about music teachers’ perception and approach to assessing music creativity  
  □ (please tick)

- I agree to an audio recording of the interview  
  □ (please tick)

- I agree to allow the researcher sit in and observe my teaching in the classroom as a complement of the interview in order to provide a grounded context for the discussions (in case this is necessary)  
  □ (please tick)

- I agree to answer any further questions/clarifications related to the study after the completion of the interview (in case necessary)  
  □ (please tick)

- I have the necessary licenses, rights, consents, and permissions for projecting the videos  
  □ (please tick)

- I would like to review and approve the verbatim transcript of my interview  
  □ (please tick)

- I understand that I may withdraw consent to participate at any time  
  □ (please tick)
Appendix IV

Peer Review Consent Form

I (reviewer's name) have been invited by Stavros Makris (PhD candidate) to review the process of his study, including Data Collection, Transcription of the Interviews and Cross-Language Accuracy/Appropriateness, and Analysis of the first six participants. With this Consent Form I confirm that:

- I have read all the documentation regarding the process of the study.
- I will provide feedback/comments regarding the collected data, the analysis process of the so-far analysed transcripts, and the cross-language/translation accuracy/appropriateness of the interview transcripts.
- I will return and/or destroy all the documentation used in the review process without making any copies of them.
- I agree that I will not discuss or share in any other kind of way the outcome with anyone else other than the PhD candidate.

Comments:
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Name: ________________________________________________
Qualifications of Reviewer: __________________________________________
Contact phone: ______________________________________________________
Contact email: ______________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________
Appendix V

MDRPCP and Interview Transcript (example)

Interview with STL – General Teacher

In Primary and Secondary School I took part in musical events of my school.

As a student in the UCY (University of Cyprus) I had a music course and I taught music to elementary school students.

When I was employed as a teacher in elementary schools of Cyprus I taught music for several years to students from age 6 to twelve.

Today I teach music in a rural school in Cyprus to 9, 10 and 11 years olds. I try to introduce creative ways to teach new songs to the children so that they will like music.
Appendices

00:00 SM: If you could tell me about the example you would have brought

00:16 STL: Yes, it is a video that we made with the students of the fourth level. We started [doing] the subject of music and because they are kids who...well, they kick against singing the more ‘traditional’ songs of the events and all that and because we start off [the year] and we have to teach songs for the 1st and 28th of October [events], I thought that, as an attempt to attract their interest and to introduce them to the percussion instruments, we could do something that they wanted. I asked them what they want, they are crazy about Despacito now, "Miss let's do Despacito, re-orchestrate it, do it as we like", anyway, we added originally lyrics in Greek Cypriot, we used percussion and we made a video in which we made over Despacito. That's it. And they want to upload it on YouTube.

01:19 SM: Do you have it with you?

01:20 STL: Yes, I do.

01:21 SM: Shall we watch a bit of it?

1:26 STL: We did it, we wrote the lyrics, they wrote it anyway and so... give me a minute to launch it.

02:40 SM: So, please tell me, this is something that you consider as creative?

02:42 STL: Well...yes.

02:43 SM: What makes you think of it as creative?

02:47 STL: Well, because they changed the lyrics, they came up with their own, it's totally their own work, they started slowly... we first listened to the song, OK they already knew it, the fact that they would step let's say on the melody, finding similar expressions [phrases] matching with the music, I think it's a skill that they developed it a bit and the percussion, because I provided them with the percussion box and I let them choose, I didn't assign them: "You will take this one, you will take that one", they came up with their own, it was totally their own work, they said, "We'll do it this way."

03:36 SM: It was collaboratively.

03:38 STL: It was something they did alone.

03:40 SM: Did you present it anywhere?

03:41 STL: No, no, but they want to upload it on YouTube to watch it. Because I tell you, they are crazy about YouTube, about games, about these songs. Just to give you another example, we did this and we were also rehearsing "I diki mou patrida" for the October's 1st Event. I told them: "We'll do that song which we need for the event and then we'll devote time to work on the song that you want"

04:07 SM: So, it was something like a motivation for them?

04:08 STL: Yes.

04:09 SM: As opposed to the song of the Event, if I understood correctly?

04:12 STL: Kind of, yes. Well, they didn't kick against it excessively but I started with this, because they were...for example, at some point a student told me: "Miss, you are the best teacher ever" because they had done this, because they had done what they had wanted so much to and because they liked what they feel so close to.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: OK, yes.</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04.44</td>
<td>STL: And I wanted to attract the interest of that particular class, because they are such kind of children... they are attached to technology, they are in a transitional phase in which they consider that we are more acceptable when singing this kind of... in any case it was something they really enjoyed.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.11</td>
<td>SM: Can you talk to me generally about music creativity?</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.16</td>
<td>STL: Yes.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.17</td>
<td>SM: How do you perceive it?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.18</td>
<td>STL: Well, OK... listening to music that you like. Changing the lyrics of a song, I think it is – particularly for young children – I think it is creative. Making sound stories I, personally, think is creative, it's something that I also do and I have in mind to do it with this class and others; you start with a story and you add sounds with objects, papers, or with... we may go to the 'health education' classroom and use the pots to make music.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.08</td>
<td>SM: Why though? Why this process... what makes you believe that this, what is it that makes you think is creative in this process?</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.20</td>
<td>STL: Well, because... they see that music is not coming out of only one instrument, which of course requires that you need to know how to play it and because most of the students that we have in Primary education do not know, they are not... OK, besides the students that go to afternoon private music schools and know [how to play a musical instrument], therefore, realising that they can produce music with anything, not just with musical instruments, I think it's creative on its own.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.00</td>
<td>SM: Can you tell me some activities that you do in the classroom, practices that you apply that you consider creative in music?</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12</td>
<td>STL: Well, that's what I told you, sound stories, for example, when I did music in the first grade, we did the story of 'Little Baba', which is about the instruments of the orchestra; it starts with... the children watched the story which presents the musical instruments. As soon as they learn the musical instruments they try to identify them, or the students extend the story, or they listen to the music and they realise that it's 'there' where Baba is sad – Baba was an elephant, who lost his parents – it's 'here' where he is happy, so that's where this instrument came in, where it [music] sounds happier. I consider this creative; or making sound stories, or sometimes scoring a song with the percussion that we have at the school with the students' ideas: &quot;Miss, here we'll have... or Miss the triangles don't sound well here, let's add the chimes,&quot; I think these promote creativity.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>SM: Do you consider music creativity as something different than creativity in general?</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>STL: I wouldn't say it's different, it's part of general creativity. Because, generally, I think in all subjects you may and you 'should' let the students' develop creativity. That is, even in maths, with a math problem, letting them alone to find a solution to a problem is creative. In music as well. Music has to do with instruments, with sounds. It's just part of creativity – not something different.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>SM: Do you consider or if you have noticed that the creativity of some...</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>SM:</td>
<td>STL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>He is not interested in it?</td>
<td>OK, I understood what you mean. I believe in multiple intelligences and I consider that it may not... someone may be creative in music and not... OK, he will transfer his creativity, he may transfer it to maths thinking of a problem that is very creative. But it doesn’t mean that he is ‘able’ to do everything. I believe that someone may apply his creativity to music, for example, but not in other subjects because it’s not...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>OK, because I don’t have much [music] knowledge I answer intuitively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>Yes, I think yes, it may be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>You’ve mentioned intelligence, do you think it’s related to creativity? And particularly with music creativity?</td>
<td>Yes, I think creativity is related to intelligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>This means that if... or just tell me what you have noticed, if you have noticed something in your students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>Throughout the years that I have been working, I think that – as long as I believe that there are multiple intelligences and I think that creativity is intelligence – yes, I think it’s interwoven, someone may not be able to solve a complex math exercise, but he can make a masterpiece, let’s say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>Can you tell the difference when something the students make is music or just noise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>[laughs] OK, because I don’t have much [music] knowledge I answer intuitively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>Yes, this is fine, that’s what I want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>Intuitively, yes, I can.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>OK, intuitively, can you tell me an example that this becomes apparent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>For example, in the video that I showed you, I feel that some kids, at least for what they did by themselves, understood, they were on the beat, [but] there were other kids who just couldn’t... and generally, during the process of making it, I think it’s obvious. Or kids who can’t follow the rhythm, who can’t get it from the beginning or even never get it. Meanwhile you see others who immediately realise it. You may say that it’s not creative to follow the rhythm, but, no, that’s not true...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Are your criteria based on aesthetics? That is, if you don’t follow the beat, the rhythm, as I understood, or someone may figure out, it’s aesthetically inappropriate to the song. Did I understand correctly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>OK, let me ask you, have you noticed if some students are more creative than others? Or maybe even not at all?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>Please tell me about this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>Are we talking generally or about music?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>Let’s focus on music, but tell me about generally too if...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>Yes, of course, there are students who are creative, you will give them something, they will think and develop it. While others, let’s say, it’s the other song I told you earlier, that we changed it and it was a sixth...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
grade, they did have music knowledge, there were many students who had music knowledge, some girls also tried to change the melody. When I was in the other school, we had a teacher who had more music knowledge [than me] and we worked together, while other students didn't even achieve to change the lyrics and make them fit the melody, for example. I think that there... yes, not all students are creative.

14.49 SM: Because when we talked earlier about the other song, I was not recording, could you please briefly repeat the context? About the song.

15.00 STL: Yes. OK, basically, I remember it was a unit, I don't remember, it was a unit in Greek language subject, which was suitable to use this song; and we listened to it, we talked about the lyrics and then the students changed the lyrics according to the subject of the unit. I don't remember exactly... it was sixth grade, I think we did a unit that had to do with cinema and they changed the lyrics to match with the unit. Totally original lyrics. And some students, when we went into the music classroom, got the instruments and tried to arrange it differently, in order to embellish also the melody. And as much creative as some were...

16.09 SM: OK, now, you told me earlier about more and less creative students, have you noticed any characteristics about these persons? Or behaviours?

16.23 STL: Some students who I consider more creative than others?

16.29 SM: Or those who are not...or those who are more or less creative.

16.33 STL: I think those who are more creative are more observant, that is, they observe everything; maybe they have more curiosity and this they try to... in music for example they try to...how should I say it, they try to express it, to apply it. I think they are more alert, they are more...with the stimuli around them, generally.

17.19 SM: Do you have an opinion about why some students may be more creative than others?

17.30 STL: Well OK, I think, generally, it's a combination of the environment and what they are born with. And I think these two play role, it maybe...I don't think creativity is actually cultivated, but at some level it may be students who have more stimuli, generally in their lives.

18.21 SM: Do you believe that creativity may be taught?

18.29 STL: At some level.

18.30 SM: That is?

18.32 STL: Expanding the students' horizons, that is, ask them "What do you see here? A glass; well, is it only a glass or if you knock it make a sound", [so] you evoke their interest in thinking that "Aha, maybe I can do more things with the objects around me." But that's up to a point, I think creativity has a lot to do with what you inherit.

19.07 SM: So generally, what are the most important factors that you consider they contribute, so that we can help students develop creativity? I say we can help, because you said that creativity may be taught up to a level.

19.24 STL: We need to let the students free to... we should not ‘mould’ them. If you want to promote creativity, because it is something that I witness at our schools, we mould students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20.07</th>
<th>SM: How? How do we mould them?</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>STL: OK, music and generally the other colleagues who have more knowledge, are the most innocent in this issue [laughs], usually we are more flexible in music, but generally we ‘mould’ students. That is, it's this, it's this song and we'll learn it this way, we'll use these instruments – I'm talking about music – generally we don't let them free to come up with their own ideas, &quot;Could this be different?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>SM: Is this something that happens in all classes of Primary education?</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>STL: Mostly yes. And I'm not talking only about Primary education, but since this is our topic. We so much ‘mould’ students that we don't promote creativity in Primary schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>SM: How do you think we could promote it more? You've mentioned some examples earlier, if you could...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>STL: We need to be more open. The new music books, for example for the fifth and sixth grades I use the book of the fifth, I think, it starts with an interview of myself about the kind of music that I like, how music makes me feel, it later asks to connect instruments with feelings. These, I think, promote creativity. But based on what I see in schools, because we have this timetable according to which we have to learn songs for the 28th of October; so we did one song. By Monday I have to think of songs for the 28th of October event. That is, it's mostly song teaching, which doesn't allow time and room for... OK, I don't know, you may be more knowledgeable; how creative it is to learn singing a song, playing along with instruments as accompaniment. It's not very creative, but that's what most often what music education is all about, it's teaching songs for the events, setting them [students] up in a line and singing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>SM: You've touch upon many topics and thank you, just to start with, first, do you think that in order to teach creativity, the teacher has also to be creative in that subject?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>STL: I think, yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>SM: For example, if someone wants to be, teaches painting, art, he also has to be creative as a teacher or painter? Or both?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>STL: Because I teach painting [arts] too, the teacher may not necessarily be creative or very creative, but he has to be open to ideas, that is, the student may paint something, which, OK, we have to get detached from giving a paper to the student and ask him to paint. Because I have taken some painting lessons with a painter/visual artist and my horizons have been broadened, there are some things... when you are not creative or open, the student may paint something and you may say, &quot;This is not good, it doesn't look nice, clear it out, do it again&quot; or... I will never do this, I mean, I let them progress, I help them, but I think you have to let them try and something that may not be considered creative or that it gives something – and a copy of something pre-existing is much better – to be different. I don't know if you've met with Nikos Kouroushis, he is sculptor, visual artist, he has been involved with theatre some time ago, he is 76 years old now, he founded the Nikos Kouroushis Institute and Museum in Mitsero, with whom we collaborate and he visited our school and came to the painting [arts] classroom. The students...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paintings were all on the board and he saw something that students did using leaves and making an unusual tree. And he said "This is very good, who did it?" That is, he was impressed by something that someone else might reject saying, "They used leaves, really? Wouldn't it be better to make a nice tree that is more visible?"

<p>| 25.39 | SM: Does the same apply to music? | 78 |
| 25.41 | STL: Yes, I think it does apply. | 79 |
| 25.45 | SM: Could you give me an example similar to what you said about painting? You may not have exactly the same example, but... | 80 |
| 25.56 | STL: For example, having a song and we have to orchestrate it. A creative student may think, &quot;Miss, why don't we cut here or using that percussion, something that...&quot; Well something that we may think that it doesn't fit with the song, or &quot;Why don't we sing it this way, differently?&quot; Or changing the melody. | 81 |
| 26.39 | SM: You are not a devoted music teacher, right? | 82 |
| 26.40 | STL: No. | 83 |
| 26.41 | SM: You teach other subjects? | 84 |
| 26.44 | STL: Yes, neither do I have advanced music knowledge, only what I've been taught at the university and at the school. | 85 |
| 26.53 | SM: Which university? | 86 |
| 26.54 | STL: University of Cyprus. | 87 |
| 26.57 | SM: Is teaching music something that the head teacher asked you to do? How does this go? | 88 |
| 27.03 | STL: When there is no... sometimes the head teacher may impose it, yes, as is the case this year, because last year there was a colleague who had more musical knowledge and took over music teaching. Before the coming of this colleague, I was responsible for the musical teaching. This year, since no colleague has any special musical knowledge, the head teacher said, &quot;OK, each teacher will take over the music teaching of his classroom.&quot; So I've taken it over, because there was no one and I knew there was no one else [with musical knowledge], because I already had some experience with the choir I said, &quot;OK, I will take over the choir&quot;, I committed myself to this, it was my decision and I asked to take over one more class, the higher grades – fifth and sixth grades are grouped in the same classroom – along with the fourth grade to work all together and assemble a rudimentary choir for the events. After all, this is what matters in the Primary education. | 89 |
| 28.04 | SM: You mean school events? | 90 |
| 28.05 | STL: Well, yes, unfortunately yes, having songs to present in the school events. | 91 |
| 28.11 | SM: I would like you to talk to me about the events in a moment, please tell me, how were your studies in terms of music creativity? Did they help you? Did they teach you to teach creatively? | 92 |
| 28.26 | STL: Well, OK, in the &quot;Music Teaching II&quot; at the university, yes, I may say that it helped me with teaching the metre with pictures, the beats. OK, I think they do have a form of creativity | 93 |
| 28.52 | SM: How about assessing creativity? | 94 |
| 28.56 | STL: No, not at all. | 95 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: I'm not talking necessarily about giving a mark, but...</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>Yes, because anyway there is no written assessment in Primary education.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>Can you talk to me a bit about school events? If you could give me your opinion?</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>Well, OK, in school events there should be presented two to three songs. In smaller schools, like the one I currently am, because... high grade students are obliged to be in the choir and orchestra; there is no choice, &quot;You will be in the choir, you will not&quot; as it is in other schools. Students of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades form your choir and you have to find...and in every event you have to present... Christmas and end-of-the-year are the big events, you present songs that fit with the theme of the event. OK, usually if the end-of-the-year event is Cypriot theatre, you pretty much have to find Cypriot songs, for example, for the choir. For the Christmas event you usually do classic carols and some other songs.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>Why don't you consider it creative, as you said before?</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>OK, you will give the... the songs are specific, you will give them... you will teach them and you will teach them. I mean, what happens with the kids who don't like these songs. And there are many such cases. For example, my son, who is a bit... I think he is creative and this is something that colleagues have noticed, it's not just me, he tells me, &quot;I don't want to... I don't like these songs, why do I have to stand and sing them, these particularly?&quot;</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>How could they, the various school events, be creative?</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>If it could be taken into consideration what students like, even though the teacher... well, I do try to do this, I try to choose songs that are more pleasant or that I do like and I consider that the students will also like them [smile], but it doesn't always work like this. OK, in the previous years I had the opportunity... my former head teachers did trust me and let me choose [the songs]. I don't know what will happen this year, because the situation is different... or if she will give me specific songs and tell me, &quot;You know, for the Christmas [event] I want you to do Cypriot carols, I want you to do this song.&quot; OK, well enough, I will do it; the song may not satisfy all the students. Or the other problem is that, you are required...the students are required to participate in the choir and sing, whether they like it or not.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>All of the students?</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>From fourth grade and higher, yes. They don't have an alternative option to say, &quot;I don't want to.&quot;</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>Let me ask you, if something that you prepare and present does not satisfy the head teacher or the colleagues or the parents, what happens? Is there any effect on you? Directly or not?</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.57</td>
<td>OK, it has to be something... it may have consequences, for example, if the head teacher doesn't like it, neither will the inspector who may come to watch it, OK, he may reproach you or... however, this never happened to me. The only thing I've had about three or four years ago, when we did the song 'Accordion' at the event of the 28th of October. The head teacher did not say anything, but a colleague told me,</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"You know, you shouldn't have taught this song for the 28th of October, which says fight against fascism, it's written about the Revolt of the Polytechnic, not about the 28th of October" and after doing a search, I found that it's among the songs that may be taught for the 28th of October, it was one of the songs that I wanted to teach, I read about the history of the song, I told her, "You are wrong, I wanted to teach it for the meaning of the lyrics, I think it is appropriate [for this event]" and that was it.

34:05 SM: So it was clearly a matter of political beliefs.

34:09 STL: I don't know, maybe, yes. I've never had, though... Or for example the song about April's 1st, it's a song I've never taught and I don't want to teach it [laughs]. No one forced me to teach it, but even otherwise, I will still not teach it [laughs]. I choose the songs.

34:34 SM: How are your relations with the other colleagues?

34:36 STL: OK, fine. Particularly about music, the previous years I used to ask other musicians' help to find unusual songs [for the events], the colleagues congratulated me: "Bravo, the songs that you choose are very good", I mean they were impressed because we didn't do the ordinary...

34:09 SM: The most common?

35:02 STL: 'Golden-green leaf' and I don't know what...

35:09 SM: In an activity that you do with the students, it may be a preparation for an event or anything else, what is more important for you? Is there something that is more important for you?

35:24 STL: For me, it's important to get something that is aesthetically pleasant, to be decently presented and be something that I like, so that I can transmit it to the students to sing and enjoy it.

35:49 SM: So you focus mainly on the result of the activity?

35:52 STL: Well, even though it shouldn't be this way, because it is something that you will present, at the back of your mind you always think of how it will be. And you feel the 'pressure' of the head teacher who will come and see the rehearsals "How is it going to be? Will it sound good? Is it good like this?" You feel this pressure, so you ignore the preparation, [and] of how you will take it to the level that you want.

36:30 Short break

38:02 SM: As an educator and particularly as an educator who teaches music, do you consider yourself responsible for the development of the students' creativity?

38:17 STL: Yes, to some degree, yes. I think I ought to promote their creativity because I do believe in creativity, that is, I believe we have to let the students be generally creative because it's... in all subjects not just in music, therefore, since I teach music, yes I think I am responsible.

38:45 SM: Why, though, particularly in Music? You've mentioned the other subjects, do you think it's...

35:51 STL: In all subjects. I think it's our responsibility to promote students' creativity; music maybe allows this more.

39:00 SM: Why? Why do you think this happens?

39:06 STL: I think... first of all I think that music on its own is a creation, since music is a creation. And it's a subject that... OK, as we said there is no
assessment in primary education, but in other subjects you may want to let your students be creative but you have to strictly follow the syllabus; in modern Greek, for example, the students have to learn the grammar and what's creative about it? Ok you may try to teach it creatively, which is fine, but you have a timeline, you are more restricted. In music, though, you don't have something to restrict you, except what I told you before, the events, which must be done and I don't consider that...

40:00 SM: But in terms of the syllabus you are free?

40:02 STL: In terms of the syllabus, yes, you are more free. And consequently, you may let your students cultivate their creativity.

40:13 SM: Would you like to add anything else? I have three very short videos to show you that I would like you to comment on. But if you have something to tell me before going to the videos?

40:23 STL: No, I think I'm fine.

Track 2

00:00 SM: The first video... you may stop it at anytime.

01:30 SM: What do you think?

01:31 STL: It is very creative because they try to find the rhythm with the sticks and it is a rhythmically driven and pleasant piece and I think it's a very good way to teach to...

01:53 SM: If you had to assess it in terms of creativity, on a scale from 1 to 10, what would it be? Could you do it?

02:03 STL: Seven, eight?

02:05 SM: What could it make it even more creative?

02:09 STL: Well... creative and harder? If they are divided into two groups? Maybe half of the students should play the beat and the others the rhythm. OK, this would be harder.

02:33 SM: So different arrangement?

02:34 STL: Yes. Perhaps they should have two different instruments so that they don't all play the sticks, [and] maybe the seating arrangement [should change].

02:36 SM: Let me play for you the second video and then the last one.

03:40 STL: This is much more creative.

03:42 SM: Why though?

03:43 STL: Well, because they did their own orchestration... they collaborated with each other. They've probably prepared for it or, I don't know, it might have been spontaneous

03:57 SM: Maybe, I don't know the context. But let's, tell me your hypotheses.

04:02 STL: They improvised trying to make something that sounds good to their ears and, indeed, they achieved it, [or, at least,] they were about to achieve it.

04:15 SM: The fact that it was satisfying for them possibly, but to the ears of an adult, or the educator to be specific, is not, would it influence you in terms of how you would assess the result or the process?

04:35 STL: Personally, no, it wouldn't influence me. I take into consideration their age and the fact that they.... they didn't seem to make sounds independent of each other; it was as if they collaborated to do something and I consider it both creative and worthwhile; it may be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05:11</td>
<td>SM: A couple of things: could you give a mark?</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:13</td>
<td>STL: Yes, since I gave seven to the other one, I would give eight or nine to this one.</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:19</td>
<td>SM: Because you talked about their age, does the age of the child influence you in order to assess or judge whether he is creative or not?</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:38</td>
<td>STL: I try to compare it to what I listen to. I mean considering the age of the children I saw, I think that what they've tried to do is much more creative for their age. It's something similar to what I told you about painting. That is, if a child of 6 to 7 years old, can paint a tree the way he does, I will not compare it to that of a 12- or 14-year-old one, this is something that happens – educators do it and tell him, &quot;No, it's not good, try harder.&quot; I think you have to bear in mind the age of the children. This one I think is very creative for the age of the children.</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:31</td>
<td>SM: And the last one.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:27</td>
<td>STL: I find it very rhythmic song, I don’t know if it's because I have a personal experience and I like it and it’s nice that she [teacher] added movement.</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:39</td>
<td>SM: Do you consider it creative? Generally, the whole thing?</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:41</td>
<td>STL: Well, OK, to the extent that a choir and an orchestra can be creative... the fact that she, believe me, it's not easy; it's very hard to manage doing both, singing a rhythmic song and doing movement, it is something that I've tried myself, after suggestions of a musician friend and I know. The students seem that they enjoy it, I think it's creative. OK, as we said, it's a choir and an orchestra; this setup is as creative as it could be.</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:34</td>
<td>SM: How could it be more creative?</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:36</td>
<td>STL: Yes, it could.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:38</td>
<td>SM: That is? How? Please tell me.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:40</td>
<td>STL: It's not easy.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>SM: That is, you suggest this activity has a limit [in terms of creativity], if I could put it this way?</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:01</td>
<td>STL: Yes.</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:02</td>
<td>SM: Which she managed to achieve the top in this particular activity, the performance, the interpretation?</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>STL: Yes. I don't know, maybe she could have done something more creative. For example, last year at the end-of-the-year event, we were to sing 'Children painting the wall;' we included movements, I asked a musician friend and my friend asked me, &quot;Why don't you have a child painting while singing it?&quot; So I asked a student who doesn't speak very good Greek – so it would have been hard for him to sing it, but he is very good at painting to do it, we put a canvas, I gave him colours and he was painting while we were singing; in the background we projected the students' paintings about peace. Our theme was about peace; we did Lyassistrati and our theme was peace. And all the students of the school did their paintings about peace, I used a movie-maker and we presented it in this way. I'm not sure if I have the video. It was as much creative as it could be, I think.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:36</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>I would like to thank you very much. Is there anything else that you would like to add? Something that we haven't mentioned? Something that you would like to add?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>I think that's it pretty much. I hope I was helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:52</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Thank you very much!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI

Member Check – Participant 1

"Member Check" (known also as "Participant" or "Respondent Validation") is one of the techniques applied in qualitative research in an effort to improve the rigour of such kind of studies. It entails bringing back a report of the initial conclusions drawn from participants' interviews in order to check the accuracy and authenticity of the initial findings. "Member Check" contributes to the trustworthiness, accuracy, validity and the credibility of the results.

Please note that for confidentiality reasons, no names will be used in this report or in the finished dissertation. Thus, "Participant 1" will refer to your name hereafter.

Participant 1

Please read the following statements/conclusions and check whether you agree or not, whether they accurately represent your beliefs, perspectives, feelings and experiences about music creativity in Primary Education and/or you have any additional general or specific comments. In addition, please feel free to reflect on your participation in this study.

Practices and activities

- Improvisation and composition (including lyric-writing/composition) as well as orchestration are considered as the most appropriate activities for nurturing creativity. These are usually conducted in groups of students, instead of individually and they provide students with the opportunity for self-activity and, generally, autonomy, rather than mechanically repeating the same thing.
- Creative teaching equals creative students. A creative educator inspires and promotes the students' creativity in various ways. Creative teaching is marked by educators' enthusiasm for the subject and their own creative behaviour and approach to teaching.
- While the above teachers' characteristics may help to engage students in the lesson, developing creative thinking and abilities depends more on the students' self-desire, as the teacher may mainly provide guidance. In other words, creativity is not an absolute task, as possibly with everything in life, while a creative teacher will always be helpful, personal dedication and self-taught process are necessary for acquiring knowledge and developing creative skills in the subject of Music.
- “Traditional” teaching, that is, providing detailed or non-flexible instructions to the students that they have to follow, kills creativity.
- “Traditional” teacher: a person who does not inspire students.

If you agree with the above, you may leave this box empty. Otherwise, please feel free to edit, clarify or write below any comments that you may have.
Definition

- Music creativity is defined as any process that encourages the students' initiatives and self-actions, in which they have the opportunity to apply their alternative approach or points of view and, eventually, to end up with an output that they like and they enjoyed making.
- Your perception and approach to teaching creativity have been shaped after graduating and starting teaching music in Primary Education.

Assessment

- The elements constituting the definition of creativity are the same as those influencing your approach to assessing it: the more the students show initiative, alternative approach, different viewing angle, emotion and sensitivity and enjoyment of the students, the more the level of creativity is.
- The process of an activity determines the product; in other words, the process is a mirror image of the product and vice versa: the more creative the process, the higher creative the product.
- Even though the process of an activity may be valued more than the product in an in-classroom activity, the focus shifts when it comes to preparing for, and presenting at, school events.
- Students overtaking the instructions and approaching the activity differently, including for example, other related elements or kind of arts (such as dancing), without deviating, however, from the assigned topic, are considered as more creative. In other words, the students' initiative, alternative approach and viewing angle, emotion, sensitivity and enjoyment, influence you regarding creativity assessment.
- The students' background and musical knowledge influence the expectations of the teacher and thus the assessment of creativity.
- Students are also encouraged to co-assess each other's group. Encouraging discussion or even argumentation among the students is also important for developing the students' critical and creative thinking.
- Doing presentations/performances of music activities, e.g., to other classes or inviting the Head Teacher to attend the in-class performance of the students, function as challenge, promoting also enjoyment and, thus, creativity.

If you agree with the above, you may leave this box empty. Otherwise, please feel free to edit, clarify or write below any comments that you may have.
Creative students

- Everyone is creative; however, the students’ background/experiences influence their emotional intelligence and some can thus be more creative than others.
- Particular characteristics of creative students are organising skills, sensitivity, intelligence and high IQ, while introversion or extroversion are not prerequisites for creative behaviour.
- Creativity seems to flourish in young ages/Grades of Primary Education. Primary Education suppresses the students’ creative behaviour; the enculturation process taking place in Primary Education makes students lose their spontaneity, which, for SKR, seems to be important.

If you agree with the above, you may leave this box empty. Otherwise, please feel free to edit, clarify or write below any comments that you may have.

Domain General or Specific

- Generally, creative students “spread”/transfer their creativity into almost anything they undertake in education. Creativity is a way of thinking that once developed in a knowledge subject, it can then be applied to other cognitive subjects of education.

If you agree with the above, you may leave this box empty. Otherwise, please feel free to edit, clarify or write below any comments that you may have.

School environment

- The School environment in Cyprus may not always be the most ideal for Music Education: while Music and other art-related subjects are considered as more suitable for nurturing the students’ creativity, still Music is not considered as important subject as others, such as Maths.
- Music teachers are expected to fulfil school event duties, namely the preparation of national and religious celebrations. This, however, is something that is not considered creative at all and takes up very much of the Music lessons’ time.
- There can be competition among teachers as to who has covered the Syllabus faster, something that generates tension and stress to the educators.

If you agree with the above, you may leave this box empty. Otherwise, please feel free to edit, clarify or write below any comments that you may have.

General comments

Please provide any general comments that you may have regarding anything about the process.
Reflection

Please reflect on your participation in, and reaction to, the interview process. If, for example, the interview process (including e.g., the questions I asked), or anything else, influenced or changed your opinion and beliefs about music creativity or anything else.

Thank you very much again for your participation!
I greatly appreciate the time you devoted to share your knowledge and experience for my study.
### Coding Example – STL’s Transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Codes/Tags</th>
<th>Categories &amp; subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SM:</strong> If you could tell me about the example you would have brought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Video-making</strong>, originality, school events, singing, dislike of ‘traditional’ songs</td>
<td>Practices &amp; Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STL:</strong> Yes, it is a <strong>video</strong> that we <strong>made with the students of the fourth level</strong>. We started [doing] the subject of Music and because they are kids who...well, they <strong>kick against singing the more ‘traditional’ songs of the events</strong> and all that; and because we start off [the year] and we <strong>have to teach songs for the 1st and 28th October [events]</strong>, I thought that, as an attempt to attract their interest and to introduce them to the percussion instruments, we could do something that they wanted. I asked them what they want, they are crazy about Despacito now, &quot;Miss, let's do ‘Despacito’, re-orchestrate it, do it as we like&quot;, anyway, we <strong>added original lyrics</strong> in Greek Cypriot, we used percussion and we <strong>made a video in which we made over ‘Despacito’</strong>. That's it. And they want to upload it on YouTube.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Video-making, originality, school events, singing, dislike of ‘traditional’ songs</td>
<td>Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SM:</strong> Do you have it with you?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STL:</strong> Yes, I do.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SM:</strong> Shall we watch a bit of it?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STL:</strong> We did it, <strong>we wrote the lyrics</strong>, they wrote it anyway and so... give me a minute to....</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Lyric-writing</strong></td>
<td>Creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>SM:</td>
<td>STL:</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:40</td>
<td>So, please tell me, this is something that you consider as creative?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:42</td>
<td>Well...yes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:43</td>
<td>What makes you think of it as creative?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:47</td>
<td>Well, because they changed the lyrics, they came up with their own, it's totally their own work, they started slowly... we first listened to the song, OK they already knew it, the fact that they would step, let's say, on the melody, finding similar expressions [phrases] matching with the music, I think it's a skill that they developed it a bit and the percussion, because I provided them with the percussion box and I let them choose, I didn't assign them: &quot;You will take this one, you will take that one&quot;, it was by themselves, they did [it] alone, they said &quot;We'll do it this way.&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lyric-writing, originality</td>
<td>Definition, creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:36</td>
<td>It was collaboratively.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:38</td>
<td>It was something they did alone.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Definition, Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:40</td>
<td>Did you present it anywhere?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:41</td>
<td>No, no, but they want to upload it on YouTube to watch it. Because I tell you, they are crazy about YouTube, about games, about these songs. Just to give you another example, we did this and we were also rehearsing &quot;I diki mou I patria&quot; [&quot;My own land&quot;] for the October's 1st event. I told them: &quot;We'll do that song that we want it for the event and then we'll devote time to work on the song that you want&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Traditional song</td>
<td>School events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:07</td>
<td>So it was something like a motivation for them?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:08</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>SM: As opposed to the song of the Event, if I understood correctly?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:12</td>
<td>STL: Kind of, yes. Well, they didn’t kick against it excessively but I started with this, because they... for example, at some point a student told me: &quot;Miss, you are the best teacher&quot; because we did this. Because they wanted so much to and they liked it so much that we did something that they think it’s close to them.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ enjoyment, Teacher’s satisfaction/confirmation</td>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:43</td>
<td>SM: OK, yes.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:44</td>
<td>STL: And I wanted to attract the interest of that particular class, because they are such kind of children... they are attached to technology, they are in a transitional phase in which they consider that we are more acceptable when singing this kind of... in any case it was something they really enjoyed.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging students Students’ satisfaction, contemporary songs,</td>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:11</td>
<td>SM: Can you talk to me generally about music creativity?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:16</td>
<td>STL: Yes.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:17</td>
<td>SM: How do you perceive it?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:18</td>
<td>STL: Well, OK... listening to music that you like. Changing the lyrics of a song, I think it is – particularly for young children – I think it is creative. Making sound stories I also think is creative, it’s something that I also do and I have in mind to do it with this class and others; you start with a story and you add sounds with objects, papers, or with... we may go to the ‘health education’ classroom and use the pots to make music.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music listening, Orchestration, sound story, experimentation,</td>
<td>Definition, Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>various sonic objects/non-musical instrumental objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:08</td>
<td>SM: Why though? Why this process... what makes you believe that this, what is it that makes you think is creative in this process?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:20</td>
<td>STL: Well, because... they see that music is not coming out of only one instrument, which</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divergent thinking Definition =&gt; Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of course requires that you need to know how to play it and because most of the students that we have in Primary education do not know, they are not... OK, besides the students that go to afternoon private music schools [conservatories] and know [how to play a musical instrument], therefore, realising that they can produce music with anything, not just with musical instruments, I think it's creative on its own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: Can you tell me some activities that you do in the classroom, practices that you apply that you consider creative in music?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.00</td>
<td>27 Sound stories Symphony orchestra instruments Identifying instruments Extending the story Feelings (sad and happy) Percussion instrumentation Students' decisions/choices/Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time | STL: Well, that's what I told you, sound stories, for example, last year that I did music in the first grade we did the story of ‘Little Baba’, which is about the instruments of the orchestra, it starts with... the children watch the story and it presents the musical instruments. And as soon as we learn them, then they may try to identify them, or the students extend the story, or they listen to music and they recognise that it's there where Baba is sad – Baba was an elephant, who lost his parents – it’s here where he is happy, so that’s where this instrument came in where it sounds more happily. I consider it as creative. Or making sound stories, or sometimes scoring a song with the percussion that we have at the school with the students' ideas: "Miss, here we'll have... or Miss, the triangles don't sound well here, let's add the chimes." I think they promote creativity. |
| 07.12 | 28 Sound stories Symphony orchestra instruments Identifying instruments Extending the story Feelings (sad and happy) Percussion instrumentation Students' decisions/choices/Initiative |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: Do you consider music creativity as something different than creativity in general?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>29 Musical creativity = General creativity Music = Creativity Definition, Domain transcendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>STL: I wouldn't say it's different, it's part of general creativity. Because generally, I think in all subjects you may and you ‘must’ let the students' creativity develop. That is, even in maths, with a math problem, letting them alone to find a problem on their own is creative. In music as well. Music has to do with instruments, with sounds. It's just part of creativity, not something different.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>30 Musical creativity = General creativity Music = Creativity Definition, Domain transcendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: Do you consider or if you have noticed that the creativity of some students is transferred? If, for example, you have noticed a student who is creative in music, to be creative in other subjects, Greek or maths, or...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>31 Multiple intelligences Domain transcendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>STL: OK, I understood what you mean. I believe in multiple intelligences and I consider that...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it may not... someone may be creative in music and not... OK, he will transfer his creativity, he may transfer it to maths thinking of a problem that is very creative. But it doesn’t mean that he is ‘able’ to do everything. **I believe that someone may apply his creativity to music, for example, but not in other subjects** because it’s not...

| 10.49 | SM: He is not interested in it? | 33 |
| 10.50 | STL: Yes. I think yes, it may be. | 34 Motivation | Characteristics of creative students |
| 10.53 | SM: You’ve mentioned intelligence, do you think it's related to creativity? And particularly with music creativity? | 35 |
| 11.03 | STL: **Yes, I think creativity is related to intelligence.** | 36 Intelligence | Characteristics of creative students |
| 11.09 | SM: This means that if... or just tell me what you have noticed, if you have noticed something in your students | 37 |
| 11.15 | STL: Throughout the years that I have been working, I think that – as long as I believe that there are multiple intelligences and I think that creativity is intelligence – yes, I think it's interwoven, **someone may not be able to solve a complex math exercise, but he can make a masterpiece**, let's say. | 38 Multiple intelligences, creativity = intelligence | Domain transcendence, characteristics of creative students |
| 11.58 | SM: Can you tell the difference when something the students make is music or just noise? | 39 |
| 12.02 | STL: [laughs] OK, because I don’t have much [music] knowledge I answer intuitively. | 40 Insecurity, not much musical knowledge, answers based on intuition and experience | Participant’s background, Methodology [sampling] |
| 12.09 | SM: Yes, this is fine, that’s what I want. | 41 |
| 12.11 | STL: Intuitively, yes, I can. | 42 |
| 12.13 | SM: OK, intuitively, can you tell me an example that this becomes apparent? | 43 |
| 12.21 | STL: For example, in the video that I showed you, I feel that some kids, at least for what they did by themselves, understood, they were on the beat, [but] there was other kids who just couldn't... and generally, during the process of making it, I think it's obvious. Or kids who can't follow the rhythm, who can't get it from the beginning or even never get it. Meanwhile you see others who immediately realise it. You may say that it's not creative to follow the rhythm, but, no, that's not true... | 44 Rhythmic accuracy & inaccuracy, inborn/inherent skills Sense of rhythm/beat Definition Characteristics of creative students |
| 13.15 | SM: Are your criteria based on aesthetics? That is, if you don't follow the beat, the rhythm, as I understood, or someone may figure out, it's aesthetically inappropriate to the song. Did I understand correctly? | 45 |
| 13.34 | STL: Yes. | 46 |
| 13.36 | SM: OK, let me ask you, have you noticed if some students are more creative than others? Or maybe even not at all? | 47 |
| 13.46 | STL: Yes. | 48 |
| 13.47 | SM: Please tell me about this. | 49 |
| 13.49 | STL: Are we talking generally or about music? | 50 |
| 13.52 | SM: Let's focus on music, but tell me about generally too if... | 51 |
| 13.58 | STL: Yes, of course, there are students who are creative, you will give them something, they will think and develop it. While others, let's say, it's the other song I told you earlier, that we changed it and it was a sixth grade, they did have music knowledge, there were many students who had music knowledge, some girls also tried to change the melody. When I was in the other school, we had a teacher who had more music knowledge [than me] and we worked together, while other students didn't even | 52 Extending/Developing Initiative, melodic embellishment, teachers School environment Assessment => Product Characteristics of creative students |
achieve to change the lyrics and make them fit the melody, for example. I think that there... yes, not all students are creative.

14.49 SM: Because when we talked earlier about the other song, I was not recording, could you please briefly repeat the context? About the song.

15.00 STL: Yes. OK, basically, I remember it was a unit, I don't remember, it was a unit in Greek language subject, which was suitable to use this song; and we listened to it, we talked about the lyrics and then the students changed the lyrics according to the subject of the Unit. I don't remember exactly... it was sixth grade, I think we did a unit that had to do with cinema and they changed the lyrics to match with the unit. Totally original lyrics. And some students, when we went into the music classroom, got the instruments and tried to arrange it differently, in order to embellish also the melody. And as much creative as some were...

16.09 SM: OK, now, you told me earlier about more and less creative students, have you noticed any characteristics about these persons? Or behaviours?

16.23 STL: Some students who I consider more creative than others?

16.29 SM: Or those who are not...or those who are more or less creative.

16.33 STL: I think those who are more creative are more observant, that is, they observe everything; maybe they have more curiosity and this they try to... in music for example they try to...how should I say it, they try to express it, to apply it. I think they are more alert, they are more...with the stimuli around them, generally.

17.19 SM: Do you have an opinion about why some students may be more creative than others?

17.30 STL: Well, OK, I think, generally, it's a combination of the environment and what they are born with. And I think these two play role, it maybe... I don't think creativity is actually cultivated, but at some level it may be students who have more stimuli, generally in their lives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>SM:</th>
<th>STL:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>Do you believe that creativity may be taught?</td>
<td>At some level.</td>
<td>61 cultivated skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>That is?</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>STL: <em>Expanding the students' horizons</em>, that is, ask them, &quot;What do you see here? A glass. Well, is it only a glass or if you knock it may make sound&quot; for example, [so] you evoke his interest in thinking that &quot;<em>Aha, maybe I can do more things with the objects around me.</em>&quot; But that's up to a point, I think creativity has a lot to do with what you bring with you.</td>
<td>Intriguing questions Curiosity, Engaging students Creativity = inborn/inherent skill Practices, Activities Characteristics of creative students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>SM: So generally, what are the most important factors that you consider they contribute, so that we can help students develop creativity? I say we can help, because you said that creativity may be taught up to a level.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>STL: <em>We need to let the students free to... we should not ‘mould’ them.</em> If you want to promote creativity, because it is something that I witness at our schools, we mould students</td>
<td>Independence No space for diversity Practices School &amp; System environmentpolicy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>SM: How? How do we mould them?</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>STL: OK, music and generally the other colleagues who have more knowledge, are the most innocent in this issue [laughs], *usually we are more flexible in music, but generally we <em>‘mould’ students</em>. That is, it's this, it's this song and we'll learn it this way, we'll use these instruments – I'm talking about music – generally we don't let them free to come up with their own ideas, &quot;Could this be different?&quot;</td>
<td>65 Flexibility in music Re-interpretation, no opportunities for alternative thinking School &amp; System policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>SM: Is this something that happens in all classes of Primary education?</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>STL: Mostly yes. And I'm not talking only about Primary education, but since this is our</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendices 410
We so much “mould” students that we don’t promote creativity in Primary schools. We, so much, “mould,” students, that we don’t promote creativity in Primary schools.

21.08 SM: How do you think we could promote it more? You’ve mentioned some examples earlier, if you could...

21.19 STL: We need to be more open. The new music books, for example for the fifth and sixth grades I use the book of the fifth I think, it starts with an interview of myself about the kind of music that I like, how music makes me feel, it later asks to connect instruments with feelings. These I think promote creativity. But based on what I see in schools, because we have this timetable according to which we have to learn songs for the 28th of October; so we did one song. By Monday I have to think of songs for the 28th of October event. That is, it's mostly song teaching, which doesn't allow time and room for... OK, I don't know, you may be more knowledgeable, how creative it is to learn singing a song, playing along with instruments as accompaniment. It's not very creative, but that's what most often music education is all about, it's teaching songs for the events, setting them up in a line and singing.

22.50 SM: You’ve touch upon many topics and thank you, just to start with, first, do you think that in order to teach creativity, the teacher has also to be creative in that subject?

23.05 STL: I think, yes.

23.08 SM: For example, if someone wants to be, teaches painting, art, he also has to be creative as a teacher or painter? Or both?

23.21 STL: Because I teach painting [arts] too, the teacher may not necessarily be creative or very creative, but he has to be open to ideas, that is, the student may paint something, which OK, we have to get detached from giving a paper to the student and ask him to paint. Because I have taken some painting lessons with a Painter/Visual artist and my spirit has open up, there are some things... when you are not creative or open, the student may paint something and you may say, "This is not good, it doesn't look nice, clear it out, do it again" or... I will never do this, I mean, I let them progress, I help them, but I think you have to let them try and something that may not be considered creative or that it gives something – and a copy of something pre-existing is much better – to be different. I don't
know if you've met with Nikos Kouroushis, he is sculptor, visual artist, he has been involved with theatre some time ago, he is 76 years old now, he founded the Nikos Kouroushis Institute and Museum in Mitsero, with whom we collaborate and he visited our school and came to the painting [arts] classroom. The students' paintings were all on the board and he saw something that students did using leaves and making an unusual tree. And he said, "This is very good, who did it?" That is, he was impressed by something that someone else might reject saying, "They used leaves, really? Wouldn't it be better to make a nice tree that is more visible?"

| 25.39  | SM: Does the same apply to music? | 77 |
| 25.41  | STL: Yes, I think it does apply. | 78 |
| 25.45  | SM: Could you give me an example similar to what you said about painting? You may not have exactly the same example, but... | 79 |
| 25.56  | STL: For example, having a song and we have to orchestrate it. A creative student may think, "Miss, why don't we cut here or using that percussion, something that..." Well, something that we may think that it doesn't fit with the song, or "Why don't we sing it this way, differently?" Or changing the melody. | 80 |
| 26.39  | SM: You are not a devoted music teacher, right? | 81 |
| 26.40  | STL: No. | 82 |
| 26.41  | SM: You teach other subjects? | 83 |
| 26.44  | STL: Yes, neither do I have advanced musical knowledge, only what I've been taught at the university and at the school. | 84 |
| 26.53  | SM: Which university? | 85 |
| 26.54  | STL: University of Cyprus. | 86 |

School environment
Divergent thinking
Song, orchestration
Alternative thinking
Melodic embellishment
Definition
Music
Melodic embellishment
Background
Musical knowledge
Background
Studies
Background
| Time | SM: Is teaching music something that the head teacher asked you to do? How does this go? | STL: When there is no... sometimes the head teacher may impose it, yes, as is the case this year, because last year there was a colleague who had more musical knowledge and took over music teaching. Before the coming of this colleague, I was responsible for the music teaching. This year, since no colleague has any special musical knowledge, the Head teacher said, "OK, each teacher will take over the music teaching of his classroom." So I took it over, because there was no one and I knew there was no one else [with musical knowledge], because I already had some experience with the choir I said "OK, I will take over the choir", I committed myself to this, it was my decision and I asked to take over one more class, the higher grades – fifth and sixth grades are grouped in the same classroom – along with the fourth grade to work all together and assemble a rudimentary choir for the events. After all, this is what matters in the Primary education. |
| 26.57 | 87 | 88 |
| Time | Head teacher | Musical knowledge | School policy/environment |
|  | Music subject | Initiative to teach music | Background |
|  | School events | School environment | Assessment |
| 28.04 | SM: You mean school events? | 89 |  | |
| 28.05 | STL: Well, yes, unfortunately yes, having songs to present in the school events. | 90 | School events | Singing | School environment |
| 28.11 | SM: I would like you to talk to me about the events in a moment, please tell me how was your studies in terms of music creativity? Did they help you? Did they teach you to teach creatively? | 91 |  |  |  |  |
| 28.26 | STL: Well, OK, in the "Music Teaching II" at the university, yes, I may say that it helped me with teaching the meter with pictures, the beats. OK, I think they do have a form of creativity | 92 | University, studies, music course | Background |  |  |
| 28.52 | SM: How about assessing creativity? | 93 |  |  |  |  |
| 28.56 | STL: No, not at all. | 94 |  |  |  |  |
SM: I'm not talking necessarily about giving a mark, but...

STL: Yes, because anyway there is no written assessment in Primary education.

SM: Can you talk to me a bit about school events? If you could give me your opinion?

STL: Well, OK, in school events there should be presented two to three songs. In smaller schools, like the one I currently am, because... high grade students are obliged to be in the choir and orchestra; there is no choice, "You will be in the choir, you will not" as it is in other schools. You have to find students of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades to form your choir...and in every event you have to present... Christmas and end-of-the-year are the big events, you present songs that fit with the theme of the event. OK, usually if the end-of-the-year event is Cypriot theatre, you pretty much have to find Cypriot songs, for example, for the choir. For the Christmas event you usually do classic carols and some other songs.

SM: Why don't you consider it creative, as you said before?

STL: If it could be taken into consideration what students like, even though the teacher...well, I do try to do this, I try to choose songs that are more pleasant or that I do like and consider that the students will also like them [smile], but it doesn't always work like this. OK, in the previous years I had the opportunity... my former Head teachers did trust me and let me choose [the songs]. I don't know what will happen this year, because the...
situation is different... or if she will give me specific songs and tell me, "You know, for the Christmas [event] I want you to do Cypriot carols, I want you to do this song." OK, well enough, I will do it; the song may not satisfy all the students. Or the other problem is that, you are required...the students are required to participate in the choir and sing, whether they like it or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32:29</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>All of the students?</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:31</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>From fourth grade and higher yes. They don't have an alternative option to say, &quot;I don't want to.&quot;</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:35</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Let me ask you, if something that you prepare and present does not satisfy the Head teacher or the colleagues or the parents, what happens? Is there any effect on you? Directly or not?</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:57</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>OK, it has to be something... it may have consequences, for example if the Head teacher doesn't like it, neither will the inspector who may come to watch it, OK, may reproach you or... however, this never happened to me. The only thing I've had about three or four years ago, when we did the song ‘Accordion’ at the event of the 28th of October. The Head teacher did not say anything, but a colleague told me, &quot;You know, you shouldn't have taught this song for the 28th of October, which says fight against fascism, it's written about the Revolt of the Polytechnic, not about the 28th of October,&quot; and after doing a search I found that it's among the songs that may be taught for the 28th of October, it was one of the songs that I wanted to teach, I read about the history of the song, I told her, &quot;You are wrong, I wanted to teach it for the meaning of the lyrics, I think it is appropriate [for this event]&quot; and that was it.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:05</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>So it was clearly a matter of political beliefs.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:09</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>I don't know, maybe yes. I've never had, though... Or for example the song about April's 1st, it's a song I've never taught and I don't want to teach it [laughs]. No one forced me to teach it, but even otherwise, I will still not teach it [laughs]. I choose the songs.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:34</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>How are your relations with the other colleagues?</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>STL: OK, fine. Particularly about music, the previous years I used to ask other musicians' help to find unusual songs [for the events], the colleagues congratulated me: &quot;Bravo, the songs that you choose are very good&quot;, I mean they were impressed because we didn't do the ordinary...</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:09</td>
<td>SM: The most common?</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:02</td>
<td>STL: ‘Golden-green leaf’ and I don't know what...</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:09</td>
<td>SM: In an activity that you do with the students, it may be a preparation for an event or anything else, what is more important for you? Is there something that is more important for you?</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:24</td>
<td>STL: for me it's important to get something that is aesthetically pleasant, to be decently presented and be something that I like, so that I can transmit it to the students to sing and enjoy it.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Aesthetic pleasant Decent performance Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:49</td>
<td>SM: So, you focus mainly on the result of the activity?</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:52</td>
<td>STL: Well, even though it shouldn't be this way, because it is something that you will present it, at the back of your mind you always think of how it will be. And you feel the 'pressure' of the head teacher who will come and see the rehearsals, &quot;How is going to be? Will it sound good? Is it good like this?.&quot; You feel this pressure, so you ignore the preparation, of how you will take it to the level that you want.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Presentation, performance pressure, stress, preparation, focus on the output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:30</td>
<td>Short break</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:02</td>
<td>SM: As an educator, and particularly as an educator who teaches music, do you consider yourself responsible for the development of the students' creativity?</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:17</td>
<td>STL: Yes, to some degree yes. I think I ought to promote their creativity because I do believe in creativity, that is, I believe we have to let the students generally be creative because it's... in all subjects not just in music, therefore, since I teach music, yes I think I...</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Teachers’ Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:45</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Why, though, particularly in music? You've mentioned the other subjects, do you think it's...</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:51</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>In all subjects. I think it's our responsibility to promote the students' creativity; <strong>music</strong> <strong>may</strong> <strong>be</strong> <strong>more</strong> <strong>appropriate</strong>.</td>
<td>121 Music as more appropriate for developing creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:00</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Why? Why do you think this happens?</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:06</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>I think... first of all I think that music on its own is a creation, since music is a creation. And it's a subject that... OK, as we said there is no assessment in Primary education, but in other subjects you may want to let your students be creative, but you have to strictly follow the syllabus, in modern Greek for example, the students must learn the grammar and what's creative about it? OK, you may try to teach it creatively, which is fine, but you have a timeline, you are more restricted. In music, though, you don't have anything to restrict you, except what I told you before, the events, which must be done and I don't consider that...</td>
<td>123 Music as more creative than other subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:00</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>But in terms of the syllabus you are free?</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:02</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>In terms of the syllabus, yes, you are more free. And consequently, you may let your students cultivate their creativity.</td>
<td>125 Curriculum School policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:13</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Would you like to add anything else? I have three very short videos to show you that I would like you to comment on. But if you have something to tell me before going to the videos?</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:23</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>No, I think I'm fine.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:23</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>The first video... you may stop it at anytime.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>What do you think?</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:31</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>It is very creative because they try to find the rhythm with the sticks and it is a rhythmically driven and pleasant piece and I think it’s a very good way to teach to...</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:53</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>If you had to assess it in terms of creativity, on a scale from 1 to 10, what would it be? Could you do it?</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:03</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Seven, eight?</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:05</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>What could it make it even more creative?</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:09</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Well... creative and harder? If they are divided into two groups? Maybe half of the students should play the beat and the others the rhythm. OK, this would be harder.</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:33</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>So different arrangement?</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:34</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Yes. Perhaps they should have two different instruments so that they don't all play the sticks, [and] maybe the seating arrangement [should change].</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:36</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Let me play for you the second video and then the last one.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:40</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>This is much more creative.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:42</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Why though?</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:43</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Well, because they did their own orchestration... they collaborated with each other. They've probably prepared for it or, I don't know, it might have been spontaneous</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:57</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Maybe, I don't know the context. But let's, tell me your hypotheses.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:02</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>They improvised trying to make something that sounds good to their ears and, indeed, they achieved it, [or, at least,] they were about to achieve it.</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>SM: The fact that it was satisfying for them possibly, but to the ears of an adult, or the educator to be specific, is not, would it influence you in terms of how you would assess the result or the process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04:15</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:35</td>
<td>STL: Personally, no, it wouldn't influence me. I take into consideration their age and the fact that they.... they didn't seem to make sounds independent of each other; it was as if they were collaborating to do something and I consider it both creative and worthwhile; it may be highly assessed as long as an adult has to assess it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:11</td>
<td>SM: A couple of things: could you give a mark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:13</td>
<td>STL: Yes, since I gave seven to the other one, I would give eight or nine to this one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:19</td>
<td>SM: Because you talked about their age, does the age of the child influence you in order to assess or judge whether he is creative or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:38</td>
<td>STL: I try to compare it to what I listen to. I mean, considering the age of children I saw, I think what they've tried to do is much more creative for their age. It's something similar to what I told you about painting. That is, if a child of 6 to 7 years old, can paint a tree the way he does, I will not compare it to that of a 12- or 14-year-old one, this is something that happens, educators do it, and tell him, &quot;No, it's not good, try harder.&quot; I think you have to bear in mind the age of the children. This one I think is very creative for the age of the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:31</td>
<td>SM: And the last one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:27</td>
<td>STL: I find it very rhythmic song, I don't know if it's because I have a personal experience and I like it and it's nice that she [teacher] added movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:39</td>
<td>SM: Do you consider it creative? Generally, the whole thing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:41</td>
<td>STL: Well, OK, to the extent that a choir and an orchestra can be creative... the fact that she believe me it's not easy; it's very hard to manage doing both – singing a rhythmic song</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and doing movement – it is something that I've tried myself, after suggestions of a musician friend and I know. The students seem that they enjoy it, I think it's creative. OK, as we said, it's a choir and an orchestra; this setup is as creative as it could be.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:34</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>How could it be more creative?</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:36</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Yes, it could.</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:38</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>That is? How? Please tell me.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:40</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>It's not easy.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>That is, you suggest this activity has a limit [in terms of creativity], if I could put it this way?</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:01</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:02</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Which she managed to achieve the top in this particular activity, the performance, the interpretation?</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Yes. I don't know, maybe she could have done something more creative. For example, last year at the end-of-the-year event, we were to sing 'Children's painting the wall.' We did movements, I asked a musician friend, we included movements and the friend asked me, &quot;Why don't you have a child painting while singing it?&quot; So I asked from my student who doesn't speak very good Greek, so it would have been hard for him to sing it, but he is very good in painting, we put a canvas, I gave him colours and he was painting while we were singing and in the background we had projected the students' paintings that we did about peace. Our theme was about peace, we did Lyssistrati and our theme was peace. And all students of the school did their paintings about peace, I used movie-maker and we presented it this way. I'm not sure if I have the video. It was as much creative as it could be, I think.</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:36</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>I would like to thank you very much. Is there anything else that you would like to add?</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>STL</td>
<td>I think that's it pretty much. I hope I was helpful.</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:52</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Thank you very much!</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII

Qualitative Content Analysis Example: From Meaning Units to Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Meaning Unit</th>
<th>Condensed Meaning Unit</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>it is a video that we made with the students of the fourth level. [...] I thought that, as an attempt to attract their interest and to introduce them to the percussion instruments, we could do something that they wanted. [...] &quot;Miss, let's do ‘Despacito’, re-orchestrate it, do it as we like&quot;, anyway, we added original lyrics in Greek Cypriot, we used percussion and we made a video in which we made over Despacito. That's it.</td>
<td>Using the students' favourite song as a motivation, aiming to introduce them to the percussion instruments, adopting orchestration, lyric writing and video recording.</td>
<td>Playing percussion instruments</td>
<td>Students’ reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyric-writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Musical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various/Non-musical activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Making sound stories I also think is creative, [...] you start with a story and you add sounds with objects, papers, or [...] we may go to the ‘health education’ classroom and</td>
<td>Such an activity provides the opportunity for experimentation with non-musical instruments</td>
<td>Sound stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-musical instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musical activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use the pots to make music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STL</th>
<th>Realising that they can produce music with anything, not just with musical instruments, I think it's creative on its own.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>Last year at the end-of-the-year [school] event, we were to sing 'Children's painting the wall.' We did [included] movements, I asked [the opinion of] a musician friend [...] and my friend asked me &quot;Why don't you have a child painting while singing it?&quot; So I asked from my student who doesn't speak very good Greek [...] but he is very good in painting, we put a canvas, I gave him colours and he was painting while we were singing and in the background we had projected the students' paintings that we did about peace. Our theme was about peace, [...] and all students of the school did their paintings about peace, I used a movie-maker and we presented it this way [...]. It was as much creative as it could be, I think.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities need to trigger the students' interest and let them develop divergent thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Students' reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divergent thinking</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using sonic objects/non-musical instrumental</td>
<td>Musical activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STL | The combination of subjects (inter-disciplinarity), such as music, art and dancing, raises the level of creativity |
| Singing | Musical activities |
| Body movements | Various/Non-musical activities |
| Dancing | Painting |
## Appendix IX

### Qualitative Content Analysis Example: From Codes and Categories to Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Self-action</th>
<th>Video-making</th>
<th>Dislike of “traditional”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>Emotional satisfaction</td>
<td>Students’ choice</td>
<td>Body-movements</td>
<td>songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric-writing</td>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>Satisfaction/enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Making instruments</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mask-making</td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impersonate roles</td>
<td>Ecstatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amusement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing-along/Accompanying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Musical activities</td>
<td>Product/Output</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Various/Non-musical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td><em>Music teachers adopt a wide range of activities that they consider creative. The most important elements an activity needs to have in order to be considered creative is to promote the students’ self-action, autonomy and initiatives, enabling them to come up with original outputs</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix X

Interview Protocol

Questions for video excerpts/vignettes

- What do you think about this activity?
- What is your opinion about the output of this activity?
- Would you consider this kind of activity as creative? Why?
- How would you rate the creative quality of this process and its output?

General Questions

• Creativity and Music creativity:
  - When you hear the word creativity, what comes to your mind? What do you consider as creative? How would you define creativity? Examples?
  - What do you think someone needs to have in order to be creative?
  - What makes you think of something as a piece of art or just an object? In the case of music, when is something creative music and when noise?
  - Do you consider creativity as important?
  - Do you think that an idea or an object/output, in order to be considered as creative, should be useful?
  - Do you consider creativity (general) as different from music creativity?
  - What do you consider as creative thinking in music?
  - What do you consider as creative musical activity in music? Examples?
  - Do you think that your college/university studies prepared you to:
    - Teach creatively?
    - Teach creativity?
    - Assess creativity?

• Music creativity in education:
  - Do you think creativity can be taught?
    - If yes, how?
    - If not, why?
  - Do you think there are important factors for developing musical creativity in education?
    - What is the role/importance of the teacher?
    - What is the role/importance of the environment? E.g., family?
    - What is the role/importance of the student him/herself?
  - Do you think that in order to teach creativity, the teacher has to be creative him/herself?
  - Are there any course subjects that relate more to creativity than others?
    - Are there any course subjects that contribute more than other courses ro develop creativity?

• Process or Product:
  - As a music teacher, what do you consider to be more important: the (creative) process or the (creative) product? Why?
  - Does the age/level/knowledge/background of the student influence you when assessing the product and/or the process?
• Supporting/Nurturing/Developing the students’ creativity:
  - Have you ever noticed if some students need motivation to attempt to create?
  - Do you think that it is possible to offer students motivation to be creative or to develop their creativity?
    - If yes, how?
    - If not, why?
  - Do you involve creativity in your teaching?
    - If yes, how?
    - If not, why?
  - Is creativity your goal when teaching?
  - Do you use any particular methods to develop your students’ creativity?
  - Are there any creative music activities that you consider more important/creative than others?
  - Do you teach improvisation and composition?
    - If yes, how often?
    - If not, why?

• Assessing creativity:
  - Do you think there are factors/considerations that contribute positively or negatively to develop creative skills?
  - What is your opinion about:
    - Assessment/Evaluation
    - Surveillance
    - Competition/antagonism among students
    - Restrictions/limitations
    - Fear of making mistakes
  - Do you think assessment (in general) affects students?
  - What defines your expectations in the students’ assessment? What do you take into consideration?
  - Do you think creativity should be assessed?
  - Do you assess your students’ creativity?
    - If yes, what? What are your criteria?
    - Can you recall if your criteria change over time?
    - If no, why?

• What defines your expectations when assessing the students’ musical creativity?
  - Does the students’ age/knowledge/experience/skills influence your assessment?
  - Do you think music teachers should interfere in the students’ creative activity?

• Transferable or specific:
  - Do consider creativity as a general or as a particular skill? Do you think it could be transferred?

• Characteristics of creative students:
  - Do you consider creativity as a characteristic of every student?
  - Do you believe that musical ability could be developed by everyone?
  - Have you noticed if there are more- and less-creative students?
    - If yes, are there any particular characteristics that you have noticed?
    - Have you noticed if ‘naughty’ students are (more) creative?
  - What in your opinion defines our level of creativity?
  - Are there any particular factors? E.g., environment, personality, imagination, motivation?
  - Have you noticed if there is any difference in terms of creativity between boys or girls?
  - How do you manage your creative students?
• Do you have any different approach to them than others?
• Do you have more expectations?
• Should they be treated differently?
  o Do you think intelligence relates to creativity?
  o Have you noticed if there is any particular age/period that students are more or less creative?

• School programme on creativity:
  o What is your school policy about creativity?
    ▪ Does it place any emphasis on creativity?
    ▪ Is creativity development part of teachers’ responsibilities?
  o Do you believe creativity should be developed or, at least, attempted to be developed in schools?
    ▪ If yes, how?
  o Do you have any restrictions (practical or not) for developing music creativity at your school?

• Responsibility:
  o As a music teacher, do you consider yourself responsible for developing the students’ creativity?
    ▪ If yes, more responsible than other teachers?
    ▪ If not, why?
  o Do you think musical teachers’ expectations of the students’ creativity in music are greater than in other subjects?

• Are there any topics or experiences that we didn’t cover and you think are relevant to this interview?

• Do you have anything to add or clarify?

• THANK YOU!
Appendix XI

Participants’ Examples and Researcher’s Videos

Examples provided by the participants:

1. **SKR**: ‘Κόκκινα χείλη’ (‘Red Lips’) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RukopjRW-fM
   Accessed: 5 February 2017

2. **ELN**: brought with her four videos. Because of the limited time we had available, however, we discussed only three:
      Accessed: 13 April 2017
   b. ‘Μόνα μου Ελλάς (Τα παιδικά τα λόγια) ΡΕΜΠΕΤΙΚΟ.1983 Remaster’ [‘My mother Greece (Fake words) REBETIKO. 1983 Remastered’]
      https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zw6KUBtSGz4
      Accessed: 13 April 2017
   c. ‘Στέφανος Κορκολής «Sensitivities» (Solo Piano, Αθήναιδα, 15-3-2015)’ [‘Stefanos Korkolis «Sensitivities» (Solo Piano, Athinaida, 15-3-2015)’]
      https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YWM4foJWQjw
      Accessed: 13 April 2017

3. **KSN**: ‘Tom and Jerry: Chuck Jones Collection’
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tYirhC48hQY
   Accessed: 27 June 2017

   Accessed: 4 July 2017

5. **KZS**: did not have with him an example of a creative activity. The additional videos listed below were used as points for discussion.

6. **TBR**: brought handouts of activities that he designed and he considers creative, which even though he shared with me, he kindly asked to keep them unpublished.

7. **STL**: provided an original video recording of an activity (re-orchestrating and re-writing lyrics for ‘Despacito’) that she applied in her classroom, which however she did not make available online.

8. **NGL**: showed examples of students’ outputs (e.g. paper cranes) of activities that she apply in her teaching that she had in her classrooms

9. **KKS**: did not have with him an example of a creative activity. The additional videos listed below were used as points for discussion.

10. **MRA**: ‘Carnival of The Animals Complete Full Version Le Carnaval des Animaux Complet Camille Saint-Saëns’ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1L993HNAa8M
    Accessed: 8 December 2017

Additional videos provided by the interviewer/researcher as points for (further) discussion:

1. ‘Fifth Grade Lesson (part 2)’: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UAQ0hBZukKM
   Video accessed: 30 January 2017

2. ‘Μουσικής Αυτοσχεδιασμός 02 Γ Δ Τμήμα’ [‘Music Improvisation 02 C Grade 4th’]:
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qwuX0qES8vg
   Video accessed: 30 January 2017

3. ‘Α Δημοτικό Σχολείο Τρικάλων – ‘Rock around the clock’ – YouTube’ [‘A Trikalon Primary School’]: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5kiDJtGcAZ8
   Video accessed: 30 January 2017
Appendix XII

Summaries of participants’ major findings
# Practices, activities and beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELN</th>
<th>KSN</th>
<th>KZS</th>
<th>SKR</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>STL</th>
<th>TBR</th>
<th>NCL</th>
<th>KKS</th>
<th>MPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principle elements that make an activity creative for ELN are challenge that brings motivation (and thus enjoyment and satisfaction), application of inter-disciplinary, such as dancing and acting, and encouragement of discussion/poor-assessment in order to achieve these. The teacher's skill, knowledge and confidence are seen as necessary. ELN puts the responsibility for creative music teaching on the educators' willingness to grow, to continue to learn and enrich their teaching material and approach.</td>
<td>Frequently providing opportunities for students' creative expression that are enjoyable and within the teacher's specific instructions is crucial for nurturing their creativity. In addition to knowledge and skill development, such opportunities boost students' confidence and make students generally more open to music and its composition, in particular.</td>
<td>Exploring students' curiosity is one of the most important prerequisites for creativity. Introducing students to unfamiliar performances, performances and musical instruments are some of the means by which KZS attempts to spark students' curiosity, enrich their experience and knowledge of the Arts and cultivate their critical thinking in what makes, for us, a piece of music remarkable.</td>
<td>Practices and activities that SKR considers creative in music education are those that incorporate other forms of art and disciplines. Those encouraging students to be independent and take initiatives – rather than mechanically repeating something – and those encouraging discussion, or even argumentation, among the students. E.g. lyre-in-strings, orchestration, composition, instrumental and vocal performance.</td>
<td>For CPA, we all have the ability to be creative; acquiring creative skills, however, takes time and hard effort. A good music teacher needs to be musically knowledgeable, to continually evolve, to love music as a kind of art and as an educational subject and to have good instrumental skills and an artistic approach to the subject.</td>
<td>The practices and activities that STL considers creative and applies to her teaching methods are lyrical writing, orchestration, sound-stories, experimentation and music-making with various objects, as well as listening to music and identification of the instrumentation, characters, and also involving interdisciplinarity. In order to stimulate students' motivation, STL also uses songs that they like, something that satisfies both herself and the students.</td>
<td>Creativity for TBR, that is, students' unconstrained thinking based on the teachers' particular instructions, is best nurtured and demonstrated when they have opportunities to present their skills in activities in which they act freely, experiment, take initiatives and work collaboratively. These activities include music games, particularly for very young students, combined with dancing, acting and painting, singing, as well as composition and improvisation. The last two activities, in particular, are considered by TBR as the most creative and need to be adopted more often in primary education. It is important for students to enjoy the lesson and, for this reason, the teacher has to listen to and implement their musical performance requests when necessary.</td>
<td>The activities which NCL uses (e.g. instrumental experimentation, body movement and combination of music with dancing and acting) aim to contribute to students' personal development, emotional maturity, self-confidence and to promote divergent thinking, which they may apply elsewhere in their lives.</td>
<td>Creativity calls for open-mindedness, inspiration and a free spirit, generally in terms of one's character but, also, as an educator and musician.</td>
<td>Creativity, for MPA, may be nurtured, regardless of whether or not the teacher is creative with respect to the subject of music, as long as there is an appropriate environment where students may apply their imagination through experimentation, singing, instrumental accompaniment, the making of musical instruments and combining music with other subjects, such as art and acting: all are means of ultimately expressing themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|...|...|...|...|...|...|...|...|...|...|
even if the teachers are not creative as musicians, they at least need to be able to recognise the importance of creativity. However, if an educator is creative as a person, then creativity will find a way to emerge in his teaching.

Being creative as a music educator is necessary to successfully prepare the students for participation in school events.

The students' creative skills are much more likely to grow in Primary education where they do not have to worry about examinations, as opposed to the Secondary education and this makes KSN feel even more responsible for her students' creative skill development.

which students need to follow. These parameters form the major criteria with which KSN evaluates the creative output of his students.

that may involve students in the lesson. However, developing creative thinking and abilities depends on the students' own desires, as the teacher simply provides guidance.

possible.
## Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education teachers who teach music only</th>
<th>General education teachers who may teach music (along with other subjects)</th>
<th>Music teachers (who teach only music)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELN</strong></td>
<td><strong>KSN</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Initiatives and alternative approaches to an activity, which are within the teacher’s instructions, have a decisive role in what is considered creative. As for the activity itself, student seating arrangement is important for stimulating their interest and motivation. Routine activities may become more interesting and movement is added. ELN’s focus in assessing students’ creativity seems to be variable sometimes it is on the process while at other times, it is on the product. In fact, the age of the students seems to be an influence to the extent that students output or the process they followed is considered creative.</td>
<td>Creativity in KSN’s classroom is often assessed by the students, a means of sharpening their critical thinking, which is important for developing creative skills. As for the participant himself, students’ creativity is judged as to whether they followed the teacher’s instructions or not, however, their input, initiatives, and ideas, and generally, going beyond the teacher’s instructions, increase the level of creativity. Otherwise, the activity is considered preliminary. For KSN, product, process and students’ enjoyment of the activity are taken into consideration when assessing creativity. Apparently, the music teacher’s background and taste define their criteria for what makes a student’s output creative and to what extent.</td>
<td>Both the process and the product have an influence on whether or not an activity is considered creative. Independence and initiative on the part of the student also play a decisive role in considering an activity and its result to be creative. The instructions of the educator are determining factors when it comes to allowing room for the student’s independent action and initiative, thus making an activity potentially creative. Sophisticated orchestration and arrangement of a music performance, particularly if these are the result of a collective work with the students, influence the creative level both of the process and the end product. The activity of instrumental or sonic object construction, as well as sound and/or melodic exploration, which, however, has a particular educational goal, also contributes to the creativity level of an activity. Passion, interaction and true engagement with the music ensemble while performing, that is, flow, are considered indicators of high levels of creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSN</strong></td>
<td><strong>KSD</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both the process and the product have an influence on whether or not an activity is considered creative. Independence and initiative on the part of the student also play a decisive role in considering an activity and its result to be creative. The instructions of the educator are determining factors when it comes to allowing room for the student’s independent action and initiative, thus making an activity potentially creative. Sophisticated orchestration and arrangement of a music performance, particularly if these are the result of a collective work with the students, influence the creative level both of the process and the end product. The activity of instrumental or sonic object construction, as well as sound and/or melodic exploration, which, however, has a particular educational goal, also contributes to the creativity level of an activity. Passion, interaction and true engagement with the music ensemble while performing, that is, flow, are considered indicators of high levels of creativity.</td>
<td>While KSN values the process more than the product when teaching, her focus shifts when it comes to preparing for school events. As for what influences her decision about what makes the students’ process more or less creative in an activity, this is based on the students demonstrating initiative, alternative approaches and viewpoints, emotions, sensitivity and enjoyment.</td>
<td>The context the teacher sets up strongly defines the level of creativity in an activity, and thus the context also defines both the process and the output of an activity. Both the process and the product of a musical activity seem to be important to CPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSD</strong></td>
<td><strong>SKP</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While KSN values the process more than the product when teaching, her focus shifts when it comes to preparing for school events. As for what influences her decision about what makes the students’ process more or less creative in an activity, this is based on the students demonstrating initiative, alternative approaches and viewpoints, emotions, sensitivity and enjoyment.</td>
<td>For STL, both original and non-original performance activities and outputs are considered creative. However, when students perform non-original music, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, the students’ enjoyment of the activity and the involvement of other subjects influence her judgment regarding the level of creativity. When it comes to activities that include experimentation, improvisation, composition and original contribution, then students’ independence, self-satisfaction and age influence her judgment.</td>
<td>For STL, both original and non-original performance activities and outputs are considered creative. However, when students perform non-original music, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, the students’ enjoyment of the activity and the involvement of other subjects influence her judgment regarding the level of creativity. When it comes to activities that include experimentation, improvisation, composition and original contribution, then students’ independence, self-satisfaction and age influence her judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKP</strong></td>
<td><strong>GLA</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The context the teacher sets up strongly defines the level of creativity in an activity, and thus the context also defines both the process and the output of an activity. Both the process and the product of a musical activity seem to be important to CPA.</td>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPA</strong></td>
<td><strong>GTP</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For STL, both original and non-original performance activities and outputs are considered creative. However, when students perform non-original music, the aesthetic pleasure of the output, the students’ enjoyment of the activity and the involvement of other subjects influence her judgment regarding the level of creativity. When it comes to activities that include experimentation, improvisation, composition and original contribution, then students’ independence, self-satisfaction and age influence her judgment.</td>
<td>STL assesses creativity on the basis of the students’ devotion and engagement with an activity; the more the students go beyond the instructions they were given, the more creative they are. In addition, activities have to allow students to act freely, either individually or collectively, and to promote originality in order to be considered creative.</td>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GTP</strong></td>
<td><strong>NGL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
<td>The product of an activity seems to be indicative for TBR. Furthermore, the more the students make good use of the knowledge that she provides in an activity, the more creative she considers the output. The students’ background is also an influence on TBR’s assessment of creativity. Furthermore, unusual activities or elements in an activity contribute to the development of students’ creativity. However, students’ independence and effort to produce an original output through which they externalise their personality, is what influences TBR’s assessment and perception of creativity the most.</td>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGL</strong></td>
<td><strong>KNS</strong></td>
<td><strong>NDF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The product of an activity seems to be indicative for TBR. Furthermore, the more the students make good use of the knowledge that she provides in an activity, the more creative she considers the output. The students’ background is also an influence on TBR’s assessment of creativity. Furthermore, unusual activities or elements in an activity contribute to the development of students’ creativity. However, students’ independence and effort to produce an original output through which they externalise their personality, is what influences TBR’s assessment and perception of creativity the most.</td>
<td>Students’ initiative and self-expression when performing influence KNS in assessing their creativity. As for the activities, as long as they provide opportunities for students to contribute and produce original output (introducing them also to music with which they may not be familiar), then they are considered to be creative.</td>
<td>NDF assesses creativity on the basis of the students’ devotion and engagement with an activity; the more the students go beyond the instructions they were given, the more creative they are. In addition, activities have to allow students to act freely, either individually or collectively, and to promote originality in order to be considered creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNS</strong></td>
<td><strong>NDF</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ initiative and self-expression when performing influence KNS in assessing their creativity. As for the activities, as long as they provide opportunities for students to contribute and produce original output (introducing them also to music with which they may not be familiar), then they are considered to be creative.</td>
<td>The product of an activity seems to be indicative for TBR. Furthermore, the more the students make good use of the knowledge that she provides in an activity, the more creative she considers the output. The students’ background is also an influence on TBR’s assessment of creativity. Furthermore, unusual activities or elements in an activity contribute to the development of students’ creativity. However, students’ independence and effort to produce an original output through which they externalise their personality, is what influences TBR’s assessment and perception of creativity the most.</td>
<td>TBR’s feedback and criteria for assessing creativity, these are based on the objectives of the lesson and the extent to which the students stepped beyond the instructions they had been given. While the process may be considered as important as the product, at least as previously stated, the final product is what is born in mind when assessing students’ creativity and their efficiency in general. Experimentation, improvisation and implementation of body movements can upgrade the level of creativity. Giving to the students the opportunity to act autonomously and devise an output in their own way, is what matters the most for TBR. The aestheticism of the output does play a significant role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confidence, social skills and relationships with other students, as well as age are important factors that influence the creative behaviour of students. Intelligence, on the other hand, seems to be irrelevant to creativity for ELN, as creativity is a different kind of intelligence for her.

The age of the student may relate to their creative output: the older the children, the more musically creative they are.

General education teachers who teach music only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELN</th>
<th>KSN</th>
<th>KZS</th>
<th>SKR</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>STL</th>
<th>TBR</th>
<th>NGL</th>
<th>KKS</th>
<th>MRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence, social skills and relationships with other students, as well as age are important factors that influence the creative behaviour of students. Intelligence, on the other hand, seems to be irrelevant to creativity for ELN, as creativity is a different kind of intelligence for her.</td>
<td>KSN shares the belief of multiple intelligences and explained that being intelligent when it comes to music, does not mean that the student will also be intelligent in other subjects, and the opposite will also be true.</td>
<td>Students who do not need the teacher’s push or external motivation, but from their own interest in, and curiosity about, something which is inherent and genuine, are usually creative.</td>
<td>Quiet and isolated students may be very creative, even though this does not preclude the opposite, that is, students exhibiting loud and extrovert behaviour may also be creative.</td>
<td>Creativity is not an escape for students who may not be interested in something, as well as a means of expression.</td>
<td>Creativity is thought of as a form of intelligence, measured here in relation to the students’ performance in the subjects of Greek and mathematics, but this fact does not necessarily make it transferable to other subjects.</td>
<td>Creativity is not influenced by age: the desire to create and the performance level are the same at all ages.</td>
<td>Creativity does not relate to behavioural characteristics and nor to age.</td>
<td>Creativity, for STL, is a form of intelligence, but intelligence is not prerequisite for being creative. In addition, an instinctive sense of rhythm is also a characteristic of creative students, as well as self-driven behaviour, independence, observance, curiosity and alertness.</td>
<td>Creativity, for NGL, is not a prerequisite for creativity; self-confidence and the ability to express yourself and take decisions on your own are the most influential characteristics of creative students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The domain issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education teachers who teach music only</th>
<th>General education teachers who may teach music (along with other subjects)</th>
<th>Music teachers (who teach only music)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>KSN</td>
<td>KZS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity, as a particular kind of intelligence, can be developed, or 'taught', as ELN explains, yet it may take time and hard work. Once developed, though, this kind of intelligence can 'transcend' and be applied generally into someone's life.</td>
<td>Creativity for KSN is not transferable, even though one may have the eye to judge the quality of something; one has to practise hard in that area to achieve creative performance.</td>
<td>Musical creativity comes under the big umbrella of human creative thinking; therefore, musically creative students will also be creative in other areas as long as they are attracted to, and interested in, them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELN</th>
<th>KSN</th>
<th>KZS</th>
<th>SKR</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>STL</th>
<th>TBR</th>
<th>NOL</th>
<th>KKS</th>
<th>NRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General education teachers who teach music only**
- Music education in Cyprus is full of numerous events, which encourage the students to participate in music teaching. As a result, most of the music time is devoted to voice interpretation and instrumental playing, bypassing other activities and skill development. However, KSN considers participating in school events to be a music teacher’s duty, because performance is an integral element of music education. As for the environment of the schools regarding music and music teachers, KSN made it clear that successful performances at school events are vital for the music teachers’ professional image.
- It has also emerged that the better the music of the choir and the orchestra in an event, the better the quality of the school’s education, and thus the head teacher’s management. As a consequence, school music event performances need to be at the | There is a rather unhealthy school environment, particularly for music educators, with music being underestimated as a subject. This devaluation, however, seems to give some freedom to the teachers in terms of the level of musical performance, which allows the teachers to express their creativity. Yet the fact that music teachers are responsible for preparing students to present songs at the numerous school events means that an excessive amount of teaching time is taken up and much stress is caused, something that contributes possibility to adding more value to the product than the process of music activities. |
| **General education teachers who may teach music (along with other subjects)**
- Showcasing a good music result in the school events that the head teacher found pleasing while also achieving happiness for the students and satisfying the teachers, in terms of the level of musical performance, is a task that requires a combination of musical and non-musical skills. KZS expressed his annoyance about the numerous school obligations that require choir and orchestral performances, an issue that may hinder the teachers’ personal agendas and career development prospects. |
| **Music teachers (who teach only music)**
- Teaching time in music education is devoted to teaching songs, most of them represented for the students as well as for the teachers, for the numerous school events. Unfortunately, even though there is no restriction in terms of the syllabus, since school events reflect the school’s image and its educational quality, no time remains for allowing students to contribute their own input or try something different, thereby nurturing a creative process. Moreover, the focus of the teacher remains attached to the product. |
| School events are very expensive, both for teachers and for the students. Music is used as a strategy to relieve students of their academic stress. As a matter of fact, students do not enjoy the process, which does not allow space for experimentation. Furthermore, while colleagues generally support each other, NOL has heard of cases in which music is undervalued. Finally, the category of music teacher, established about 30 years ago, will soon be disappear. With the music specialist educators taking their positions. |

### Notes
- Music teachers experience a lot of pressure to prepare students for various formal school events. In addition, the higher the quality of the students’ performances, the more appreciation music teachers receive from their colleagues, and thus the pressure may be greater. Furthermore, such school events require much time, something that eliminates the possibilities for including activities that are required for preparing for the events.
- Preparing for school events may give rise to tension among colleagues. The greatest issue regarding the school environment that negatively influences creativity in music is the numerous school events.
- KKS acknowledges that audience attendance is a great pressure for him.
- KKS’s emphasis is on output, since the output defines his own capabilities as a music teacher.

---
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highest possible level and they also reflect the music teacher's work and capabilities.

Accordingly, a music teacher often shifts his/her focus from the process to the result when preparing students for school events. And, even though the music teacher may want to engage students in a creative process, while preparing them for a school event, the pressure of time, the difficulties of class management and usually the level of students' musical knowledge, hold him back and drive him to the 'easy way out' of presenting a simplified orchestrated song, just to fulfill the obligation.
Creativity for ELN seems to be an evolving term, currently related to the ‘demolition’ of anything established or standard, thus generating new knowledge or product. Important elements that bring this about are inspiration and motivation, and important elements that arise from this are the students’ satisfaction and personal development.

A variety of musical activities is necessary in order to be used to prepare students to make their own creations and to move from the structured to the unstructured. Experimentation is also considered to be a creative activity as long as it is within a context. The context within which students are expected to function, in order to create, is, in fact, what makes assessment, to some extent, achievable.

Musical creativity, for KZS, is a branch of a man’s general creativity ‘tree’; it is also considered to be the application of students’ own ideas, critical thinking and self-assessment in any musical activity which, ultimately, brings enjoyment and satisfaction to the student.

Music creativity is defined as any process that encourages the students’ initiatives and self-actions, in which they have the opportunity to apply their alternative approach or points of view and, eventually, to produce an output that they like and they enjoyed making.

CPA has a wide-ranging perspective on music creativity. This perspective encompasses various activities besides improvisation and composition, for example, singing. Generally, however, activities, such as singing, in which students are not required to devise novel products are considered skills and knowledge-builders for the students, in which, however, even the slightest purposeful deviation from its original interpretation and/or performance may be thought of as creative.

Students’ self-action and original output seem to be crucial in what defines creativity, as it repeatedly emerged in STL’s interview.

Creativity, for TBR, is connected to students’ independent individual or collective acting, where they have the opportunity to apply their unconstrained thinking and imagination, either by using musical instruments, their voice, or their body, to come up with a result that they like.

NGL defines creativity as the process in which the students act freely, take initiatives, listen to music and use their bodies to express themselves, thereby, producing an output that, as we have seen, may or may not be related to music.

Keeping in mind that performances at school events are the primary goal of KKS’s teaching, then, being able to reach a musically satisfactory result in terms of rhythm and intonation is, in fact, creative, something that causes him to focus on the result, rather than the process.
Appendix XIII

Researcher’s beliefs towards understanding of creativity

My theory of music creativity acknowledges that the simplest transmission and reception of musical ideas, even without audience, just with the performer – to whatever level – he/she, is in some sense creative. Based on this understanding of creativity, the following paragraphs outline what I consider to be influential in defining and assessing a musical creative output or behaviour.

As mentioned earlier, despite the controversy, creativity in general is most often defined by novelty or originality and appropriateness or usefulness; in educational settings, however, where Little-c should be the focus it has also been defined as a desirable way of thinking and “imagination successfully manifested in any valued pursuit” (Odena, 2012, pp. 29-30). It is my assumption that the music teachers’ criteria will still be close to the two generally accepted core elements, that is: (a) novelty/originality/imagination/desirable way of thinking and (b) usefulness/appropriateness; however, the extent to which whether one of the two or both is/are applied when evaluating a student’s creativity is defined by their expectations based on the particular factors outlined below.

Based on the four main approaches to studying creativity and my experience as a music teacher, my assumption is that among the influences that most probably define the music teachers’ approach to evaluating a creative output are (1) the teacher’s and student’s background particularities, i.e. music skills, experience and knowledge, that is, the Persons; (2) the music activity, e.g. composition, improvisation, performance, (3) the style of the music being evaluated and (4) the place/environment in which students perform, as well as where they are being taught/prepared to practice their music skills and knowledge. All of these define the expectations of the evaluator; therefore, since we accept that every child is different
and, thus, the circumstances of the music activity to be judged are probably never exactly the same, I suspect that the music teachers’ perception and approach to evaluating creativity may be, or should be, in a constant flux within a dynamic continuum shaped by: the Person (e.g. age, music background), the activity and the style/genre of the activity and the setting in which it takes place (e.g. in-class activity or ceremonial performance).

My assumptions outline also my position as a researcher and my biases in this study, as they derive from my so far experience as a musician, teacher and PhD student. As Court (2013) puts it, “the researcher, (...) is inevitably both enriched and bound by his or her subjectivity” (p. 8). According to Locke, Spirduso, and Silverman (2013), however, the researcher’s subjectivity, background, experiences, ideas, prejudices and personal philosophies are part of the richness of qualitative data and may sometimes be useful to the study; “if accounted for in advance of the study, [they] enhance the transparency of possible research bias” (Smith & Noble, 2014, p. 100). Thus, I believe my understanding of the multiple music contexts and my roles as a musician enhance my awareness, knowledge and sensitivity to many of the misconceptions about creativity and assist me in the data gathering and objective analysis. I possess knowledge as a music student, composer, improviser and orchestrator/arranger and teacher which, I believe, puts me in a position to identify thoughts and beliefs coming from both “Western” and “Eastern” perspectives of music creativity and gather and analyse data with eyes wide open. Without deviating from the methods of qualitative research, my assumptions do not form a kind of theory that the designed method used to test; my initial intentions are espoused with the posture suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1985) as a researcher “not knowing what is not known” (p. 235). However, I cannot ignore what I have come to experience after more than seven years of studying music at a university level and for four years of music teaching from the Primary School to adult education.
However, as justifiable or inevitable as it is for a researcher to have his own assumptions, this does not suggest that the researcher should impose them on the interviewees and, particularly later, in analysing and interpreting data, setting up a self-fulfilling prophecy. Instead, as Asselin (2003) suggests – and is integral in a phenomenological study – I acknowledge my assumptions and “bracket” them from the study in order to understand those of the participants (p. 100). Therefore, my biases are clarified from the outset so that my own assumptions and way of thinking are explicit both to the reader, but also to me, so that I am capable of refraining them. Therefore, throughout the progress of this study – and, particularly, during data collection and analysis – I tried very carefully to set aside my assumptions. Firstly, during data collection, in an informal interview setting, where the participants had the freedom and comfort to describe their lived experiences with no formal language restrictions, questions were “directed to the participant's experiences, feelings, beliefs and convictions about the theme in question” (Welman & Kruger, 1999, p. 196). Secondly, during analysis, attention was paid to bracket my personal views by repeated listenings to the recorded interviews in an attempt to familiarise myself with the data and develop a holistic sense (Holloway 1997; Hycner, 1999; Groenewald, 2004). Thirdly, during the analysis, illuminating statements, i.e. meaning units, about the phenomenon were isolated based on their literal content and significance, that is, the number and the way they were stated (Groenewald, 2004).

Finally, clarifying biases relates also to Auerbach and Silverstein’s (2003) “transparency”, a criterion for research justification which, along with communicability and coherence, lets other researchers “check against the tendency to impose one’s own subjective biases on the data analysis” (pp. 83-84).