

Third Space Creative Pedagogies: Developing a Model of Shared CPDL for Teachers and Artists to Support Reading and Writing in the Primary Curricula of England and Wales

Alex Southern^{1*}, Jenny Elliott², Colin Morley²

¹University of Wales Trinity Saint David, UK

²University of Nottingham, UK

Corresponding author: Alex Southern, E-mail: a.southern@uwtsd.ac.uk

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: October 25, 2019

Accepted: January 14, 2020

Published: January 31, 2020

Volume: 8 Issue: 1

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Zip Zap is a Creative Social Enterprise, which offers an author/illustrator-led Continuing Professional Development and Learning (CPDL) programme to develop teacher knowledge, confidence and skills in delivering creative writing and illustration activities, and a Festival of artist-led activities for school pupils. It is one of a number of initiatives that UK schools can buy into. This paper draws on an evaluation of Zip Zap's CPDL programme and Festival across two UK sites, with two quite different creative learning contexts – Wales and England, to explore issues affecting the pedagogies at work in the space where teachers and creative practitioners elide. An analysis of findings from teacher/pupil/parent/creative practitioner interviews and observations of classroom teaching and CPDL sessions highlighted a number of key issues in relation to pedagogies of creative writing. These are: the teachers' lack of confidence in creative writing pedagogies, a lack of shared approaches to teaching creative writing, and the potential for shared creative pedagogies. We propose a theoretical framework based on Homi K. Bhabha's theory of the third space that offers a framework for professional learning that enables collaboration between teachers and creative practitioners, and the emergence of shared, creative pedagogies that would nurture pupils' creative writing.

Key words: Creative Writing, Professional Learning, Creativity, Primary School, Pedagogy

INTRODUCTION: CREATIVITY IN SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

From the introduction of the 1944 Education Act until Callaghan's Ruskin University speech in 1976, creativity was at the very core of teaching and learning in primary education in England and Wales. Educational policy during this time was informed by progressive, child-centred philosophies from the Froebel Institute (The Froebel Trust, 2018). The 1976 speech took place against the backdrop of some high profile media reports of progressive education gone awry and Callaghan flagged up the need for education to be centrally controlled, for teachers and their work to be scrutinised and for pupils to be prepared for the world of work. This fledgling neoliberal agenda then paved the way for the introduction of the Primary National Curriculum and Standard Attainment Tests (SATs) in 1989 and the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) in 1992. The ensuing 'performativity' (Ball, 2003), in which schools, teachers, and pupils were judged by their SATs (and other assessment) performance, served to squeeze creative subjects, creative teaching and creative learning onto the side lines, as these were considered to be either too hard to judge and assess, or too risky in relation to assessing achievement (Granger &

Barnes, 2006). In their discussion of creativity and performativity, Burnard and White write of the issues of 'risk-taking, time constraints, student-teacher agency and the explicit practice of teaching to the test' (2008, p. 672).

Craft (2005) and Troman, Jeffrey and Raggl (2007) have documented key policy moments in UK education, where creativity fought back. Relevant to both Wales and England was the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education's (NACCCE) report (1999). The Report was published prior to a slim majority voting for Welsh Devolution in 1999, at which point, responsibility for education in Wales shifted from the UK's central government in Westminster to the Welsh Government. While research reports influenced both nation's education policies, the specifics of the curriculum differ. From 1999 to the time of writing in 2019, educational policy, and the position of creativity within this, has followed different trajectories in England and Wales. Significant moments for creativity in English educational policy include: a Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) report into culture and creativity in education (1999); a Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) initiative to generate a discourse of creativity across the curriculum with publications and online support for

teachers; the launch of the Creative Partnerships programme funded by the Arts Council England (2002 – 2010); the introduction of the Primary National Strategy, calling for a rich, varied and exciting curriculum in 2003, and Ofsted's (2003) report 'Expecting the Unexpected: detailing good practice in creativity in schools' (Craft, 2005; Troman et al., 2007). Rose's 'Independent review of the teaching of early reading' recommended that phonic work be set within 'a broad and rich language curriculum' and 'multi-sensory in order to capture (students') interest, sustain motivation and reinforce learning in imaginative and exciting ways' (Rose, 2006, p. 70).

The Cambridge Primary Review (Alexander, 2009) highlighted the erosion of teachers' professional freedom and creativity in the aftermath of the Primary National Strategies for Literacy and Numeracy in 1998, and argued that creative activities 'raise the quality and capacity of children's thinking, perseverance and problem-solving abilities, as well as fuelling their imaginations' (Alexander, 2009, p. 13). It recommended eight domains for primary education, one of which was 'arts and creativity', explaining that 'the renaissance of this domain, which takes in all the arts, creativity and the imagination, is long overdue ... there should be a much more rigorous approach to arts teaching in schools. However, creativity is not confined to the arts. Creativity and imaginative activity must inform teaching and learning across the curriculum' (Alexander, 2009, p. 24).

Shortly after the report was published, the Conservative government came into power in 2010 and promptly revised the Primary National Curriculum, into the form that was in use at the time of undertaking the research in England for this project, and at the time of writing in 2019. In the eighty pages of its section on Language, Literacy and English, the word 'creativity' appears just once: 'pupils should be taught to control their speaking and writing consciously and to use Standard English. They should be taught to use the elements of spelling, grammar, punctuation and 'language about language' listed. This is not to constrain or restrict teachers' creativity' (DfE, 2013, p. 15), an interesting linear sequence in which 'creativity' is not advanced as to how it might be used, but rather by a form of false double negative of 'not. constrain' and 'not restrict', further embedding the deficit discourse surrounding the term. Ofsted's chief inspector, Spielman, reported of a narrowing of the curriculum, particularly in Key Stages 2 and 3, and suggested that 'school leaders and teachers have an overt focus on performance tables (which) can lead to mistaking 'badges and stickers' for learning and substance' (Ofsted & Spielman, 2017).

In terms of ITE, the training nomenclature of arts subjects is that they are 'non-core' at secondary (and receive no bursary) and there is barely half a day per year available for arts subjects on primary PGCEs. All of which gives us a continuing impression that they are viewed by the state as deficit at worst, functional at best. As Galton (2015, p. 433) notes 'in most primary schools', aspects of creative learning have continued to be incorporated into the curriculum although adapted to meet the 'demands of the dominant 'performativity' ideology'.

Against this backdrop of a narrowing curriculum in England, the situation in Wales appears comparatively rich in creativity, with greater emphasis on the arts as subjects for study, and on creativity as a purpose. Education policy in Wales is administered by the Department for Education and Skills, and is guided by the Government's close adherence to the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child (Welsh Government, 2015). Central to Welsh Government education policy is the aim to break the link between levels of attainment and poverty, and to raise standards of pupil outcomes (Welsh Government, 2014).

Welsh Government announced the launch of a new, National Mission for education in 2017. The broad aim of which is to raise standards in schools through a number of key policy and structural changes to the education system. Taking recommendations from the 'Donaldson Review' of the curriculum, *Successful Futures* (Donaldson, 2015), Welsh Government (WG) is developing a new statutory curriculum for pupils aged 3-16. At the time of writing, WG is working with a broad range of stakeholders, including teachers, subject experts, academics, and local authority representatives to define the objectives, learning outcomes, progression steps, and evaluation frameworks of the new curriculum, in advance of a staged, piloted roll out from 2022. The new curriculum structure and emerging content is based on four purposes for the development of young people, to include 'enterprising, creative contributors, ready to play a full part in life and work' (Donaldson, 2015, p. 4) and will be divided into six Areas of Learning and Experience (AoLE) to include Expressive Arts. The aim of the AoLEs is to increase the focus on learner-centred approaches and enhance cross-curricular working by removing the boundaries between subjects. The curriculum will also include the three cross-curricular responsibilities of literacy, numeracy and digital competence, in recognition of previous performance measures, national objectives, and the relevance of education to real world settings (Donaldson, 2015).

Of interest here, is the inclusion of Expressive Arts as an AoLE. This represents a departure from global trends in curricular that shows arts subjects at the base of a hierarchy where they are afforded less importance than more 'traditional' subjects such as English, Maths and Science (see, for example: EACEA, 2009; Henley, 2012; Wagner, 2006). The decision to include Expressive Arts at the centre of the new curriculum for Wales can be understood as a direct response to the findings and recommendations of research published by Professor Dai Smith (2013). Smith's independent report, *Arts in Education in the Schools of Wales* (Smith, 2013), responded to a Welsh Government brief to focus specifically on the relationship between the education and arts sectors. Smith (2013) describes the expressive arts as "the cognitive champions in the acquisition and development of knowledge" that most consistently "enhance and improve learning outcomes" (Smith, 2013, p.9). Smith (2013) advocates for joint working between the education and arts sectors in order to share expertise and resources and the arts as, "a pedagogical tool to improve student performance and achievement across the curriculum, and ... enhance knowledge and understanding of a particular subject" (Smith, 2013, p.5).

The curriculum in Wales currently includes a Literacy and Numeracy Framework (LNF) for pupils aged 5-14, which describes the annual expected outcomes for literacy and numeracy against which pupils are evaluated. Creative writing in primary schools functions as an element of literacy, with targeted activities such as story-writing or poetry that sit within English or Welsh. There are ongoing discussions at present around where Creative Writing might be placed in the new curriculum – in Welsh or English lessons, as a cross curricular ‘skill’, or an aspect of literacy, and therefore whether it will reside within the Languages, Literacy and Communication AoLE or Expressive Arts. Despite the inclusion of the Expressive Arts at the centre of the curriculum, there are still questions around how Creative Writing is perceived, taught, understood, and valued.

DATA GENERATION AND ANALYSIS

This paper reflects upon the findings from two, parallel research projects into the work of Zip Zap, a Creative, Social Enterprise that was undertaken in primary schools in England and in Wales. Zip Zap offers a programme of Continuing Professional Development and Learning (CPDL) for teachers, led by writers and illustrators, a Festival of workshops for pupils, an annual conference and networking event for teachers and writers/illustrators of children’s books, and a hub on its website for teachers to share ideas, materials and good practice. The schools-based work centres on artist-led participatory and collaborative activities that engage pupils with reading, writing and illustration, with the aim of improving teachers’ confidence and skills when teaching these.

The data on which this paper focuses stem from the secondary analysis of datasets generated for an evaluation of the impact of the Zip Zap project in the selected schools in England and Wales. The evaluation centred on a range of outcomes identified by Zip Zap through a Theory of Change modelling exercise. These comprised the impact of the annual, Zip Zap Festival (workshops and associated activities delivered in schools by writers and illustrators) on pupils’ enjoyment, engagement and competencies in creative writing and reading; and the impact on teachers’ confidence and ability to teach creative writing and reading. The teacher outcomes were based on their experience either of participating in the Festival, or of attending the twilight and/or residential CPDL sessions.

The data generation activities undertaken to meet the objectives of the evaluation comprised the following.

In Wales: focus groups with teachers; with Year 2 pupils (aged 6-7); Year 4 pupils (aged 9-10); parents/carers; an interview with the Zip Zap coordinator (member of staff responsible for liaising with Zip Zap); and an interview with a member of Senior Leadership Team (SLT) if the Zip Zap Coordinator was not a member of SLT. These took place in three schools over a total of three years. Each school dataset was generated in one day of focus group activities, which took place two weeks after the Festival in school.

In England, the evaluation data comprised observational notes from video-recorded weekly CPDL sessions, interviews with four teachers at the CPDL residential, observations and

thick description from four author/illustrator events in the East Midlands and interviews with Head Teachers, SLT and pupils at five primary schools.

After each Festival, the data from each setting was analysed to produce an evaluation report for Zip Zap and its funders. The analysis comprised coding of the data to identify a priori themes, identified by Zip Zap as relevant to the organisation’s reporting and future practice; and an inductive process of open coding to identify recurrent themes, specifically around pedagogies of creative writing and reading, as these concepts were of prior interest to both researchers.

After the second year, the researchers in England and Wales discussed their findings and noted overlapping themes generated through open coding that were evident in both settings. These themes were as follows: teachers’ lack of confidence in creative writing pedagogies; and a lack of shared approaches to teaching creative writing. The researchers returned to the data and undertook a secondary analysis of the teacher-focused datasets. These datasets comprised the focus groups with teachers and interviews with members of the Senior Leadership Team in the three schools in Wales, and the interviews with teachers and CPDL lesson observations in England.

The researchers carried out theoretical thematic analyses of the datasets using a priori codes identified through the literature, and driven by the researchers’ analytical interest in the data. The findings and discussion in this paper are based on this secondary analysis of the teacher-focused datasets over two school years, 2017-18 and 2018-19, in the two settings – schools in Wales, and schools and CPDL sessions in England.

FINDINGS

In analysing the data, we identified a number of key issues in relation to how the teachers responded to the opportunities for professional learning offered through the Zip Zap programme, and the potential for teachers to develop pedagogies to support creative writing in the primary classroom. These are: teachers’ lack of confidence in creative writing pedagogies; a lack of shared approaches to teaching creative writing, and the potential for shared creative pedagogies.

Teachers’ Lack of Confidence in Creative Writing Pedagogies

The first is the teachers’ lack of confidence in pedagogies of creative writing that they either witnessed through the Festival in school, or participated in during the CPDL sessions. For example, during a focus group discussion, a teacher from School A (Wales-based research in 2017) explained how the visiting writer,

Showed how simple it was to make a beautiful poem, she made one with the class, and all of a sudden we looked up and it was a really nice piece of writing, and it was the case that she led them to it. Whereas I think that if I were to deliver poetry I think I would over-deliver, overkill it ... It’s confidence as well, like I’m not particularly keen on poetry, teaching poetry, and so it was a nice way of doing it.

The teachers recognised this lack of confidence as a barrier that needed addressing. For example, one of the school-based co-ordinators for the Zip Zap Festival explained that,

I chose people [to go to the CPDL session] who lacked confidence in that particular subject area, but showed passion and drive for creativity, but it just didn't show in what they did in their lessons ... you didn't see it come across. (England-based research at School Y in 2018)

The issue of confidence may have been impacted upon by the teachers' adherence to curriculum 'subjects' and divisions, and questions around the integration of ideas/activities that are considered external to the school system – i.e. 'fitting it in' to the planned scheme of work. For example, in School C (Wales-based research in 2017) there was discussion around tying the Festival in with the "story writing genre", and how this would work logistically. The response from the Literacy Coordinator was that there are "two types" of writing, "you've got first person and third person so you could do it around either". Story-writing in this instance is considered a distinct element that needs to be placed within a current curriculum objective. There was no indication that creative writing could exist in various different genres, and sit within a range of different 'topics' or activities, regardless of whether the pupils were formally studying English/Welsh in a particular lesson. It is worth considering here that for teachers, pedagogy is a process that leads to a product, one that can be framed by a genre as an example of assessable performativity whereas for an artist the pedagogy is the process itself.

The teachers' sense of time pressures, and the need to adhere closely to the elements of the curriculum which have 'value' in performance measures, at the expense of more creative approaches (Granger and Barnes, 2006; Burnard and White, 2008) is also indicated in the data. 'We're phonics, phonics, phonics, we need to learn to spell, we need to learn to read and when they come to write, we're saying use your phonics knowledge' (England, School X, 2018, cited in Elliott, 2018). This pressure to complete curriculum-driven objectives was repeated across the schools, and teachers welcomed the opportunity to spend time reading to/with the pupils, but expressed concern that this was not always possible.

There were also questions over what comprises a 'valuable' activity in this context, given the pressures on time, and therefore what could or should be included within workshops, preparatory, and plenary activities. In School B (Wales, 2017) there was uncertainty around how the author-led workshop would 'fit' in with work already completed, work planned for the pupils, and the specific demographic of the group, their needs, abilities, taste. This suggests the author visit is only considered valuable insofar as it meets the specific needs of the pupils, the curriculum focus, the planned activities for that term, and the teacher's capacity to capitalise on the work that took place during the time available for the workshop. The values are not the skills in themselves, or what they might give to the individual, but rather how they might be used to create assessable product.

Lack of Shared Approaches to Teaching Creative Writing

The lack of confidence described above is linked to the second key issue identified through analysis of the datasets in both countries. That is, the current lack of, and future potential for, shared pedagogies of creative writing for the primary classroom. We offer some examples of evidence for this lack, followed by indications of desire or potential for shared pedagogies below, before moving on to consider how this might be addressed.

An indication that creative practitioners and teachers work in polarised, rather than collaborative ways is evident in the data. Interviews with pupils revealed a celebrity 'wow' factor as the creative practitioners came to work with them and observations/rich descriptions from the author/illustrator event capture the creative practitioner leading, with the teacher in classroom assistant role, rather than a shared, co-facilitation of the learning. The expectations of authors/illustrators in this context did not always match the author/illustrators' objectives, and the discussion around the artist/illustrators' practice reveals an underlying schism between the artists' educational practice and teachers' pedagogy.

At times, the author/illustrator impact on pupils was measured and assessed by teachers in terms of her/his understanding of the school context. For example, a Year 6 teacher in School C of the 2017 research project in Wales explained that,

My author was great, but he also teaches in University, he lectures. His talk was pitched a little bit too high for my kids. It felt, because I was sitting in on it, and it did feel like a lecture at times, rather than a more interactive session. I mean, the kids loved it, and they didn't say anything about it, they all enjoyed, but as a teacher observing, I thought, 'Right, now I'd get them to do something' because it was pretty much 40-odd minutes of just sitting there listening to him. Even though it was interesting.

Despite the teacher's own admission that the pupils enjoyed the session, and that he found it interesting, he still felt that the approach was in some way 'wrong'. This split between the teacher's expectations and the writer's practice serves to illustrate the polarity between teacher and writer/illustrator.

In England, both the weekly and residential CPDL events appeared to position the creative practitioners as 'experts' with the participating teachers as 'pupils'. This was evident in the layout of the room, with a separation between the creative practitioners standing up, leading from the front and writing notes on flip-chart, with teachers as mainly passive receptors of the information, seated together at tables. The 'them and us' focus of the CPDL structure reinforces the sense that the creative input was 'other' and needed to be sourced elsewhere. Nonetheless, there was some evidence that teachers were empowered to make changes to their practice as a result of their engagement with Zip Zap, as follows:

Everyone who goes to the workshop has fresh ideas and inspiration ... we are starting to co-write with classes. We don't encourage our children to write for pleasure

but [Zip Zap] is the perfect platform to try out writing for pleasure. (School Z, England-based research project, in 2018)

We all came in the next day and did really different things with our classes. We felt we'd been doing it all wrong up until now. (School Z, England-based research, in 2018)

I've learnt to build on their experiences so you've got more ideas about how to develop an idea, rather than ... I think I was more ... writing you have to write because it's writing, whereas there's drama, that can be involved, you can create a picture and I think it opened my eyes up more. I think I was really skills based before (School W, England-based research, in 2018).

During the CPDL residential, teachers were encouraged to play around with mark-making as a way of expressing ideas in image form, and as a stimulus for writing. This they appeared to do with confidence and gusto, as a group of teachers on a creative writing CPDL retreat. There was, however, no evidence in any of the classroom observations, of teachers modelling such exploratory practice with their students.

Evidence of the Beginnings of Changed/Changing Practice

The issues outlined above were identified during analysis of the data, and were also recognised to greater or lesser extent by teachers engaged in the Zip Zap Festival. Some schools were beginning to adapt in response to the presence of the author/illustrators, and considering ways of continuing the activities or bringing some of the learning into future practice. For example, one teacher spoke of how the focus had shifted from end result to process,

If you look in books from other schools, you will see that every piece of work looks immaculate. If you look in the books of our school, you will see the work, the process that goes into the end piece ... so we're celebrating those parts of the process rather than just the end result. (School T, England, 2018)

The place of Zip Zap within wider school initiatives appears to influence the potential for shared pedagogies. In all three schools in Wales, the Zip Zap Festival functioned as an element of larger-scale initiatives relating to the schools' development plans, rather than solely focusing on a love of reading, creative writing and visual literacy, which were the Festival aims. For example, improvements in literacy, or closing the gap between those pupils eligible for Free School Meals (eFSM) and their peers. The relationship between the Zip Zap Festival and those initiatives impacted on the extent to which staff were able to invest (time, resources, curriculum demands) in the workshops, and the richness of the outcomes. This is exacerbated at a micro level, in terms of age group, and Additional Learning Needs (ALN) of pupils for example, and the capacity of individual teachers. The activity around the Festival was richest where the Festival met a specific and school-wide demand. For example, in School B, in 2017, the interviewee explained how Estyn (the Inspectorate in Wales) had recommended the school

needed to develop extended writing across the curriculum, which was now included in the Post Inspection Action Plan. The Zip Zap project functioned as one of the initiatives that would contribute to meeting this need.

The Head teacher of School C (Wales-based research in 2018) described Zip Zap as "part of a bigger picture, sometimes it's difficult to unpick. We do the reading behaviours and we do all sorts of other things as well. But as part of that package, it certainly is a significant part of that for me ... This is a gem that brings the core strategies to life". Again, this implies a strategic use of the affordances of the Festival, rather than an intention to focus on the specific outcomes intended by the organisation.

DISCUSSION

The findings outlined above indicate a 'gap' between the teachers' pedagogy and that of the creative practitioners. While this gap can be understood as a lack, we conceptualise it as a space between discourses that offers an opportunity for dialogue, learning and ultimately the innovation of shared creative pedagogies. Understanding the dynamics of the space where creative practitioners, teachers and pupils come together is complex. Bhabha's (1994) theoretical construct of the 'third space' offers a framework for conceptualising this pedagogical gap between the two identified discourses – of teachers and of creative practitioners – as a site of culture creation.

Building on Said's (1977) discussion about the need to overcome binaries of, for example: them/us; East/West; black/white, Bhabha (1994) explores the idea of bringing binaries together into a 'third space'. In this third space, each could work on their understanding of their own identity and the assumed identity of the 'other', in order to deconstruct assumptions/stereotyping/prejudices and develop new hybrid understandings of, and new non-oppressive ways of being with, the 'other'.

Gutiérrez et al (1999) offer a useful model for applying Bhabha's (1994) theory in practice. Through their research, the authors illustrate how "productive cultures of collaboration can create hybrid activities, roles, and practices that lead to productive contexts of development" (Gutiérrez et al., 1999, p. 289). The research project explored how a teacher used student knowledge as new tools for learning. The teacher allowed pupil questions to function as the catalyst for the focus of study and validated 'home' knowledge and colloquial forms of expression. In this manner, the 'official' knowledge of the school curriculum melded with the 'unofficial' discourse of the pupils' community to create a third space within which new knowledge was generated. For ZipZap, the discourse of classroom pedagogies must trouble the discourse of the writer/illustrators' practice in order to enable the generation of new, shared, creative pedagogies.

In order to work, this innovative third space must be dialogic, hybrid, and diverse. Quigley (2013) describes the creation of a third space in an urban kindergarten classroom in which community members fulfil the role of teaching assistant, advisor, role model, family member. Describing how the teacher worked with 'Talia's grandma' and other community

Elders to support pupils' Science education, Quigley (2013) argues that the kindergarten classroom becomes a third space where discourses are blended to create new learning. She writes that, while at times, it was difficult for the teacher to negotiate the relationship between her desire to ensure pupils used Science concepts appropriate to the classroom, and the community knowledge brought by Talia's Grandma for example, "the encouragement of a broad sense of discourse promotes ideas and validates knowledge" (Quigley, 2013, p. 854).

Blending discourses requires a free flow between that is non-hierarchical to enable the creation of a new culture, and a catalyst – a 'Grandma' to trouble the established discourses. This approach, we argue, would enable teachers and creative practitioners to develop shared, creative pedagogies for supporting pupils' creative reading and writing in the primary classroom.

While this conceptualisation of a third space offers a useful theoretical framework, we also acknowledge that it does not adequately describe the multifarious practices that characterise each of the pedagogies described. There is no singular discourse of 'teacher' nor of 'creative practitioner', (notwithstanding a loose conceptualisation of the latter in Hall and Thomson's 'signature pedagogies' (2016), which captures some common themes in the ways that creative practitioners might work within school contexts). This linear representation of a third space doesn't capture the messiness, the diversity of individuals within each of the descriptors. Teachers and creative practitioners are diverse groups of individuals with highly varied skillsets, beliefs, motivations, pedagogies. Foucault's (1984) theoretical discussion of heterotopias offers a useful model for conceptualising this multifarious third space. The diversity of irreducible social relations that interact across unique sites, describes how the varied practices of teachers, writers and illustrators co-exist within the classroom. As Foucault describes it, the "heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are themselves incompatible" (Foucault, 1984, p. 6). This standpoint offers a practical alternative to addressing the need for shared pedagogies that avoids the implication of binary discourses.

However, the data suggests that the potential for a non-hierarchical conduit is not part of the inherent structure of the process. The references to 'other' suggest that there is little of what Bottery (2004, p. 7) calls 'mutual unconditional respect and trust' and with it 'a perception of job competence' (Bottery, 2004, p. 7). What we have experienced through our research into the Zip Zap Festival is a power (im)balance between teachers and creative practitioners where skills, knowledge and experience is not equally conceptualised. By creating a physical, heterotopic, third space that is dialogic, we can nurture the opportunity for the creation of new culture - new creative pedagogies.

We are also aware that this theoretical model requires some consideration of how it might look in practice, in order to bring about any form of culture shift. The model does not explore the ways in which pedagogies may evolve – what exactly do teachers and creative practitioners learn from each

other? How does this learning happen? What factors may support/hinder the learning processes? Indeed, the findings for this study indicate that very little hybridising of teacher/creative practitioner pedagogies actually takes place.

Meyer and Land's (2005) 'threshold concepts' are useful in exploring this further. Studying how economists develop an understanding of their subject, they noted that certain concepts were essential for its mastery. They named such concepts 'threshold concepts' which Cousin (2006) explores as: *transformative* for the learner (involving an ontological as well as conceptual shift); *irreversible* – once learnt, they cannot be unlearned; *integrative* – they may shine a light on the hidden interrelatedness of phenomena and therefore serve to promote learning in other areas and *bounded* - they may act as portals to other threshold concepts, and involve forms of *troublesome knowledge*, where the learner undergoes a process of discomfort, instability and uncertainty, whilst shifting from a firm foundation of existing knowledge to a less solid, insecure one.

Meyer and Land (2003) warn of 'mimicry', a limited understanding of a more complex process, which can serve to close down 'further avenues of enquiry or complexity' (Cousin, 2006, p. 382), as a result of more knowledgeable others simplifying and over-scaffolding the threshold concepts, in order to protect their students from the 'troublesome'-ness of the learning. Such 'mimicry' may be evidenced in the 'creativity hour' one school has embedded within its teaching week. Here, teachers have plucked an activity or an idea from the creative practitioner and added it in to their teaching repertoires, the variety of activities that they embrace with their students, rather than taking potentially uncomfortable, troublesome steps to more radically adapt and develop their pedagogy.

Meyer and Land (2003) have used the term 'liminal space' to describe the space inhabited, as the learner shifts from one stage of learning to the next. Akin to an adolescent moving from the familiar existence of a child into the as yet unknown arena of adulthood, a liminal space is an uncomfortable straddling of both the old and new fields of learning, similar to Piaget's (1955) notion of 'disequilibrium' as a cognitive developmental process. During the CPDL residential in Wales, teachers showed evidence of tentatively shifting into such liminal spaces. The illustrator's instruction to freely explore marks on paper without an end result in mind, may have been a threshold concept for teachers who have never engaged with illustration in this way before. Whilst they were away from their usual teaching and learning contexts, they were able to enter the liminal space by starting to take risks and make themselves vulnerable. Yet in schools, there was little evidence of teachers exposing their own drawing vulnerabilities with their classes, possibly through fear of what Goffman (1959) might call a loss of face.

A review of the data shows that there is an awareness of the hegemonic practices of particular physical spaces (such as a library) in which there are expectations dictated by notions of place as to what should happen in them. Comments by teachers are rich with a spatial mantra of expectation, something that the use of a third space as non-hegemonic conduit

might help to avoid, and something which the presence of the Grandma as ‘non-school’ persona helps to create.

This suggests there is potential for creating a professional learning programme that enables both teachers and creative practitioners to explore this liminal space further and to develop shared creative pedagogies. The essential trust requirements could be built upon Bottery’s (2004) approach in which the vulnerability of the teacher is demonstrated within the third space with the artist, developed by them via an initial imitative mimicry of an artistic approach by the teacher before the approach is realised in front of the class. At which point the fear of a loss of face may be mediated by a carapace of artistry by the teacher.

CONCLUSION

The above discussion highlights the recurrent lack of confidence in adopting/adapting to examples of practice from artists. We believe this points to the need for sustained professional learning opportunities that would enable the development of shared creative pedagogies that are embodied rather than enacted. We have argued that the concept of third space is a useful theoretical framework for exploring developing pedagogies/discourses when teachers/creative practitioners come together, and that this third space is itself heterotopic, comprising multiple iterations of the discourses of teachers and artists. Drawing on the work of Quigley (2013), and Gutiérrez et al. (1999), we conceptualise this third space as an opportunity for professional learning, a site where teachers and creative practitioners need to shed their established pedagogies in order to generate new, shared pedagogies, in response to a catalyst. This catalyst needs to be a presence that is neither teacher nor creative practitioner – a ‘Grandma’ (from Quigley, 2013), and sited in a new physical space, unfamiliar to both pedagogical discourses and thereby open to experimentation. Meyer and Land’s (2003) theory allows us to drill down further into the actual processes that take place as teachers/creative practitioners change pedagogies/discourses and allows us to consider the practicalities of defining a professional learning programme that draws on the expertise of teachers and writers to construct pedagogies of creative writing for the primary classroom.

Development of these pedagogies is important at a particular moment in educational history. A moment when creativity is being squeezed out of the curriculum in England and teachers are losing capacity for creative pedagogies; and in Wales where creativity is central to the new curriculum, teachers do not yet have appropriate support to develop pedagogies of creativity/creative pedagogies that would meet the needs of the new curriculum.

Exploring parallels across school systems has allowed for differences to be explored, not only in the instant of action, but also within their ongoing discourses (where these discourses came from and how they might develop). The inherent deficits of the English system are still evident in an approach which judges the outcomes (see, for example, the intention, implementation and impact sections of the Ofsted (2019) inspection handbook) rather than the processes of arts-based CPDL. The English system’s bolt on approaches

are neatly juxtaposed by a Welsh system in which there is an ongoing embodiment of artistic approach visible in both policy and practice.

Such contrasts allow us to unpick how notional third space sites as conduits for development might be approached by both systems, allowing for our catalytic Grandmas to be at the forefront of teacher development rather than part of systems of compliance. Within both systems the Grandma offers a non-hierarchical, non-judging ‘other’ which can work as an embodied third space, a conduit between students and practitioners, but also between the practitioners of art and teaching themselves. In this way we see how they can become both an embodiment of the Welsh engagement with the arts as well as being perceived as a more instrumental function within the English context. With both, however, there necessitates a degree of ‘buy in’ from artist and teacher to allow the third space conduit to function, and this would be an interesting start point for further study. This further study should also focus on defining the threshold concepts (Meyer & Land, 2003) in this context, considering how shared pedagogies can be developed that are genuinely collaborative and avoid mimicry, and exploring what the catalytic ‘Grandma’ might comprise to instigate the creation of a new culture of creative writing pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (2009). *The Cambridge Primary Review*. [Online] Available: https://cprtrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/CPR_revised_booklet.pdf (September 8, 2019).
- Ball, S. (2003). The teacher’s soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal in Educational Policy*, 18, 215 - 228.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bottery, M. (2004). Trust: Its importance for educators. *Management in Education*, 18(5), 6–10.
- Burnard, P. & White, J. (2008). Creativity and performativity: counterpoints in British and Australian education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(5), 667 – 682.
- Cousin, G. (2006). An introduction to threshold concepts. *Planet*, 17, 4-5.
- Craft, A. (2005). *Creativity in Schools: tensions and dilemmas*. London: Routledge.
- DfE. (2013). *National Curriculum: primary curriculum*. London: DfE.
- Donaldson, G. (2015). *Successful futures: Independent review of curriculum and assessment arrangements in Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- EACEA. (2009). *Arts and Cultural Education at School in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Elliott, J. (2018) ‘Buying In and Selling Out – The Commodification of Creativity in the Classroom’, *Changing English*, 25(4), 396-409.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. *Architecture/Movement/Continuité*. October 1984.
- Galton, M. (2015). ‘It’s a real journey – a life changing experience.’ A comparison case study of Creative Partnership and other primary schools. *Education*, 43(4), 433-444.

- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Granger, T., & Barnes, J. (2006). Creativity in the Primary Curriculum. In T. Granger & D. Wray (Eds.), *Learning to teach in the Primary School*. London: Routledge.
- Gutierrez, K. (1999). Rethinking Diversity: Hybridity and Hybrid Language Practices in the Third Space. *Mind Culture and Activity*, 6(4), 286 - 303.
- Hall, C. & Thomson, P. (2016). Creativity in teaching: What can teachers learn from artists? *Research Papers in Education*, 32(1), 106-120.
- Henley, D. (2012). *Cultural Education in England*. London: DCMS/DfE.
- Jones, K. (2003). *Education in Britain 1944 to the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 49, 373 - 388.
- NACCCE. (1999). *All our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education*. Sudbury, Suffolk: DfEE Publications.
- Ofsted. (2019). *School Inspection Handbook (180119)*. Manchester: Ofsted.
- Ofsted & Spielman, A. (2017). HMCI's commentary: recent primary and secondary curriculum research. [Online] Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/hmcis-commentary-october-2017> (September 8, 2019)
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The construction of reality in the child*. London: Routledge.
- Quigley, C.F (2013). With Their Help: How community members construct a congruent Third Space in an urban kindergarten classroom. *International Journal of Science Education*, 35(5), 837-863.
- Rose, J. (2006). *Independent review of the teaching of early reading*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Smith, D. (2013). *An Independent Report for the Welsh Government into Arts in Education in the Schools of Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- The Froebel Trust. (2018). *Froebelian Principles*. [Online] Available: <https://www.froebel.org.uk/froebelian-principles/>(September 8, 2019)
- Troman, G., Jeffrey, B., & Raggl, A. (2007). Creativity and performativity policies in primary school cultures. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(5), 549 - 572.
- Wagner, T. (2006). *Building Creative Capacities for the 21st Century*. Lisbon: UNESCO.
- Welsh Government. (2015). *Programme for Children and Young People*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.