

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

**1<sup>er</sup> semestre – 2<sup>ème</sup> session**

Année d'étude : M1 MEF  
Enseignant responsable : Jean-Luc Bodin

Durée de l'épreuve : 4h  
Documents autorisés : aucun

**UE T72MEC- : Fondements scientifiques de l'EPS**  
**EC T72MEC2 : Approches scientifiques de l'intervention en EPS (1)**

**Sujet :**

Tout enseignant est confronté à l'hétérogénéité des élèves qui lui sont confiés.

Après avoir analysé cette affirmation, vous présenterez les leviers sur lesquels l'enseignant d'EPS peut jouer, au cours du cursus collège, afin de permettre à chaque élève d'atteindre les apprentissages visés.

Votre argumentation intégrera des exemples professionnels issus de deux CP différentes.

*La qualité de la rédaction, de la présentation et le respect de l'orthographe seront pris en compte dans l'évaluation. (Jusqu'à -2 pts )*

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2e session, 1er semestre

Année d'études : *M1 MEF*

Enseignant responsable : *Julie MORERE/Sarah  
ROSENFELD*

Durée de l'épreuve : *2h00*


Documents autorisés : *aucun*

**UEF T71TCM : Tronc commun**  
**EC T71TCM4 Anglais**

*Working on a scientific paper – Topic under study: P.E. and dance*

Part of an article entitled “The dilemmas of teaching for creativity: Insights from expert specialist dance teachers” by Kerry Chappell (April 2007) has been reprinted here.

- 1) Think of **5 keywords** in relation with this article. (5 pts)
- 2) The 4<sup>th</sup> and concluding part has been removed. Write down a 250-word paragraph drawing **your own conclusions** after reading this paper. (10 pts)
- 3) **Give your own opinion** about the use of dance in P.E. classes. (5 pts)



Thinking Skills and Creativity

## **The dilemmas of teaching for creativity: Insights from expert specialist dance teachers**

Kerry Chappell

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2007.01.001>

---

### **1. Introduction**

The study from which this paper is drawn, was originally stimulated by dance education work within the Laban Education and Community Programme. This programme is part of Laban, one of the leading conservatoires for dance artist training in the United Kingdom. It runs classes, workshops, projects and teacher development sessions in dance. These take place in a wide variety of life-long educational and community settings, across London and nationwide in partnership with dance organisations, agencies and professional dance companies ([www.laban.org/labane/education\\_community.phtml](http://www.laban.org/labane/education_community.phtml)).

The programme is made up of management and administrative staff, a full-time education and community dance worker and a pool of dance teachers with various age, style and ability foci. In the main the teachers in the pool are of a particular kind. They are hybrid professionals of dance educator and dance artist, often employed by the Laban Programme to teach in short-term, visiting capacities or on a project basis, in a variety of educational settings. It should be noted that they are only one of a number of kinds of dance teachers currently working within education in England. In particular, they are distinguishable from full- or part-time permanent dance teachers within formal state school settings.

Around 2000/2001, the programme, including myself as Projects Manager, was increasingly being approached to run educational projects with a focus on 'creativity'. These approaches in no small part stemmed from the NACCCE Report (1999), which had stated that there is a clear and urgent need to develop creativity. In response, government schemes had been initiated, including Creative Partnerships ([www.creative-partnerships.com](http://www.creative-partnerships.com), ongoing), aiming to provide school children with the opportunity to develop creativity in learning via collaborative partnerships making best use of the United Kingdom's creative wealth. As part of this 'creative wealth', dance education organisations were identified as key potential partners in the drive for developing creativity. Amongst others, the Laban Education and Community Programme management and teaching team found itself surrounded by rhetoric about creativity. Questions were therefore provoked around the nature of creativity in dance education, what it means to be able to teach for creativity within dance, and what this means in relation to the wider educational agenda of creativity.

Alongside these emerging questions, concern was growing that the number of appropriately skilled dance teachers was failing to meet the ever-increasing demand of such agendas (NDTA, 2004), including the risk of 'creative' dance education activities becoming formulaic rather than truly encouraging creativity (Ackroyd, 2001). The risk of formulaic choreographic processes and products within supposedly creative experiences in school dance education has also been highlighted again more recently by Jobbins (2006). From a UK dance education perspective, there was and still is a real need to tackle questions about creativity in order to encourage valued originality rather than repeated formula, for both teachers and learners. In particular, questions about creativity might be most usefully approached in a way that can practically feed into continuing professional development (CPD) and dance teacher training. It was therefore felt that the most appropriate focus for this research was on exploring and unlocking the conceptions of and practical approaches to creativity of expert specialist dance teachers working at the late primary level (an age group in which dance education research is particularly sparse, Lord, 2001), particularly those reputed for their abilities in teaching for creativity. Findings could then be most fruitfully applied for use by other teachers and researchers.

In theoretically contextualising and conceptualising the study, a framework was developed which brought together previous theorising and research from both national and international dance education and mainstream creativity in education literature. Craft's (2000) theory of 'little c creativity' and its three integrated lenses of people, process and domain was particularly influential. Craft highlights the value of the social systems theory approach to creativity, particularly the work of Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner (1994) which drew out the features of the individual, the field and the domain as a framework for understanding genius level creativity. Whilst acknowledging the usefulness of these three features, Craft made certain amendments in order to conceptualise a theory which more appropriately encapsulated 'little c creativity'. She adapted the framework to play down the importance of field-shifting originality more pertinent to the high level creator and raised the profile of aspects of process within her model. [...]

With an accompanying emphasis on domain (in this study, dance) and an acknowledgement of the importance of environment, Craft's framework was therefore able to act as a catalyst for shaping the conceptual framework for this study. The dance teachers conceptions of and approaches to creativity were then studied within the framework.

As this study was considering aspects of people and process within a particular domain, the visual configuration of the three strands, which made the most sense in terms of facilitating this study, prioritised people and process within the wider circles of domain and environment (see Fig. 1).




Fig. 1. The interacting strands of the conceptual framework.

It is important to emphasise that framing the study in this way does not represent an attempt to consider every potential aspect of the interaction between people and process within domain and environment. The framework was used as a way of understanding and inter-relating theory as a context for and way of focusing research questions. It was used in conjunction with the most salient aspects of people and process within the teachers' conceptions and approaches that arose through the fieldwork. The framework is not an attempt to test or develop a theory of creativity in dance education.

Grounded within this conceptual framework, the research investigated how expert specialist dance teachers conceive of and approach creativity at the coalface of creative project delivery. Ethell and McMeniman (2001) note that researchers have distinguished between expert and novice teachers' knowledge structures, with experts having larger, more efficiently organised and more effectively utilised knowledge bases, both pedagogically and in relation to subject matter. This study is grounded in McMeniman's (2001) arguments, drawing on Schon's (1987) epistemology of practice, for 'unlocking' what has become expert teachers' tacit practical knowledge. Munby, Russell, and Martin (2001) describe practical knowledge as relating to practices within and navigation of classroom settings, highlighting the complexities of interactive teaching and thinking-in-action.

The study follows in the footsteps of, and seeks to build on teacher knowledge studies in dance (for example, [Buck, 2001] and [Chen, 2001]; Fortin & Siedentop, 1995; Lord, 2001). However, it aims to place greater emphasis on the importance of teacher reflection, and therefore seeks to represent findings in a fluid format, emphasising the shifts and developments of practice.

As stated earlier, it is important to be clear about the kind of dance teachers involved in the research, so that readers can be clear about how they generalise from the findings to a variety of dance, and other, teaching situations. They were 'expert specialist dance teachers', hybrid professionals of dance educator and dance artist, teaching in short-term, visiting capacities, in a variety of educational settings, including projects like Creative Partnerships. [...]

This paper will focus on perhaps the most dominant dilemma from the study, that of how to achieve the 'balance between personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge'

when teaching for creativity in dance education. Theoretically, the dilemma sits in the very centre of the Venn diagram in [Fig. 1](#), where personal agency/qualities and process combine within the dance domain in particular educational situations and environments where teachers are working to teach for creativity. This dilemma connects strongly to two wider questions within mainstream creativity in education practice and research (for example, [Jeffery, 2005](#); [Jeffrey & Craft, 2004](#); [Stein, 2004](#); [Woods & Jeffrey, 1996](#)). The first question concerns the role of knowledge in creativity, where the domain provides a knowledge context for creativity, and within which creativity is judged. The second question concerns the ways in which adults – in particular experts – might engage in teaching for creativity, both highlighted by [Craft \(2005\)](#) as key ongoing areas of research.

The dilemma itself is alive and well within debates in dance education practice and literature [...]. The question is no longer expressionism (art as products of feelings publicly expressed, capable of evoking the same feelings in others) or formalism (aesthetic experience as the education of the perception of formal, structural and relational qualities which can be discerned through sense perception and in symbolic expressions) ([Cooper, 1999](#)), but, how might the two be intertwined and balanced? It is the achievement of this balance with late primary age children which lies at the heart of the dance teachers' dilemma: balancing personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge to teach for creativity.

Drawing on [Best \(1985\)](#), [Smith-Autard \(2002\)](#) advocates an equal emphasis on creativity, imagination, individuality, subjectivity and feelings, and acquisition/training of the techniques, knowledge and objective criteria of theatre dance. Having published the second edition of her book after the [NACCCE Report \(1999\)](#), Smith-Autard sees the definition of creativity to be found therein: imaginative activity fashioned so as to produce outcomes that are both original and of value, as in accordance with her stance, as it is grounded in the inter-relationship between the originality of the individual and the criteria of the public art world.

[Smith-Autard \(2002\)](#) and writers such as [Gough \(1999\)](#) clearly articulate teaching for this inter-relationship using the three processes of creating, performing and appreciating; with [Smith-Autard \(2002\)](#) particularly advocating the use of open-ended problem solving and directed teaching. In unpacking the dilemma of how to balance voice and knowledge for creativity, the study delved into Smith-Autard's suggestion of open-ended problem solving blended with directed teaching with the three teachers [...] in relation to the potential roles of classroom atmospheres, criticism, playfulness, learning structures and teaching styles.

## **2. Methodology**

The research methodology was firmly grounded within the qualitative interpretive realm, acknowledging reality as socially constructed and investigating meaning within that paradigm ([Marshall & Rossman, 1995](#)). This methodology was coupled with [Stenhouse's \(1985\)](#) multi-case educational case study approach, which allowed for the development of understanding of the complexity and particularity of each dance teachers' conceptions of and approaches to creativity in context. Three cases were studied in order to achieve a balance between depth of individual practice, and cross-analysis to demonstrate common and different approaches with detail of personal and situational explanations ([Schofield, 1993](#)).

The selection strategy used was based in both reputational selection ([Goetz & Lecompte, 1984](#)), participants chosen through recommendations from the researcher and teachers' peers, and theoretical representativeness, finding expert specialists who could most effectively

contribute to the theoretical area under consideration (Patton, 1990), for this study creativity in education. The expert specialist dance teacher participants were all colleagues of mine within the Laban Education and Community Programme: ([www.laban.org/labane/education\\_community.phtml](http://www.laban.org/labane/education_community.phtml)): Michael, Amanda and Kate were all hybrid professionals of dance educator and dance artist, teaching in short-term, visiting capacities, in a variety of educational settings. [...]

Data collection methods used within the study were: stimulated recall semi-structured interviews with dance teachers and children; participant observation in classes; video (particularly useful for later stage task analysis) and photography; collection of documentation; and reflective diaries. The research was designed to allow the researcher to consecutively spend a period of approximately 12 weeks in the field with each dance teacher, carrying out cycles of data collection and analysis. Fieldwork was followed by an extended period of analysis, applying the principles of constant comparative analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) throughout, and seeking to achieve trustworthiness, quality and rigour through the application of Lincoln and Guba's (1985) principles of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

The generalisations to be made from the findings of this study are of a particular kind. Fortin and Siedentop (1995), drawing on Shulman (1983), are clear that studies of this nature are aiming for generalisations described as 'images of the possible'. These are images on which dance teachers of different kinds, teacher educators and researchers can draw to catalyse their own reflections on developing practice and related theory. Key to these reflections (Schofield, 1993) is the use of contextualising descriptions. These descriptions allows the reader to understand the details of the situation from within which the findings were generated, and to compare these with the situation to which they are looking to apply them, in order to judge for applicability.

### 3. Findings and discussion

#### 3.1. Foundations

Before articulating the pedagogical spectra and decision-making processes that made up the dance teachers' solutions to the dilemma under investigation, a little space must be given to two other aspects of the research findings which were foundational to teaching for creativity: embodied knowing and creative process.

The dance teachers particularly focused on building greater 'literacy' regarding an embodied way of knowing. The term literacy here is borrowed from the terminology of English educators. It is applied to a movement context to articulate the dance teachers desire for children to be able to interpret and create using their own bodily movement, and that of others (comparable to the notions of reading and writing using verbally-based languages). This movement literacy was grounded in being able to "sense" movement from within; developing to "thinking physically" as part of a "connected *thinking body-mind*"; to moving with "*whole self-awareness*". This was coupled with an emphasis on *reciprocity*.

Kate described *sensing* as "feeling their energy ... being aware of what they're doing ... it's kinaesthetics isn't it? ... physical knowledge ... they have to feel it and recognise it". For all three teachers, this was layered with the "thinking body" incorporated within the "mind". Amanda described watching children "struggling with their physicality then making the

connection ... their own understanding of what that thing is”. Kate commented: “his whole body is thinking ... he’s got it into his body”. A child in Kate’s class confirmed: “it’s like ... your body’s the brain and I just go into this shape, and you just think and you just do”. Developing “movement memory” and “movement vocabulary” were also a part of the *thinking body–mind* which, Michael argued, structured “physical knowledge”. Equipped with the possibility to think physically, the children became equipped with the ability to make their own meaning physically; to interpret and create with their increased movement literacy.

*Whole self-awareness* was the final layer of embodied knowing that the dance teachers conceived as foundational to creativity. Michael connected the body–mind and the children’s sense of self: “a sense of their own personal physical self ... I’m pushing them to be aware of that ... that awareness of the being, them as a being in the space or with another person ... Inhabiting your body”. Amanda explained “it’s not just an external shape you’re making. It’s about thinking, feeling, moving the whole of you”.

Intertwined with this, was *reciprocity*, the ability to comprehend other people’s perceptions, ideas and ways of doing things, and to respond to them. For Michael responsiveness to others was: “the talking, the working together ... the sensitivity, the touch ... they are social skills in terms of [how] they can ‘talk’ to each other, and show their ideas ... they are also about space, contact”. For all the teachers, *reciprocity* was closely connected to *whole self-awareness* with an ability to develop self, built on *reciprocity*, at the heart of which was the ability to empathise. Two of the children in Amanda’s class discussed this: Natalie: “when you go up and do it, no-one hardly laughs at you, because it’s like your own moves” Michel: “Everybody else understands how you feel”.

In order to frame and understand these emergent findings, it became necessary to explore beyond theory underpinning dance in education in the UK (Smith-Autard, 2002). Although dance is seen to contribute to personal and social education, direct references to the ‘self’, relationships and their development or inclusion within creativity are generally avoided within the model’s theoretical discussions. Laban’s Modern Educational Dance articulation of self-realisation (1948) is critiqued, but no explicit alternative conception is offered. This is understandable, as one of Smith-Autard’s (1994) purposes was to justify dance as art in the curriculum, which meant emphasising theoretical aspects of dance that were assessable and educable, playing down those connected with the romantic ideology of self-expression.

Dance research from the USA is therefore more useful for theoretically framing the embodied knowing. The layering of *sensing*, *thinking body–mind* and *whole self-awareness* echoes [Stinson, 1995] and [Stinson, 2004], Green’s (1993) and Bresler’s (2004) research, which frames dance education within theories of embodiment. Both Stinson and Bresler draw on Hanna’s (1988) work in ‘somatics’, which is described as a way of perceiving oneself from the inside out, where one is aware of feelings, movements and intentions (Stinson, 2004). The findings regarding the *thinking body–mind* resonate with Green’s discussions of that very same connection. In addition, the fundamental importance to the dance teachers of *reciprocity* particularly resonated with the conceptions of self put forward by [Stinson, 1995], [Stinson, 1998] and [Stinson, 2004], which is similar to that put forward by John-Steiner (2000) in her theory of collaborative creativity (with which the dance teachers’ conceptions also had very strong similarities, see Chappell, 2006a, or Section 5.2, Chappell, 2006b). Both their work is grounded in the feminist conception of ‘self developing in relation’ (for example, Surrey, 1991).



Finally, building on these articulations, it is particularly important to draw out the significance of the dance teachers working for greater literacy in embodied knowing in relation to the education of aesthetic experience. Recently, Bannon and Sanderson (2000) have argued for a re-evaluation of the nature of aesthetic experience in dance pedagogy. They argue that there is still a “political and cultural reluctance in the UK to accept the value, or even the existence, of the knowledge, embodied in dance experience” (p. 11). Quoting Fraleigh (Fraleigh & Hanstein, 1999, p. 190), they argue that this embodied knowledge is intrinsic to aesthetic experience which is “... founded in our senses, realised through our living body in its wholeness, actualised in our words, our work, and daily life”. They argue that the aesthetic should be understood as the simultaneous engagement of body, mind, and sensibility, aligning feeling and cognition, and that it has to do with discovering being ‘human’, individual and ‘interested’.

Bannon and Sanderson (2000) also remind dance educators of Reid's (1969) arguments that art education is a way of intentionally activating aesthetic encounters. This in turn makes us revisit Reid's argument for the educational acceptance of aesthetic knowledge grounded in embodied and felt understanding, “with the cognitive and affective indivisibly united and fused together” (Reid, 1986, p. 24) as a unique form of knowledge, a way of experiencing the world. Reid discusses this unique form of knowledge alongside ‘knowledge that’ (propositional knowledge of concepts) and ‘knowledge how’ (procedural knowledge) which were put forward by, amongst others, Ryle (1949) and which are now often accepted as potential ways of knowing within educational discourse. Reid distinguishes the unique embodied, felt, aesthetic way of knowing as ‘knowing this’ ([Reid, 1974] and [Reid, 1980]). It is important to remember that in discussing ‘feeling’, he is referring to deep feeling which is not just a subjective ongoing but is a feeling *of* and *for* values gathered from enormous ranges of human knowledge and experience, transformed into symbolic expression and embodiment ... feeling is not to be equated with cognition, but there is no doubt not only that it can share in cognitive activity, but that it can illuminate it, helping us to see and understand as we could not without it (Reid, 1980, p. 334–335)

Returning to the question concerning the role of knowledge in creativity, in understanding the dance teachers solutions to the dilemma being discussed within this paper (balancing personal/collective voice with craft and compositional knowledge) it is embodied knowing intrinsic to aesthetic knowledge or ‘knowing this’ (albeit not discounting the involvement of ‘knowing that’ and ‘knowing how’) which is being negotiated in balancing the scales to teach for creativity, that leads to valued originality within dance.

The other aspect of the research findings which will be articulated here is the dance teachers’ conceptualisations of aspects of creative processes which threaded through their use of the spectra detailed below when teaching for creativity. These will only be very briefly considered in order to acknowledge the importance of processes within the teachers’ teaching for creativity, with the remainder of the findings section devoted to the dance teachers solution to the dilemma of balancing personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge. In relation to processes, the dance teachers prioritised: *immersion* or absorption in being the dance; an emphasis on *physical imagination*; the *inter-relationship of generating and homing in on ideas*; and an ability to ‘capture’ appropriate ideas using intuition. Further unpacking of these processes can be found within Section 5.3 of Chappell (2006b).


### **3.2. Teaching for creativity: pedagogical spectra**

The heart of this paper now focuses on the pedagogical spectra rooted within embodied knowing, the emergent ability of ‘knowing this’, and the above articulation of process.

When balancing personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge to teach for creativity, for the dance teachers, personal/collective voice concerned ‘what’ the children had to communicate, and how they wanted to communicate it, individually and collaboratively. Craft/compositional knowledge was structured within Laban's movement framework of body/action, relationships, space and dynamics, as well as basic solo and collaborative compositional skills. In particular, the combined balance was about the children understanding aesthetic conventions of how movement form could be used to communicate ideas in order that they could use these to creatively communicate their own ideas.

All three teachers worked to encourage this combination, yet their approaches to creativity represented different weightings between personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge. Amanda offered the most equally weighted balance, with Kate weighted more strongly towards the development of personal/collective voice and Michael weighted towards craft/compositional knowledge. Of vital importance was the fact that although each teacher had a preferred weighting, these shifted dependent on situation, focused on the needs of the children within the project objectives.

The findings showed that the teachers were all using tasks and strategies from three core pedagogical spectra when solving the dilemma to teach for creativity. These are represented in [Table 1](#) and are articulated separately below. However, the three dimensions were intricately intertwined within the teachers’ practice. For this reason, the reader may find themselves cross-connecting between the three rather than seeing them as coherently separated. This is intentional.



### 3.2.1. Creative source: inside out or outside in

This concerned whether the creative source was prioritised within the children *inside out*, or within dance knowledge, most often manifested within the teacher working *outside in*. Favouring personal/collective voice, but including craft/compositional knowledge led to a preference for *inside out*, vice versa for the opposite balance.

Kate's approach was weighted towards prioritising the *inside out*, but including working *outside in*. Pedagogically, this meant that *stimuli were teacher/child-derived* through discussion, with *relatively unknown outcomes*. *Within creating tasks*, Kate was anti “colouring-in”, placing the *onus for movement generation on the children*: “do you give them movement material as a starting point or not? ... it does give a structure ... and it can look neater, but it is like colouring in”. *Within appreciation tasks questions were child initiated*, subsequently drawn out using Kate's targeted questions building understanding of compositional success.

Michael and Amanda worked prioritising *outside in*, but ultimately shifted to include *inside out*: “I taught them the beginning of the duet, because they needed that vocabulary ... to have more confidence to play with things they added on ... it also gives them some of the tools that they can use in their own creativity” (see Fig. 2). *Stimuli were initially teacher-derived* with

relatively “pre-envisioned” outcomes, begun with clear *teacher-initiated demonstrations*: “With Tracey, Michael demonstrates a learned pair sequence containing an opportunity to improvise ... He demonstrates with a lot of energy, stretching to the very ends of his light filled shape, which Tracey is good at responding to in the moment, he also describes suggestions as he does them” (11.11.04).



Fig. 2. Developing the taught duet.

*Appreciation tasks* were also *teacher-initiated* by Michael giving detailed feedback and questioning of children's creative work to offer tight examples of insights they might have into creatively successful work.

Within Craft's (2000) creativity theory, it is impulse that roots the creative process in personal voice and meaning-making. It is therefore worth emphasising that, for the teachers, working *inside out* was never submerged by working *outside in*. They taught to ensure that by allowing for working *inside out* via whichever prioritisation of approaches was appropriate within the situations in which they were teaching, children could authentically and creatively give voice to ideas which were aesthetically appropriate and meaningful to them in dance.

I refer the reader to the teachers' situations: Kate in an ongoing community class which children attended voluntarily, often long-term; Michael and Amanda in short term-long projects with relatively inexperienced children, and for Michael less well-supported. In these situations, time was a key factor: *inside out* favouring the more time-consuming learning through exploration; *outside in*, with time at a premium, favouring learning by example. All three teachers emphasised that, whichever approach, the children had to experience “internalisation” and “ownership” of the creative impulse; thus each successfully solving the dilemma of balancing personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge in their situation.

In relation to these dance teachers, it might also be suggested that Michael's preference for *outside in* prior to *inside out* can be explained by his strong background in school dance, influenced by [Smith-Autard, 2000] and [Smith-Autard, 2002] theorising which suggests selecting the stimuli before improvisation. Within this framework it makes sense to offer the children pre-selected stimuli, perhaps with pre-prepared movement interpretation or, in a less polarised adaptation of *outside in*, pre-selected stimuli for improvisation. Kate's background is less influenced by the theories of [Smith-Autard, 2000] and [Smith-Autard, 2002], and her

positioning of improvisation within the compositional process. This could be another explanation for Kate's initial prioritisation of *inside out* before *outside in*, where stimuli are teacher/child-derived, and relatively unguided improvisation with few limitations was often the starting point for the choreographic process.

By delving behind the decision-making to the teachers' solutions, these findings demonstrate the importance of raising awareness amongst specialist dance teachers, and those who educate them, of the reasons behind the selection and inter-relation of creative sources when teaching for creativity. This particularly relates to the underlying theoretical conceptions underpinning teaching approaches, which contribute to weighting the balance between personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge.

### 3.2.2. Proximity and intervention<sub>1</sub>

Rooted in the dance teachers' preferred 'way', this spectrum ranged from supporting and challenging reactively from a distance or proactively at close range, with distance relating to freedom.

Kate and Amanda both favoured a *praise-based democratic approach* with space for personal choice and challenge. For example, Amanda collaborated with the children in shaping their sharing: "I want to be as responsive as I can to where the group are at ... allowing children to instigate their own journeys". Amanda and Kate *supported reactively from a distance* (see Fig. 3):

Natalie and Amelia stand apart doing nothing ... they try one of Amanda's suggestions ... it doesn't work. Natalie suggests another of Amanda's possibilities ... They unsuccessfully try the first again, they talk, they try Amanda's possibility ... they repeat the second one. Natalie tries a version ... which involves changing the body facing of one person to make the movement a different way (11.2.04).




Fig. 3. Circulating without intervening.

The girls did nothing, were unsuccessful, were successful, were unsuccessful again, finally generating their movement without Amanda's intervention but with her present nearby.

Amanda and Kate consistently used very open suggestions and questions: “play around with ideas”. This language, coupled with distanced support, suggested that the children could include the teacher's ideas, or not.

Michael *supported*: “trying to give some safety ... security” with a more control-based element emphasising craft/compositional knowledge: “what do I need to give them ... skills, knowledge ... confidence ... taking responsibility for it?” He challenged through focused *criticism* often proactively using ‘question clusters’ (see [Fig. 4](#)): “How are you going to do this smooth turn?” “How do you control it?”




Fig. 4. Proactive intervention.

This spectrum is indicative of the freedom and space the teachers allowed the children for creativity and the teacher/learner power balance. Amanda and Kate's style echoes [Craft et al.'s \(2005\)](#) observation of teachers using ‘invisible’ pedagogy positioning themselves ‘off centre-stage’ when teaching for creativity, also reported by [Cremin, Craft, and Burnard \(2006\)](#), drawing on the same study. Their style also resonates with [Anttila's \(2003\)](#) dialogical approach in dance, which emphasises teaching as listening and encountering, with interference tempered by these. There are parallels with the reactive distance Kate and Amanda used to afford children space.

Contrastingly, Michael's relationship style resonates with [Lavender and Predock-Linnell \(2001\)](#) argument within dance for ‘critical consciousness’, emphasising struggle and challenge; and echoes [Gough's \(1999\)](#) argument against [Lerman's \(1993\)](#) affirmative-based criticism approach, which Gough argues restricts dance criticism from being as rigorous as it might. Interestingly, in their final interviews, Amanda and Kate emphasised that their approach also challenged, but did so subtly through children challenging themselves.

It is important to note that Michael was not using authority for its own sake. Discussing power relations, [Green \(1993\)](#) emphasises that authority cannot simply be done away with, arguing that a reflective approach to dance pedagogy does not attempt to rid the teacher of authority but allows them to become aware of how it plays out and use this to develop the most helpful pedagogy. It is exactly this kind of reflective approach that led these three teachers to their different, but equally considered, applications of proximity and intervention style, in order to solve the dilemma of balancing personal/collective voice and craft/compositional knowledge entwined with understanding of the aesthetic experience, in their own way, in their particular situations.

Finally, returning to the mainstream creativity in education literature in relation to this point, the dialogical, reactive end of the spectrum seems to be the more commonly cited within discussions of teaching for creativity. For example, Odena's (2003) findings of secondary music teachers' perceptions of themselves as facilitator, nurturer and helper in relation to creativity, Craft et al.'s (2005) discussions of invisible pedagogy, and Craft's (1997) finding of the use of a care ethic leaning towards the dialogic when teaching for creativity. Perhaps because of the onus on considering the relationship between knowledge and creativity within a particular domain, these findings provide a more unusual example of teaching practice in relation to creativity, suggesting that 'close proximity' and 'proactive intervention' might well be an overlooked strategy as part of a reflexive approach to teaching for creativity. This research illustrates a positive use of teacher control within a wider spectrum of intervention choice in order to teach for creativity.

### 3.2.3. Spectrum of task structures

This spectrum relates to responsibility sharing for creative activities: immediate or gradual. Kate and Amanda used *purposeful play* characterised by *risk-taking and acceptance of failures* (see Fig. 5): "learning through mistakes ... knowing that they can fail and get back up again, and nobody says anything".



Fig. 5. Taking physical risks whilst playing with responses to '\` symbol.

The *pick and mix structure* offered choice regarding which parts of stimuli/ideas to work on, including going beyond the task: working on a dance based on the computer keyboard, "Amanda suggests ... they can include a movement which represents a '/', an '@', a '-', and a surprise keyboard symbol ... delivered in quick succession, each with ... physical demonstrations of possible movements with space for responses in between" (11.2.04). This "play structure was giving them ... security" whilst providing "as much freedom as possible", with play stimuli/rules negotiated with the teacher relating to craft/compositional knowledge.

Communal *fun, silliness and mess* were also fundamental: "they're more prepared to ... be silly ... so much of creativity is about play ... licence to do that"; as was "physical imagination" (see Section 5.3, Chappell, 2006b), rooted internally and within an embodied way of knowing (Section 3.1). This was distinguished from "dramatic imagination"/"acting" to avoid "literal responses ... play-acting ... within role", although dramatisation could be included later.



Lindqvist (2001), drawing on Vygotsky's (1995) drama-based play argued for play within dance classes more closely equate-able with drama, as dance is not easily intelligible for children, who are not always skilful at expressing in dance. In contrast, these dance teachers encouraged play rooted in physicality and embodied knowledge within a strong dance/movement meaning-making framework which could be coupled with dramatisation.

In relation to structure within play, a spectrum applied to dance by Anttila (2003) is useful here. She uses Kallia (1999) to argue that play can be seen on a continuum from enjoyment, spontaneity and freedom to commitment to rules and aims. These dance teachers' conceptions of embodied 'purposeful' play might find a home mid-way along Kalliala's spectrum. Their play is so structured when teaching for creativity in dance education because of a wish to balance freedom to explore playfully with experience of craft/compositional knowledge intertwined between which is the 'knowing this' of aesthetic experience.

Linked to Michael's emphasis on craft/compositional knowledge, Michael used *apprenticeship with tight parameters*. In order to give the children secure foundations for bursts of creativity, Michael modelled three learning stages: "First stage is ... where you're looking for them to use physical imagination ... learning skills and gaining confidence ... a given movement vocabulary ... Second stage ... you introduce a theme, image, context ... asking them to layer ... a dynamic interpretation of material they've already developed ... that's the transitional stage ... third stage is where you're hoping to see the two fusing ... where they're ... independently using the physical and the dynamic to translate ... the theme ... into their movement".

*Progression was contingent on step-by-step success*: "you can't get to those places until you've seen evidence of them ... they've made that journey ... Now we can carry on" with *stimuli initially teacher-specified*. As the children progressed and succeeded more choice and variety was offered. It is worth noting that Michael did make reference to play, but was not keen to use the term: "it can easily go wrong ... present all the wrong images ... and prevent the children from *hard work* and commitment".

This structure is reminiscent of Kane's (1996) discussions of cognitive apprenticeship in which dance students are scaffolded through the processes of a knowledgeable expert, using modelling, coaching and fading. Michael worked to scaffold the children through three contingent stages of learning, finally stepping back, and shifting responsibility to the children. The strategy is also reminiscent of Chen and Cone's (2003) study of an expert dance teacher's use of sequential open-ended tasks, learning cues and instructional scaffolding to help students generate divergent and original movement responses and refinement of dance quality and expression, two elements of critical thinking.

In relation to solving the dilemma between voice and knowledge to teach for creativity, this study shows tight apprenticeship and scaffolding within a spectrum of task structures with purposeful play tasks which are not scaffolded, and which contain much more freedom and space for children to make mistakes and to experience exploratory time without teacher intervention. Choices made from this spectrum were crucially dependent on the teacher's own way of working, the children and the surrounding situation.

Situationally, Michael was working with issues of value and motivation in terms of dance in his school setting, with children lacking in creative dance experience. He therefore favoured apprenticeships, which, *through a gradual sharing of responsibility* gave the children



necessary creative knowledge/skills. This method ensured that, when the children took responsibility, they were in control but with a relatively low level of freedom within which they achieved “bursts of creativity”. Amanda, with risk-taking as a project objective, was working with inexperienced, but very motivated, supported children. She therefore *shared responsibility almost immediately* which required the children to be relatively free, allowing more space for personal choice and voice. Kate was working with an experienced group with whom she *already shared responsibility for creative activity*. As they were preparing for a performance, the balance of responsibility shifted back and forth in degree between the children and Kate, and finally rested almost wholly with the children when they took to the stage.

At both ends of this spectrum the dance teachers were therefore sharing responsibility for creative activities with the children, but in different ways. It is worth taking a slight aside here and comparing this analysis with research rooted in Woods (1990) and developed by Jeffrey (2004) and Jeffrey and Craft (2004). They explain how, when teaching for creativity, the teachers make learning relevant and encourage ownership by passing control back to the learner. [...]

#### **4. Conclusions**

...

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session – 1<sup>er</sup> Semestre

Année d'études : *MI MEF*  
Enseignant responsable : *Jubeau Marc*

Durée de l'épreuve : *2 h*  
Documents autorisés : *aucun*

**UE T74MEC Formation professionnelle par la recherche**  
**EC T74MEC3 Approches physiologiques et biomécaniques**

**Sujet :**

Présenter une (ou deux) séance (s) d'EPS permettant d'évaluer les aptitudes aérobies des élèves. Vous préciserez l'âge et le niveau de vos élèves. Vous justifierez vos situations d'évaluation au niveau physiologique et/ou biomécanique.

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

**2ème semestre – 2ème session**

Année d'étude : M1 MEF  
Enseignant responsable : Jean-Luc Bodin

Durée de l'épreuve : 4h  
Documents autorisés : aucun

**UE T85MEC-: Fondements scientifiques de l'EPS**  
**EC T85MEC2 : Approches scientifiques de l'intervention en EPS (2)**

**Sujet :**

Dans quelle mesure et comment les outils utilisés par l'enseignant d'EPS au cours des différentes évaluations menées tout au long du cycle, sont-ils susceptibles d'aider les élèves dans leurs apprentissages ?

Votre argumentation intégrera des exemples professionnels issus d'au moins deux CP différentes.

*La qualité de la rédaction, de la présentation et le respect de l'orthographe seront pris en compte dans l'évaluation. (Jusqu'à -2 pts)*

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session – 2<sup>ème</sup> Semestre

Année d'études : Master 1 MEF EPS  
Enseignant responsable : Eric BROTONS

Durée de l'épreuve : 2 H  
Documents autorisés : Aucun

**UEF T87MEC- : Professionnalisation**  
**EC T87MEC3 : TICE et EPS**

Vous traiterez l'ensemble du sujet à partir du fichier se trouvant sur Madoc (Tice et EPS) et vous enverrez votre travail à l'adresse suivante : [eric.brotons@univ-nantes.fr](mailto:eric.brotons@univ-nantes.fr).

**Contexte** : Vous êtes enseignant d'EPS et vous faites Course d'Orientation avec une classe de 6<sup>ème</sup>. Pour l'évaluation terminale les élèves doivent effectuer une course individuelle sur **3 circuits différents**. Il s'agira donc de comptabiliser les temps effectués sur chaque parcours et de les additionner (Le chronomètre tourne pendant toute la course).

- A la fin de la course chaque élève rend sa feuille de résultat comportant : les temps de départ et d'arrivée pour chaque parcours, les perforations des différentes Balises et les 3 cases temps remplies après Calcul.
- En 6<sup>ème</sup> le choix est de privilégier la découverte exacte du poste en **pénalisant l'erreur de 5 minutes. (8 balises dont 3 leurres)**

## TRAVAIL à FAIRE :

- 1) Créer une feuille « CALCUL DE TEMPS » qui permette à l'élève à la fin de chaque parcours de calculer son temps de course. (*Exprimé en Secondes*) / 3points
- 2) Créer une feuille récapitulative des résultats : créer une nouvelle feuille « RESULTATS » (CIRCUIT A) permettant de rassembler les temps réalisés sur les parcours et les pénalités liées aux erreurs de poste pour les élèves de la classe. / 6 points (partie 2 et 3)

**NB :** Utiliser le fichier CO-2013 2<sup>ème</sup> session / (conseil : Utiliser la formule choisir.)

Vous obtiendrez un tableau de cette forme :

	Temps réel en sec	Erreurs de poinçons	Pénalités en secondes	Temps corrigé en sec	Classement
Gilbert	220	0			
Emile	290	0			
Sylvain	292	0			
Arthur	312	0			
Christelle	596	1			
Stéphane	729	1			

**Données  
Rentrées**

**Données  
Calculées**

Vous effectuerez un tri de ce tableau par ordre croissant de « Temps corrigé »

- 3) Vous effectuerez le même travail pour les circuits B et C
- 4) Créer une dernière Feuille « RESULTAT FINAL », dans laquelle on trouvera donc le résultat final avec le temps total de course, auquel correspondra une note (/10). / 5 points

**NB :** utiliser le barème pour avoir une note (Fonction recherche !)

- 5) Effectuer un classement final en fonction de la note, du plus grand au plus petit. / 2 points

**NB :** 4 points seront attribués à la mise en forme et aux justifications des fonctions utilisées.

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>e</sup> session

Année d'études : **M1 MEF EPS**  
Enseignants responsables : *Philippe Macquet ;  
Julien Salliot*

Durée de l'épreuve : *4h*  
Documents autorisés : *aucun*

UEF T85MEC- : Fondements scientifiques de l'éducation physique et sportive (2)  
EC T85MEC1 : Dimensions sociales, historiques et épistémologiques de  
l'évolution de l'éducation physique et du système éducatif (2)

**Sujet :**

Dans quelle mesure les pratiques d'évaluation dans les établissements du second degré sont-elles révélatrices de l'évolution des conceptions en Education Physique, depuis la fin du XIXe siècle ?

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>e</sup> session

Année d'études : **M1 MEF EPS**

Enseignants responsables : *Lionel Helvig ; Philippe  
Macquet ; Julien Salliot*

Durée de l'épreuve : *4h*

Documents autorisés : *tous*

UEF T72MEC- : Fondements scientifiques de l'éducation physique et sportive (1)  
EC T72MEC1 - Dimensions sociales, historiques et épistémologiques de  
l'évolution de l'éducation physique et du système éducatif (1)

**Sujet :**

Le sport a-t-il fait oublier la santé dans l'évolution de l'EP au XXe siècle ?

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> Session

Année d'études : Master STAPS spécialité MEF-  
EPS 1<sup>ère</sup> année  
Enseignant responsable : Jacques SAURY

Durée de l'épreuve : 2H00  
Documents autorisés : *aucun*

**UEF T71TCM- : Tronc commun - Sport Santé Société**  
**EC T71TC3M : Méthodologie**

**Sujet :**

**Question 1 (12 points)**

Quels critères principaux distinguent les connaissances scientifiques (publiées dans des revues scientifiques) d'autres sortes de discours ou rationalisations pouvant exister dans le domaine de l'éducation physique et sportive (EPS), tels que par exemple, les conceptions et méthodes pédagogiques et didactiques, les conceptions des finalités éducatives de l'EPS, qui peuvent également donner lieu à des publications diverses (ouvrages, articles, sites web, etc.) ?

**Question 2 (8 points)**

Qu'appelle-t-on un paradigme scientifique ? A partir d'exemples choisis dans les recherches en EPS (ou plus largement en STAPS), illustrez cette notion.



**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> Session

Année d'études : *M1 MEF EPS*  
Enseignant responsable : *Philippe Amarouche*

Durée de l'épreuve : *2h*  
Documents autorisés : *aucun*

**UEF T71TCM- : Tronc commun**  
**EC T71TC2M : Projet professionnel**

**Sujet :**

En quoi l'appropriation et la synthèse pluridisciplinaire de connaissances scientifiques peuvent-elles être utiles aux enseignants pour questionner les enjeux actuels du métier d'enseignant EPS, et faire face aux problèmes professionnels qu'il rencontre ?

Vous construirez votre réponse en vous appuyant sur les éléments qui organisent le métier de professeur d'EPS : les textes officiels et programmes de la discipline, les savoirs de la discipline et les questions éthiques posées par la relation pédagogique. Vous étayerez cette réponse avec des éclairages scientifiques de votre choix, issus de l'histoire de l'EPS, des sciences humaines ou biologiques, ou des sciences de l'intervention.

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session

Année d'études : *Master MEF-EPS 1ère année*  
Enseignants responsables : *B. Huet, B. Lebouvier,*  
*J. Le Nuz*

Durée de l'épreuve : *1h30*  
Documents autorisés : *aucun*

**UE n°T74MEC- : *analyse des situations d'intervention***  
**EC n°T74MEC4 : *dispositifs d'observation et d'analyse***  
***des situations d'Enseignement-apprentissage***

**Sujet :**

L'analyse des situations d'enseignement-apprentissage en éducation physique et sportive peut être menée dans des perspectives diverses, et porter sur des objets d'étude différents.

Après avoir choisi un objet d'étude particulier relatif à la situation d'enseignement-apprentissage, présentez un cadre théorique et une méthodologie appropriés à une investigation portant sur cet objet d'étude.

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

Seconde session.

Année d'études : *Master 1 MEF*  
Enseignant responsable : *Franck Le Goff*

Durée de l'épreuve : *2 h.*  
Documents autorisés : *aucun.*

**UEF T74MEC-** : Formation professionnelle par la recherche  
**T74MEC1** : Approches historiques, anthropologiques et sociologiques

**Sujet** : Le corps peut-il être considéré comme étant au cœur des mécanismes de pouvoir ? Vous répondrez à cette question en vous appuyant sur les travaux examinés cette année.

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session,

Année d'études : *Master MEF-EPS 1ère année*  
Enseignant responsable : *Lebouvier Bruno*

Durée de l'épreuve : *2 heures*  
Documents autorisés : *tous*

**UEF T87MEC- : Professionnalisation**  
**EC T87MEC1 : Prendre en compte la diversité des publics**

Projet d'EPS et projet de cycle se doivent de prendre en compte les caractéristiques des élèves pour ajuster l'enseignement au contexte. Dans un premier temps, en vous appuyant sur des approches théoriques distinctes, vous indiquerez les données qui vous semblent devoir être recueillies par les enseignants pour appréhender l'activité des élèves en EPS (10 points). Dans un deuxième temps, vous illustrerez, par quelques exemples précis, les choix et les « leviers » qui peuvent être envisagés dans les projets EPS et les projets de cycle pour contextualiser l'enseignement de l'EPS (10 points).

**Université de Nantes**  
**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session

Année d'études : MASTER 1 MEF EPS  
Enseignant responsable : Mme Guylaine CADO-GERARD

Durée de l'épreuve : 2h00  
Documents autorisés : aucun

**UEF T87MEC- : Professionnalisation**  
**EC T87MEC2 : Le système scolaire et ses acteurs**

Situation et question :

Vous commenterez ce document en vous interrogeant notamment sur les valeurs éducatives qui en inspirent l'auteur et sur les conséquences qui s'ensuivent pour un enseignant.

Document extrait d'un article d'Alternatives Economiques n° 306 –octobre 2011 « Que peut faire l'école ? » par François Dubet... L'école fait trois choses.

La première, c'est de fabriquer de l'unité sociale. Son objectif est de donner des références communes aux sociétés complexes, diversifiées, qui ont une tendance à l'éclatement. C'est une fonction d'intégration sociale, d'égalisation et d'homogénéisation. Après tout, nous sommes le pays dans lequel l'école a fabriqué la conscience nationale républicaine.

La seconde chose que doit faire une école, c'est donner des compétences. Cela pose problème, car elle doit donner des compétences qui sont fatalement inégalitaires, hiérarchisées. Elle doit bien fabriquer des gens qui vont piloter des avions, qui vont faire du commerce, qui vont travailler dans la presse. D'une certaine manière, elle doit créer les inégalités les plus efficaces et les plus justes possibles.

Enfin, l'école doit fabriquer des individus, des citoyens, des gens honnêtes, épanouis, qui ont confiance en eux. Elle a donc une fonction proprement éducative. Le problème, c'est que ces différentes finalités ne convergent pas forcément. Si nous n'insistons pas sur l'intégration sociale, nous n'aurons pas nécessairement une école démocratique, épanouissante et efficace. Si nous insistons sur l'efficacité, nous n'aurons pas l'égalité, etc. Il faut équilibrer ces objectifs.

Ceci entraîne quelques priorités. Il faut d'abord rééquilibrer les efforts en faveur de l'école élémentaire et du collège qui doivent être plus proches qu'ils ne le sont aujourd'hui. Il faut ensuite clarifier et rendre plus juste la règle de la concurrence scolaire : composition des classes, des établissements et des filières. Il faudrait, enfin, créer des établissements plus accueillants, et donc capables de favoriser l'autonomie et l'éducation des élèves. Mais là, nous touchons au cœur même de notre culture scolaire... »

**Université de Nantes**

**UFR STAPS**

Année universitaire 2012/2013

2<sup>ème</sup> session

Année d'études : Master 2 MEF EPS

Enseignants responsables : Guylaine Cado, Eric Brotons, Julien Salliot et Stéphane Bellard

**UEC 12 Formation professionnelle ou formation à la recherche**

**EC 12. 2 Connaissance du système éducatif et des institutions**

Vous traiterez au choix l'un des 4 sujets suivants :

Sujet 1 (conduites déviantes):

Vous venez d'achever une leçon de football sur un terrain situé à 5mn à pied de l'établissement. A la fin du cours à 15h30, alors que vous accompagnez votre classe jusqu'aux vestiaires, vous apercevez l'un de vos anciens élèves parmi un groupe de 5 adolescents, en train de consommer de la bière.

Comment réagissez-vous?

Votre attitude sera-t-elle différente si vous intervenez en collège ou en lycée ?

Votre attitude sera-t-elle différente si le groupe consomme manifestement du cannabis ?

Sujet 2 (Equité) :

Vous constatez un écart de 1,5 pt entre la moyenne des garçons et des filles dans votre lycée. Que proposez-vous dans votre lycée et de manière plus générale dans les EPLE.

Avec quels acteurs du système éducatif allez-vous travailler ?

Sujet 3:

Au fil des séances de travail avec une classe de collège, vous décelez peu à peu une audition défaillante chez l'un de vos élèves au gymnase.

Questions :

Ce constat vous semble-t-il devoir concerner votre responsabilité de professeur ? Dans la négative, vous en exposerez les raisons. Dans l'affirmative, vous exposerez les différentes actions professionnelles que vous pourriez proposer dans le cadre de votre enseignement et plus largement au sein de l'établissement.

Vous argumenterez votre propos en exposant la problématique au regard de la compétence « Agir en fonctionnaire de l'Etat et de façon éthique et responsable ».