

DISRUPTING THE CONSENSUS: CREATIVITY IN EUROPEAN EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSES AS A TECHNOLOGY OF GOVERNMENT

CATARINA SILVA MARTINS

csmartins@fba.up.pt
University of Porto

ABSTRACT. According to policy research, Europe will achieve the cutting edge of global competition through a strong investment in creativity. However, I argue that this critical ingredient is not a neutral nor a natural concept in thinking about progress or the individual. As a trait historically made as essential for autonomy and freedom, the category of creativity defines models of being a person at the same time that creates its abject (the person who is not creative). The paper examines how the concept of creativity is being addressed in European educational discourses drawing on the systems of reason that make possible to think, act and see the creative self in our contemporaneity. Creativity and the creative person will be considered as historical constructions that emerged in specific contexts and for specific reasons. These will be explored through the analysis of European educational reports on creative skills for the 21st century, in order to make visible the assembly and connection of different practices that give intelligibility to creativity as a means of existence and as a problem of social planning in governing.

Keywords: creativity; Foucault; hopes and fear; discourse

1. Introduction

The paper intends to think about the concept of creativity as an historical event that most of the times tends to be used in an a-historical way. The word is today used in several fields, from arts and education to politics and government, from science to business and, more recently, from economic to creative industries. One of the most interesting facts when one reads how creativity is being addressed in research is that it contains a psychological meaning in its currency. Even when studied by neuroscience, the biological and physiological creativity has a psychological translation in terms of

expected behaviors. If this is not at all surprising, the truth is that it will be only by making a cultural history of many of the concepts that psychology installed in our lives, and that now go as natural and obvious, that we can think otherwise about the unquestionable blind spots of the present. Following Michel Foucault's (1991a) idea of a History of the Present what remains open for a historian is not to admire and recount the birth and evolution of a concept but rather to ask for its emergence and conditions of possibility.

In this paper, I want to stress the level of fabrication of creativity, which means to talk about its invention. The faith in creativity as a natural and biological attribute of the person produces real effects in the world. Creativity is not just a word, nor it is neutral or natural. It produces academic research, assessment criteria, a myriad of policy documents and reports, and different ways of seeing and behaving.

This paper is divided into five parts and a conclusion. The introduction is followed by a brief incursion on the emergence of a discourse about creativity in the arts that constitutes the cultural matrix from which our sense of creativity comes from. My argument is analytical and observational. In this paper I am borrowing from Michel Foucault (1991b) the notion of governmentality, from Ian Hacking's (2002, 2006) the notion of categories as "making up people" and from Thomas Popkewitz notions of "double gestures of hopes and fears" and "fabrication of human kinds" (1988, 2008). In the third section I will consider creativity as a technology of government. Through an incursion on educational papers and European reports, my objective is to think how creativity is being discursively constructed and how this defines who we are, how to act on particular populations and cultural thesis for people to act for themselves. There is a sense that creativity is the solution for any sort of crisis and that those who do not conform to its principles will be left behind and will not take part on the European exceptionalism (Popkewitz and Martins, 2013). The fourth section aims to make visible that the apparent emptiness of creativity discourse is full of prescriptions for thinking and behaving. The educational discourse on creativity will be seen as an actor in the sense developed by Popkewitz (2013) of theories as actors. I will develop the idea of creativity as a cultural concept to think about collective desires and fears. In the last part of the paper, I will focus how the creative citizen of the future, and its abject, are shaped. When I use the term technology I am referring to Foucault's (1988) notion of technology, i.e., the ways in which different ideas and practices are combined in order to govern and shape the conduct of individuals.

2. How Can We Think about Human Creativity: A Brief Incursion into the Arts

According to Kristeller (1983), “whereas the word ‘creativity’ is apparently of recent vintage, it is derived from other words such as ‘creative’ and ‘to create’ that have a much earlier origin and history” (p. 105). That history enables us to make sense of the term creativity and the assemblage of the meanings it acquired. The Greeks had only one word for “creating” and “making” and that word was “poien.” The Latin Christian language had two separate words “creare” and “facere” that established the division between a divine creation and a human making. Until the 18th century to create was only a property of God, was not of the human. Saint Augustine’s interpretation of the first chapter of the Genesis stresses that God created the world out of nothing. The world was created not in time but simultaneously with time.

Greek art or medieval art were not creative spheres of human action, as, for instance, also passionate love was not a necessary ingredient for a fulfilled life (Baumeister, 1987, p. 167). The arts were regulated by the grids of beauty, utility and morality. Art, as a separate and autonomous territory, is an invention of modernity (Martins, 2011). This is not to say that the modern system of the arts appeared from nothing. It is inseparable from the history of the institutions created to naturalize this same idea such as the museums, the academies, or the symphony halls, but also from the invention of an anthropological and modern subject equipped with an interior domain (the self). But what made “a series of historical events and accidents” (Wolff, 1983, p. 17) be considered under the same aesthetic, visual or creative regime?

In fact, the turning point in Western thinking is a product of the Enlightenment and its new arrangement of knowledge in which man was the central subject replacing God. As such, man was also seen as a creator. In ancient Greece or in medieval times, the artist was considered as we consider today the craftsman, as art was also considered an activity with specific objectives, from beauty to function. Visual arts, such as painting, were embedded in functional architectural contexts in which they had an ornamental and pedagogical part. The romantics exalted the artist above all human beings and contributed to the difficulties relating to self-knowledge with the emphasis on “the unique, individual destiny and potential of each person” that existed to be discovered and fulfilled (Baumeister, 1987, p. 165). The idea of the free artist gave rise to the possibility of originality and installed the ideal of the “autonomous artist pursuing self-expression and originality” (Shiner, 2001, p. 38). Kant is in the beginning of this history. With Kant, creative imagination comes to be the background of all originality and the

artist as a genius is the one that makes the rule instead of following the rules of nature. Guided by feelings and sentiments, more than by reason, the artist and his highest ranking, the genius, were considered as an exception (Ó, Martins, Paz, 2013).

The idea of creative imagination became a taken for granted idea of the new distribution of the sensible in modernity. The distribution of the sensible, according to Jacques Rancière (2004), refers to the “system of self-evident facts of sense perception that simultaneously discloses the existence of something in common and the delimitations that define the respective parts and positions within it” (p. 12). The idea of creativity governs what is to be understood as original and transformative. However, it also creates an objection. This determination separates those that take part and those that do not possess it, determining “the ability or inability to take charge of what is common to the community” (Rancière, 2004, p. 12).

As opposed to the reproductive imagination, the creative imagination also entered in the pedagogical field. Friedrich Froebel was the pedagogue that discovered the creative side of each child, but this “creative child” was again discovered by the 2nd World War and after, being massively tested by psychological tests such as the Torrance Tests, and acquired a natural sense. However, in the 2nd part of the 19th century, in the *Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire* by Ferdinand Buisson the creative imagination of the child was considered both “right” and “wrong,” as

the human mind is incapable of creating anything absolutely original, of forming images that are not copies of sensations from the outside; it is nonetheless true that the works which are the products of the imagination manifest a novelty like the creations of nature. In fact, the creative imagination is the ability we have to combine the images stored in our minds, so as to form a ‘whole conscientiousness new’ (Cousinet).

The article drew the most recent psychological and philosophical works on imagination and marked, in a way, the inscription of creativity within the educational arena.

What is important in this history is that creativity as part of a human potential was not ever important or considered. Even if in today’s educational discourse creativity is understood in essentialist terms and as a biological fact, the distinctions that constitute creativity as creativity or the creative person as creative “do not exist in some sealed private box before they are so labelled in public” (Danziger, 1997a, p. 58). What I will focus in the next section is how in the current educational discourse creativity is being taken as a granted, desirable and wholly positive idea. What is being misunderstood, however, is the discursive construction of creativity.

3. Creativity as a Technology of Government: Governing the Child and the Teacher's Actions and Thoughts

In this section I will look to some European educational documents on creativity to see how this concept is being discursively constructed and how this construction melts into a technology that governs ways of being a person and defines particular models for acting and thinking in schooling. This means that creativity is not just a word coming from research but rather it is a concept that acts in the world and operates, for example, through the sciences of education, institutions and policy. The section is inscribed within the theoretical background of Foucault's governmental rationality as a set of practices that aim "to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons" (Gordon, 1991, p. 2). In its matrix, the governmental rationality has a Christian heritage that Foucault (1983a) identified as a pastoral power. As I will analyze through the discursive construction of creativity, it operates in terms of guidance to a kind of salvation of those that have to achieve the land of creativity, but it addresses each individual through a specific knowledge about him/her. This truth is part of the power of the creativity discourse and its effects, it "cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people's minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their inmost secrets. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it" (Foucault, 1983a, p. 214).

As Foucault, Nikolas Rose (1996) also considers that "our very experience of ourselves as certain sorts of persons creatures of freedom, of liberty, of personal powers, of self-realization is the outcome of a range of human technologies, technologies that make modes of being human as their object" (p. 26). It is in this sense of human technologies that I see creativity as a technology of government. It operates in a universal logic that takes as its object of study ways of being a person, and orders, disciplines and normalizes what a creative person as a reasonable person is and should be. As such, creativity is not only a way of talking about different types of person, but it also organizes the ways in which people think about themselves as "free."

A great number of European researches on creativity start as follows: "Creativity and innovation are becoming increasingly important for the development of the 21st century knowledge society. They contribute to economic prosperity as well as to social and individual wellbeing and are essential factors for a more competitive and dynamic Europe" (Ferrari et al., 2009: iii).

It seems that the first questions we should ask are: how can we engage ourselves in creative learning and teaching strategies? How can we do better to be at the forefront of progress? How can we be part of this reality? Unless we look at these affirmations searching for alternative questions. My

questions are different from these as they are focused on the effects of creativity as a discourse of truth. I follow Foucault's (1983b) point that not "everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous" (p. 231). To think about the effects of the discourse on creativity is to think that language is not only denotative but constitutive of the objects of the world. Language "makes up" things. When talking about "democracy," Thomas Popkewitz (2008) argues that recognizes "its function as a cultural thesis formed within a grid of practices and not as a universal or transcendental category that stands outside historicity" (pp. 32–33). Concerning "creativity" I also consider this concept as a reality that comes up through a grid of practices that order and classify the processes and the procedures that govern how the child is seen and how the teacher reflects and acts considering that child.

When one reads the words that come along with creativity, such as innovation, innovative potential, entrepreneurship, future generations, sense of initiative, innovative teaching, creative learning, we can realize how pedagogy is being thought in terms of classroom and social planning and how governing takes place through the production of certain subjectivities. The discourse is empty in terms of contents but full of psychological meanings that order action and thought. What is at the very center of the meanings are the individual's relations with themselves, how do they see themselves, what they want to be and the pathways to improve themselves a certain type of person. The teacher becomes the one that discovers and "have the power to unlock the creative and innovative potential of the young." As such, "Innovative teaching is the process leading to creative learning, the implementation of new methods, tools and contents which could benefit learners and their creative potential" (Cachia et al., 2010, p. 19).

The creative children as successful learners are those that are "confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors" (Cachia et al., 2010, p. 22). The creative child of today is the creative worker and citizen of tomorrow, the one that can solve any problem presented by a teacher, a crisis or an employer.

Foucault's notions of power (1980) and confessional techniques (1981) become important to think how it is a matter of conducting the conduct that is in question through the discovering of a truth about oneself. "For to 'conduct' is at the same time to 'lead' others (according to mechanisms of coercion which are, to varying degrees, strict) and a way of behaving within a more or less open field of possibilities." The exercise of power as Foucault said "consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome" (Foucault 1983a, pp. 220–1). Creativity could only be read as a way of governing if we consider that this governing presupposes and requires the imagination of a free and active subject.

It is usually made a distinction in the type of creativity that is being addressed: “A distinction is highlighted between ‘big C’ and ‘little c’ creativity (Craft, Jeffrey, & Leibling, 2001), the first one referring to the creativity of the genius, such as Mozart and Einstein, the second one pertaining to the everyday life, being the ability of common people to solve daily problems in an unexpected way, or to see things with a fresh perspective” (Cachia and Ferrari, 2010, p. 17).

The type of person that educational discourse means is not the genius but the lifelong learner and the problem solver child. The future of the world is put in the right development of creative skills, so that both child and teacher can see themselves in the rational way to achieve that future. It promotes subjectivities that will feel anxiety or disappointment when nothing new is created, but also pleasure, inner success, self-realization when the principles that order the way of thinking about creativity and education are followed. The explanation is tautological: “creativity is a form of knowledge creation, therefore stimulating creativity has positive spillover effects onto learning, supporting and enhancing self-learning, learning to learn and life-long learning skills and competences” (Ferrari et al., 2009, p. iii).

Particular psychological meanings are mobilized to explain the success and failure of the teacher and the student. Creativity is thus seen as particularly important for classroom management defining which are the good practices that define the good teaching. One of the most interesting aspects to analyze is that the discourses that make the creative child or teacher embody principles for action and participation. My interest, then, is not to focus in that separation between the theory and the practice but to pay attention to the grids of reason that order that practice (it includes thought). Even if trying to draw a separation, the discourse on creativity, novelty and originality is connected to the 19th century arguments on the creative genius.

Pedagogic practices are associated with the incorporation of individuals into discursive regimes of truth. The pupil, as well as the teacher, is regulated through these regimes that link knowledge and power. What comes as describing styles of teaching or strategies for learning is understood as truth. As such, real effects emerge from this understanding. A *Final Report on Creative Learning and Innovative Teaching* (Cachia et al., 2010) addresses one question that is said not to be considered very often. It respects to the way creativity should be implemented into the classroom. Teachers from the 27 EU States were questioned about their practices to improve creativity in the classroom. The development of thinking skills, participative learning, learning how to learn, play and multi-disciplinary work appear as the ordering words that also order and classify what is a good creative teaching practice. The creative management of the classroom is linked, for instance, with the management of the behavior, personality, attitudes, and

beliefs of both teacher and pupil. The good reasoning about a creative teaching practice is given in *Creativity in Schools: A Survey of Teachers in Europe*. There,

creative learning can be seen as any learning which involves understanding and new awareness, which allows the learner to go beyond notional acquisition, and focuses on thinking skills. It is the ability of making connections between things which were not connected before, of seeing relationships between unrelated items. It puts the learner at the centre of the learning process, favoring understanding over memorization and mere content acquisition. The creative learning experience is opposite to the reproductive experience (Cachia and Ferrari, 2010, p. 17).

The way in which the discussion goes allows for the exploration of systems of classification that relate pedagogy, learning, psychology, ways of thinking and acting about who the child and the teacher are and how they have to become to be creative and, consequently, to be positioned “at the forefront of this new world” that is called Europe, as said in the *Manifesto for Creativity and Innovation* (European Commission, 2009). It stresses the need of reinventing education through the retraining of teachers and engagement of parents “so that they can contribute to an education system that develops the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes for intercultural dialogue, critical thinking, problem-solving and creative projects” (European Commission, 2009). In *All Our Futures*, everybody is taken as a virtual audience, but when reflecting on the importance of creativity, the authors agree that their question, and our question too as readers, is “how can education enable our children to make the most of themselves and take the best advantage of the opportunities and uncertainties that they face in a fast changing world?” (NACCCE, 1999, p. 13). This common sense on the importance of creativity as a positive wholly thing speaks for everybody with authority. The argument elides, however, the hopes and fears in facing the unknown future.

4. The Meanings and the Making of the Creative Person: Hopes and Fears

In this section I want to interrogate how the emptiness of content I talked above is not a vacuum. The discourse on the creative child, the creative teacher or the creative tools for a creative learning produces effects in the ways these persons think and act, as well as in the ways they evaluate their performances according to what means to be creative. Here, I am also borrowing from Popkewitz’s (2008, p. 19) the notion of fabrication. Creativity is a fabrication in two senses. It is a fiction and a reality, because it is a

discursive production of research that classifies certain kinds of persons and responds to something in the world.

Educational discourses talk about creativity as a skill that has to be fostered in order to produce a self-reflective and responsible teacher and child. The educational research and policy that agree on the need and importance of creativity starts from the principle that creativity exists as a trait or a quality and, as such, what is needed is to research about its conditions of production. As something that exists out there and that theory only looks into to know better, this separation erases the historical construction of a “fact.” “Finding questions where others had located answers” (Dean, 1994, p. 4) means to make unnatural the taken-for-granted assumptions about creativity as an essence. The words are ostensibly placed in European educational discourses to signify a natural effort of the child and as a mission of a society that fails to understand that the future needs to be treated with other tools that will prepare the child as a problem solver child. Present in the discourse are the norms to regulate the future from which progress and development can be obtained.

Reading the European documents and papers that agree for the establishment of creative practices in education, we do not find what they are talking about in terms, for instance, of curricular knowledge but we can follow its historical inscriptions. There is no questioning for what kind of knowledge is selected in schools and how can this knowledge improve creative thinking. What it does is a move from the learning of school subjects to a pastoral discipline that acts, specifically when the teacher, as the shepherd of a flock, guides the child to a self-examining and self-reflective game. Foucault’s notion of governmentality (1991b) as the conduct of conduct comes as a way of explaining how creativity is addressed as a technology of government that inscribes some of the principles of modern schooling. The modern states proclaimed the need of freedom and autonomy in the production of the modern citizen. The self-government appeared in politics, and within a variety of institutional spheres of society, as the possibility of the self’s intimate relations according to abstract relations of a secular world. To think about the citizen or the government of the State became possible in only one gesture through systems of populational reasoning and probabilities. The regulation of society as a group of people became inseparable from the regulation of each individuality. The creativity that is talked in educational research is not only about the child or the teacher but about their government of them as lifelong learners, about their soul, about them as responsible and disciplined citizens of a community and also about the creative community or the creative nation. For instance, it is stated that: “Today’s dramatic disparities between and within countries could be a major source of creativity, specialization and mutually beneficial interdependence. The dangers emerge

when differences lead to incomprehension and conflict. Minimizing these risks and boosting the advantages depend, in large part, on being able to learn from differences” (Stevens et al. 2000, p. 19).

The hope is related with the fear of the dangers of a society that will not be well organized. Creativity appears as a salvation theme and as the means to achieve a certain regulatory end. Even if talking about difference and recognizing it (even if not recognizing that this difference is the product of particular historical constructs), these principles of inclusion generate processes of exclusion. The consensus that will allow for comprehension and harmony is the universal category of creativity.

This universal category is also directed to the “young people disaffected or at risk of exclusion from mainstream provision” (Roberts, 2006, p. 15). This space of inclusion draws the space of exclusion as it casts out the qualities of those that are not creative. On the other hand, those at risk are virtually in the path to salvation because they are the focus of attention of particular intervention programs. A recent conference on the importance of Prison Education and Training also underlines this idea of salvation through the boost and mix of creativity and learning. It says that “cultural and creative activities can help offenders to improve their personal and social skills, to develop confidence and can also lead them to acquire a taste for learning. [...] Creativity and new ways of thinking can help in the process of rehabilitation, for instance by encouraging the offender to explore new roles (Hawley 2010, p. 16).

The discourses on the creative citizens organize studies about war, power, governing, crisis, schooling, poverty, economy, citizenship, crime, among others. The principles for an inclusionary society are part of the double gesture of hope and fear. The hope that is expressed in “All our futures” (NACCCE, 1999) that it is vital the “investment in ‘human capital’ for the twenty-first century” (p. 5), is also the fear “of the danger and the dangerous populations that threaten the envisioned future” (Popkewitz, 2008, p. 6).

The techniques developed in the educational landscape lie within this set of practical action that Michel Foucault called the “technologies of the self” (1988), and that, in general terms, are just a technically accurate mode of supervision of individual freedom. As shown by Ian Hunter (1994), the pastoral school conjugated things that theoretically were placed as opposites: vigilance and activity of the self, obedience and spontaneity (p. xiv). The basic principle, then, is to find in the student all the intellectual, moral and physical interface that will serve as a pedagogical action that does not violate the individuality, so that the child to be educated could achieve the maximum potential development of his/her creativity. It is stated that “When individuals find their creative strengths, it can have an enormous impact on self-esteem and on overall achievement” (NACCCE, 1999, p. 6).

More and more, we are not talking about a repressive or sovereign power, but in a power that operates through administrative technologies and regulation of the very interior experiences of the subject. This power is productive in the construction of the autonomous, self-reflective, problem solver child who, that will be the creative person.

The discourse on creative education, thus, promotes the subject that works on him/herself through processes of reflection and reflexivity. Creative learning, for instance, is not just simply based “on learner empowerment and centredness” (Cachia et al. 2010, p. 19), but is a form of regulation that orders thought and action.

The idea of rescuing the child through creativity as a planned intervention combines a religious view of salvation with secular conceptions about crisis, poverty, society, economy and the self. The individuality of the child or of the teacher are linked with norms of collective belonging that are, for the creative Europe, the ones that confront the fear of crisis. Drawing the creative child, the creative teacher or the creative economy, means also to draw those that do not take part on this industry of creativity. They will not be prepared for the future, for a Europe that “depends on the imagination and creativity of its people” (European Commission, 2009). This European exceptionalism reinscribes the Enlightenment of cosmopolitanism and the hope of Europe to set apart and better than others in the world (Popkewitz, Martins, 2013). The conclusion is that “to be at the forefront of this new world, Europe needs to become more creative and innovative” (European Commission, 2009). The European is unified through his/her creative potential that passes as a universal value of reason and human activity.

What I will be talking in the next section is about creativity as a category that generates principles by which individuals construct themselves as self-motivated and active persons, members of a community. Some questions that we can start by asking are what does creativity do to our understanding of ourselves as citizens? And how does it regulates and reorders what we as teachers and students do?

5. Creativity as Defining Human Kinds

What we started to see is that the great power of creativity is the capability of mobilizing individuals into discursive regimes in such a way that they become active and inscribed with certain capacities to act. The basic argument used to defend the presence of creativity in education is its importance for the future. In this section I will focus on how creativity is taken as a category that produces itself as a fact of the world and makes up people (Hacking, 2006). The self-evident category of creative produces cultural thesis about who people are and how their expected behavior is.

Making up the creative subject, in contemporary educational research and policy, is not a matter of impositions, manipulations or dominations, but rather a question of inscribing and mobilizing the subject within a framework of hopes, pleasures, anxieties and goods. The assumption in educational research is that creativity is a skill which everyone can develop, however, the teacher has to unlock the door that gives access to it. When this deep inner property is discovered, the doors of empowerment, wellbeing and happiness are also open. The confessional practices as self-regulation and self-improvement practices are visible, for instance, in the ways assessment is talked about. Innovative ways of assessment mean the growth of portfolios that allow “students to test and give each other feedback.” As such, teachers should combine “different methods of assessment, including self and peer assessment by students” (Cachia et al. 2010, p. 24). The idea of assessment, being it the older IQ tests, the after 2nd World War psychometric tests, or the self and peer assessment to improve or help to achieve a certain state, cannot be disconnected from competitive, classificatory, grading, and confessional purposes.

To be inscribed within certain discourses of creativity, creative potential, creative learning or creative teaching is to become an active subject of a particular sort, one for whom the conduction of conduct through the technology of creativity becomes an expression of self-government. It is a conclusion of one of the reports consulted that “teacher training programs should provide all prospective teachers with guided development of classroom teaching practice as part of their initial training. Hands-on experience with guidance is crucial to prepare new teachers to face the reality of the classroom and to develop innovative and creative teaching methods” (Cachia et al. 2010, pp. 46, 47).

This division between the theory and practice entails a pragmatism that tends to erase the conditions of possibility for seeing and act in the classroom. Popkewitz (2013) argues that theories about creativity “are embodied in the styles of reason that order and classify what is seen and acted on in schooling” (p. 13). The eye of the teacher is normalized through ways of reasoning about the creative classroom environment and practices, and these inscribe styles of reasoning about the child, his/her inner sensitivities, dispositions and capabilities to achieve a creative, but regulated, behavior.

Here, we are confronted with the problem of the common sense of creativity in education as an unquestionable truth, part of a humanizing and developmental process that will result in success and emancipation. Reflecting on oneself becomes equivalent to uncovering a hidden potential that is called creativity. What I am arguing is that since creativity is seen as a category produced discursively, there is a double process of being classified and of mirroring oneself according to that classification. In that process, the

resultant individual is not just a “creative” but he has to creatively imagine the meaning of his/her self as an enterprise in which his/her capacities and dispositions are seen as a potential to be discovered and revealed. Paul du Gay (2003) refers to an entrepreneurial government that makes up the individual as “an ‘entrepreneur of the self’” (p. 156). The discourse on creativity takes part on that government of the self through identifications and allegiances that appear to be the result of very personal choices. However, the entrepreneurs of the self-become experts of themselves and, as argued by Rose and Miller (2008), “adopt an educated and knowledgeable relation of self-care in respect of their bodies, their minds, their forms of conduct and that of the members of their own families” (p. 215). Their lives have to be shaped as a work of art according to the grammar of individuality, freedom, autonomy, flexibility, originality, among others that constitute psychological ways of understanding what is to be a person. The key dimension of creativity is to promote certain qualities that are regarded as “a fundamental dimension of human activity” (European Commission, 2009). The unity given within the phrase that all children and young should be creative also contains those that do not achieve creative behaviors.

Ian Hacking’s (2006) notions of kinds of people and moving targets are of special importance here when we are dealing with the mobilization of people through the activation and engagement of self-fulfilling aspirations of each one according to a certain mode of being. The flow of the process is very simple. Classifications are produced and people are classified, classifications affect the people classified; the effects on people, in turn, change the classifications. To these dynamics in which classifications of people and their behavior affect each other, Hacking calls “looping-effects.” Creativity is a classification that defines a certain way of being a person, is not a natural or a neutral classification, and it is interactive. Classifications, “when known by people or by those around them, and put to work in institutions, change the ways in which individuals experience themselves – and may even lead people to evolve their feelings and behavior in part because they are so classified” (Hacking, 2002: 11). However, in the everyday life of research it seems that it is forgotten that the classifications are determined social constructions.

The historian of psychology Kurt Danziger elucidates the process in a very clear manner. After questioning if popular categories among us, like cognition, emotion, intelligence, motivation or learning, represent natural kinds, he concludes that these categories were invented but not as the consequence of empirical investigation. Psychologists did not invent the concept of “emotion,” for example, to account for certain empirical findings; they obtained certain empirical findings because of their desire to investigate a set of events which their culture had taught them to distinguish as “emotional”

(Danziger, 1997b: 6). In that sense what is seen as creative is just what follows the prescription of what creativity is. We saw already how in the arts, to be original or creative was not always a principle that defined the quality or the existence of it. This idea started when the older functional idea of art was replaced by the pair “fine art” and “craft.” The modern system of the arts is an invention with two hundred years old. The modern artist as a creative is part of that invention and also defines a kind of person.

The creative child, as well as the creative teacher, are kinds of people that solve problems. As argued by Popkewitz (2013), the educational sciences have never operated without theory. Problem solving, as well as creativity, is not a natural characteristic of the mind but an assemblage of theories about who they are and should be, in such a way that their performance becomes calculable and their lives manageable. If teachers want to support the creative potential of the students, they can, for instance, be “a model of creative attitude, solving problems in an original fashion, communicate values which foster a creative mindset” (Cachia and Ferrari, 2010: 47). These are not individual qualities but qualities for belonging to a larger community. Another study traces the hopes and fears, if this community is not realized. It concludes that “Especially in times of economic crisis, skills need to be improved in order to enhance employability and, as a consequence, economic growth. Transversal skills, such as problem-solving, self-management or analytical skills are the backbone of new skills for new jobs” (Ferrari et al., 2009, p. 2).

It is affirmed that the acquisition of these competences will give form to personal fulfillment, development, social inclusion, active citizenship and employment. The creative child as a problem solver is a kind of person imagined not in his/her individuality but in relation to his/her belonging to a community in which he/she has to participate actively. The premise of originality in the answers given is also the premise of the subject’s freedom, although, this is a regulated freedom that encourage and require individuals to compare what they do, what they achieve, and what they are with what they could or should be (Rose and Miller, 2008, p. 9). The *Manifesto for Creativity* (European Commission, 2009) and innovation, for instance, puts creativity and innovation as moving society “forward toward prosperity.” But the creative and innovative individual has to act within a society that “needs to take responsibility for how they are used.” The dreamed society is “a fair and green society, based upon intercultural dialogue and with respect for nature and for the health and well-being of people worldwide” (European Commission, 2009). We see, then, that the ways in which the creative person is addressed is not in terms of individuality but rather in relation to its responsibility for the common good of the community.

The child, in European documents, has to develop and foster creative and innovative capacities “for further learning and their working lives” (Cachia et al., 2010: 9). To construct oneself as a creative person is an unfinished and continuously task, being it the child as the future citizen or the teacher in constant retraining to be always more creative. The teachers who are not yet creative enough have to be helped. Training programs have to be reviewed to ensure the promotion of “diverse and innovative teaching methods, digital competence and teaching cross-curricular competences with plenty of hands-on classroom practice and efficient guidance.” The data gathered in one of the studies shows how policy drive is needed. The conclusion is that, among the teachers interviewed, “technologies are far from exploited for creative and innovative purposes in the classroom” (Cachia et al., 2010: 10). That training should enable “teachers to reflect on the activities that take place in the classroom and discern which of them are more likely to encourage creativity” (Cachia et al., 2010: 25). The unspoken differentiations between good practices and bad practices of teaching inscribe, in a real way, different kinds of person and simultaneously install the hope and fear of being or not that sort of person.

6. Conclusions

An analysis of the discourse on creativity in educational research in Europe makes evident that being creative is part of the contemporary agenda. The creative subject is addressed to a certain type of person that inscribes capabilities and properties that allows us to face the future. The Europe in crisis claims for a new generation able to create innovative ideas and values. However, a close look into these principles shows that discourse is more than a group of signs. To speak of creativity, the creative child, the teacher creates strategies for developing creativity, embodies principles that organize behaviors, ways of being, acting and thinking. In this paper I sought to explore the idea of creativity as one of the technologies of government in the 21st century, alongside, for example, with entrepreneurship and life-long learning. These technologies create principles that order, discipline and regulate action and participation, through the production of certain subjectivities. As such, creativity was seen as a category that makes up subjects, and the creative child or teacher were seen as problem solvers. What I observed is that is not their individuality that is in question, but qualities that link them to the need of participation in communities. To be or not to be creative appears as a choice of inclusion or exclusion from the European exceptionalism of the future. As argued by Thomas Popkewitz (2008), the twin elements of hope and fear differentiate and divide “the qualities of those ‘civilized’ from those who were cast out of that space” (p. 95). What

creativity does within European educational discourse is to activate the hope for a creative Europe through the idea of pursuing a certain happiness and way of being, but at the same time suggesting the “other” space of identity, economic and societal crisis. But an incursion through creativity as a construction gives us is the possibility of imagining other alternatives than those already inscribed in the order of the present.

NOTES AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author appreciates the comments of Thomas S. Popkewitz on a preliminary version of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Baumeister, R. (1987), “How the Self Became a Problem: A Psychological Review of Historical Research,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52(1): 163–176.
- Cachia, R., Ferrari, A., Ala-Mutka, K., and Punie, Y. (2010), *Creative Learning and Innovative Teaching. Final Report on the Study on Creativity and Innovation in Education in the EU member States*. European Commission, JRC.
- Cachia, R., and Ferrari, A. (2010), *Creativity in Schools: A Survey of Teachers in Europe*. European Commission, JRC.
- Cousinet, R. (n.d.), “Imagination [entry of the Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d’Instruction Primaire], by Ferdinand Buisson, [available at: <http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=2894>].
- Danziger, K. (1997a), *Problematic Encounter: Talks on Psychology and History*. [available at: www.kurtdanziger.com/].
- Danziger, K. (1997b), *Naming the Mind. How Psychology Found Its Language*. London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (1994), *Critical and Effective Histories. Foucault’s Methods and Historical Sociology*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ferrari, A., Cachia, R., and Punie, Y. (2009), *Innovation and Creativity in Education and Training in the EU Member States: Fostering Creative Learning and Supporting Innovative Teaching*. European Commission, JRC.
- European Commission (2009), *European Ambassadors for Creativity and Innovation. Manifesto*. [available at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/year09/manifesto_en.pdf].
- Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. (1981), *History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1983a), “The Subject and Power,” in H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 208–226.
- Foucault, M. (1983b), “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress,” in H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 229–252.

- Foucault, M. (1988), *Technologies of the Self. A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991a), "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in D. F. Bouchard (ed.), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 138–164.
- Foucault, M. (1991b), "Governmentality," in G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 87–104.
- Gay, P. (2003), "Organizing Identity: Entrepreneurial Governance and Public Management," in Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 151–169.
- Gordon, C. (1991), "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction," in G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1–51.
- Hacking, I. (2002), "Inaugural Lecture: Chair of Philosophy and History of Scientific Concepts at the Collège de France, 16 January 2001," *Economy and Society* 31(1): 1–14.
- Hacking, I. (2006), "Kinds of People: Moving Targets," the 10th British Academy Lecture. Read 11 April 2006 at the British Academy.
- Hawley, J. (2010), *Prison Education – Contents, Trends and Policy Issues. Background Paper*. European Commission.
- Hunter, I. (1994), *Rethinking the School: Subjectivity, Bureaucracy, Criticism*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kristeller, P. (1983), "Creativity and Tradition," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44(1): 105–113.
- Martins, C. (2011), *As narrativas do génio e da salvação: a invenção do olhar e a fabricação da mão na Educação e no Ensino das Artes Visuais em Portugal (de finais de XVIII à primeira metade do século XX)*. Lisboa: Doctoral Thesis.
- NACCCE (1999), *All our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education*.
- Ó, J., Martins, C., Paz, A. (2013), "Genealogy as History: From Pupil to Artist as the Dynamics of Genius, Status and Inventiveness in Art Education in Portugal," in Thomas S. Popkewitz (ed.), *Rethinking the History of Education. Transnational Perspectives on Its Questions, Methods, and Knowledge*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 159–178.
- Popkewitz, T. (1988), *Struggling for the Soul. The Politics of Schooling and the Construction of the Teacher*. New York-London: Teachers College University Press.
- Popkewitz, T. (2008), *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform Science, Education, and Making Society by Making the Child*. New York-London: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T., and Martins, C. (2013), "'Now We Are European!' How Did We Get That Way?," *Sisyphus, Journal of Education* 1(1): 36–64.
- Popkewitz, T. (2013), "The Empirical and Political 'Fact' of Theory in the Social and Education Sciences," in G. Biesta, J. Allan, and R. G. Edwards (eds.), *Making a Difference in Theory: The Theory Question in Education and the Education Question in Theory*. London-New York: Routledge, 13–29.
- Rancière, J. (2004), *The Politics of Aesthetics*. London-New York: Continuum.

- Roberts, P. (2006), *Nurturing Creativity in Young People: A Report to Government to Inform Future Policy*. London: DCMS/DES.
- Rose, N. (1996), *Inventing Ourselves; Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N., and Miller, P. (2008), *Governing the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shiner, L. (2001), *The Invention of Art. A Cultural History*. Chicago-London, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stevens, B., Miller, R., and Michalski, W. (2000), "Social Diversity and the Creative Society of the 21st Century," in *The Creative Society of the 21st Century*. Paris: OECD, 7–24.
- Wolff, J. (1983), *Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art*. London: George Allen & Unwin.