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**Session Proposal: Interactive Workshop – Defining Your Creativity**

Asked to name a creative person whom would you choose? Do your thoughts turn automatically to the arts or is your chosen creator a scientist or engineer? Think of how you evaluate creative work, what are the criteria on which this evaluation is based and how are these criteria determined? In the creativity literature there is often an underlying assumption of the existence of an objective quality ‘creativity’ that those judging can recognize (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). However there is no consensus on a working definition of creativity in the UK (Banaji, Burn & Buckingham, 2006) let alone one that encompasses the international nature of the creative industries. From Guilford (1951) to Torrance (1974) to Florida (2002) measures of creativity developed since the mid twentieth century have taken different approaches to the question of evaluating creativity. Whilst there is now an abundance of literature on creativity, questions remain as to the extent to which creativity is an internal cognitive function or an external socially constructed phenomenon (Radclyffe-Thomas, 2011). Equally in assessing creativity different emphases have been placed on whether the process or the product is more valid in defining creativity and whether creativity is a trait a person possesses or a skill that can be taught.

The workshop session is based on doctoral research into culturally situated concepts of creativity and invites participants to explore their own implicit understandings of creativity. After some brief icebreakers designed to expose conceptions of creativity, participants will complete a creativity attribute ranking exercise developed from my research into international understandings of creativity. This exercise gives participants an opportunity to define their own ‘recipe’ for creativity and has been reported as an enlightening and informative experience. After this activity participants will engage in a plenary dialogue about their experiences of practicing and fostering creativity in order to develop proposals for future good practice.

**Workshop Objectives:**

1. To expose implicit understandings of creativity
2. To explore how conceptions of creativity may be culturally situated
3. To engage in dialogues around the fundamental attributes of creativity
4. To expand our understandings of 21st century creativity

**Biography**:

A researcher, designer, and academic with experience in the UK, Asia and the US I am currently Course Leader in LCF’s School of Management and Science lecturing in branding, marketing and forecasting. Research interests include creativity, intercultural communication, social media and cross-cultural marketing. I have published and presented internationally including to the annual Creativity Conference at the ICSC, Buffalo NY and the 2013 ICL City Conference. I hold an EdD from Durham University; my thesis explores cultural understandings of creative practice and products.

<http://uk.linkedin.com/pub/natascha-radclyffe-thomas/15/b55/376>
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The workshop session is based on **doctoral research** into culturally situated concepts of creativity and invites participants to explore their own implicit understandings of creativity. After some brief **icebreakers** designed to expose conceptions of creativity, participants will complete a **creativity attribute ranking exercise** developed from my research into international understandings of creativity. This exercise gives participants an opportunity to define their own ‘recipe’ for creativity and has been reported as an enlightening and informative experience. After this activity participants will engage in a **plenary dialogue** about their experiences of practicing and fostering creativity in order to develop proposals for future good practice.

**5 Workshop Objectives:**

1. To expand our understandings of 21st century creativity
2. To engage in dialogues around the fundamental attributes of creativity
3. To expose implicit understandings of creativity
4. To explore how conceptions of creativity may be culturally situated

**5 Individual Activity**: Think of a creative person… What is it about them that makes them creative? Write this on your index card & save for later ☺

**10 Context:**

* Creativity Imperative: UK creative industries valued at £8m per hour (DCMS, 2014)
* Creativity Measures: Multiple contested definitions of creativity (Banaji, Burn & Buckingham, 2006)
* Culture & Creativity: Cross-cultural researchers argue cultures can inhibit or facilitate creativity (LUBART, 1999)

**Creativity Imperative**: Creativity is a vital economic imperative. Creativity is at the forefront of many government policies

**Creativity Measures**: From mid 20th century (Guilford & APA), links to IQ testing, TTCT 1074 figural & semantic tests (FIGURAL: Fluency, Elaboration, Originality, Resistance to premature closure, Abstractness of titles. VERBAL: Fluency, Flexibility, Originality). FLORIDA’s 2004, 2010 Global Creativity Index (3Ts: Talent, Technology & Tolerance)

**Culture & Creativity**: Much creativity research has been undertaken in Western cultures and has focused on identifying creativity at the individual not cultural level (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). Translating creativity across cultures is not value free; the power balance between the culture being studied and those doing the studying must be considered (R-T 2014, in press).

‘The Chinese and Western ways are very different. The Chinese want to see the result, they don’t care what the orocess is. The West, they care about the result but they want to see the whole process of research and inspiration’ (Huishan Zhang 2014 Dorchester Collection Fashion prizewinner) (Blanchard, 2012)

**5 Case Study: Situated Creativity:** ‘We do a lot of work in Britian about Mixing things up, making a mess and then kind of picking out… but there’s also something about honing things down and making things very beautiful, or very expert… overseas students can bring that focus… technically evolving ideas… being quite patient and building up something that’s amazing in a technical way’ (UK tutor). Case study of creativity in an intercultural environment: tutors, managers, recruiters, students & their implicit notions of creativity- place & academic culture are important. Mistakes, experiments, questions, process.

**5 In pairs discuss**: Which is more important, the creative process or the creative product? Is creativity a trait that a person possesses or a skill that can be taught?

**15 Creativity attribute ranking**: sort the creativity attributes into rankings- 6 least relevant, 8 less relevant, 10 neutral, 8 more relevant, 6 essential

**15 Discussion**: Compare creativity attribute rankings, how does your creative person fit with these themes?

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/creative-industries-worth-8million-an-hour-to-uk-economy>