



JAPAN ASSOCIATION FOR LANGUAGE TEACHING JALT2016 • TRANSFORMATION IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

NOVEMBER 25-28, 2016 • WINC AICHI, NAGOYA, JAPAN

Student-Reported Creativity and Language Output: Assessing Hypotheses

Cameron A. Smith Aichi Gakuin University

Reference Data:

Smith, C. A. (2017). Student-reported creativity and language output: Assessing hypotheses. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper presents the results of a small-scale study into the relationship between Japanese university students' self-reported creativity and assessments of their English language ability in order to investigate whether previous exploratory results, which suggested relationships between creativity and language learning achievement in terms of fluency and test-based assessment, can be reproduced. I discuss the generally negative results found in this study in the light of recent debates in the field of creativity concerning the generality or otherwise of creativity as a personal attribute and of assumptions about the benefits of creativity. I argue for the importance of viewing creativity as a general personal attribute that varies among individuals.

この論文は、先行研究(流暢さとテストを基にした評価の観点から、創造性と英語学習到達度の関係性を示したもの)が再 検証できるかどうか示すため、日本の大学生の自己申告による創造性の度合いと英語力の関係性に関する小規模研究の結果 を示したものである。そして、創造性が領域一般的か領域特殊的なものであるかといった昨今の議論を鑑みて行ったこの研 究では、否定的結果が得られた。創造性は個人的な素質、すなわち領域一般的なものというより、与えられる課題や環境など によってもたらされる領域特殊的なものであると見なすことの重要性についても論じる。

This paper is a report on an attempt to assess hypotheses produced by a study of student self-reported creativity and performance in language assessments (Smith, 2013a). I consider the importance of defining creativity and, in the light of the results that suggest for the most part a lack of connection between general self-reported creativity and progress in foreign language acquisition, argue for a domain-specific view of creativity in language learning.

Creativity in Education

Creativity is now widely accepted in education systems as something to foster and support, at least in policy pronouncements. Creative prowess is believed to be a key part of an individual's future employability in a world where "knowledge and skills have ever-diminishing half-lives" (Cropley, 2001, p. 135). In Japan, concern about creativity in education has existed since at least the 1960s, initially with concern over Japan's ability to innovate rather than copy (Yumino, 2005, p. 4), with a second wave of concern in the 1980s as then Prime Minister Nakasone became concerned with the creation of "healthy internationalism" embodying both individualist creativity and a love of country (Hood, 2001, p. 55). Recent education white papers in response to economic malaise and the stress of the 2011 disasters have asserted the need for creativity to create new values both economically and socially (Central Council for Education, 2012).

It is also a common assumption that creativity specifically benefits language learning. The European Commission on Languages declared that "creativity is central to language learning and hence language teaching" (cited in Jones & Richards, 2015, p. 3). Dörnyei (2005, p. 204) suggested that a growing body of educational psychology literature supports such claims. However, it is not always clear what educationalists and policy makers mean when they make these broad claims. Creativity is left, often overtly, undefined (Smith, 2016).

Defining Creativity

It is only relatively recently that creativity has been conceptualised as a fundamentally human activity, rather than as originating with or reflective of a deity, heaven, or muses (Niu & Sternberg, 2006). However, the historical secularising experiences of the renaissance, enlightenment, industrialisation, and totalitarianism have generally encouraged a popular view of creativity as an innate, natural, and (in the West in particular) disruptive property of every person as an individual (Smith, 2016). Although some creativity re-



search was done in the early part of the 20th century, the beginning of its modern formal study is usually taken to be the Presidential address by J. P. Guilford to the American Psychological Association (Guilford, 1950) in which he made a plea for psychologists interested in psychometrics to consider divergent thinking as well as analytical skills.

Over the next few decades, a general two-dimensional definition of creativity has achieved general agreement (Mumford, 2003): the production of things that are in some way new (original, novel, etc.) and in some way of value (useful, appropriate, pleasing, etc.). This framework allows for the identification of creativity at various levels of proficiency and human experience (in terms of originality, something may be new or transformative merely to the creator, or new to their peers, or to the world [Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009]) and to the full range of human creative activities (engineering, music, the study of history, etc.).

This framework also leaves open the issue of what leads to creativity. Although there is a modern bias, particularly in western popular thought, that creativity essentially comes from some innate cognitive ability (recently encouraged by the popularity of the work of Csikszentmihalyi, 1996, that focuses on individual psychological experiences of being creative), contemporary research acknowledges the role of various aspects of creativity, traditionally summed up in the four Ps: person (individual creative ability), place (environment and task conditions), process (techniques and approaches), and product (what is considered creative). Some also mention a fifth P, persuasion: the ability to convince people that you are creative (Kozbelt, Beghetto, & Runco, 2010).

Thus, the importance of defining creativity, of structuring the analysis of creativity, of leaving the question open of what leads to creativity, and particularly of decentering the individual should not be understated. When one talks of addressing creativity in education, one needs to be clear what one is talking about: equipping students for future creativity-demanding employment, encouraging identified individual creative talent, employing creative teaching approaches, assessing creativity of student output, setting tasks that exploit the value of creative responses, the impact on creativity of different learning environments, the impact of creative aptitude and/or approaches on learning success, and so on. In writing on creativity in language education, rather often (through an open reluctance to define and frame creativity) all of these various aspects can seem mixed up in a jumble that reifies creativity as some kind of infectious energy (Smith, 2016) that can be added like a magic ingredient.

Clarity in this is essential if we are to understand how creativity can help or hinder language learning, particularly given the importance granted creativity in educational rhetoric. It is also essential if we are to integrate effectively the results of creativity research into education practice.

Personal Creativity and Language Learning

This particular study was used to assess the hypotheses generated by a previous study (Smith, 2013a) into the relationship between students' own assessments of their creativity and outcomes in language learning. In that study, I explored whether students identified as generally more creative by one or another form of self-assessment also displayed an advantage or disadvantage in language learning outcomes. The *prima facie* argument for a positive relationship is strong. First, speaking in a foreign language can be seen as a personal creative act: The frequent creation of previously unuttered sentences in order to produce a useful outcome looks like it matches the definition of creativity. Swann and Maybin (2007) held that, in one sense, all language use is creative. Second, as Albert and Kormos (2004) argued, many traits associated with creativity (imagination, flexibility, creation of new systems of classification, risk-taking, etc.) would presumably help in communicative language learning and task-based methods. On the other hand, some methods of assessment may disadvantage creative individuals, such as closed answer assessment.

However, the evidence for a relationship between language learning and a person's own general creative potential is mixed, and as Ellis (2015) pointed out, there is "relative-ly little research" (p. 30). In the two most widely cited studies, both from Hungary, Otto (1998) found a positive relationship between tests of divergent thinking and the course scores awarded to students, but Albert and Kormos (2004) found a small number of weak relationships between some aspects of assessed creativity thinking, such as originality and fluency, and aspects of narrative performance—and not all of them positive.

My previous study considered two variables for language performance—a closed-ended placement test and a simple fluency measure (word count) in two speaking tasks (telling a narrative)—and explored the data for any significant relationships. Although, as detailed below, it used a simpler global measure of creativity, it had the advantage of assessing relative progress over time in fluency. The results of the study generated two hypotheses:

- 1. Students with higher self-assessed creativity may suffer a disadvantage in closed-order speaking tests. That is, we may expect a negative correlation between self-rated creativity and the outcome of TOEIC scores, placement test scores, or both. This effect may be stronger at lower levels.
- 2. Students who are more creative will show more improvement over time in fluency than their peers in open-ended tasks such as speaking tests (interviews and conversations).

The current study was an effort to assess these two hypotheses.



Differences From the Previous Study

The current study was undertaken at a different university, with students a little higher academically in terms of a comparable intake measure (*hensachi*—the standard deviation measure drawn from performance in entrance tests frequently used to rank Japanese universities). The speaking tasks used were also different: conversations as opposed to narratives. Whereas the previous subjects were working from a published textbook, subjects in the current study worked partly from samples of target output (particularly questions) and their own generated content in order to talk about themselves, their families, school life, and their hometowns. However, both previous and current sets of students were assessed on their ability to produce open-ended responses to prompts. In both cases, the language output tasks were part of course assessments.

Creativity Assessment Methods Used

As explained in the original study (Smith, 2013a), there are broadly three ways to assess creativity of the person (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008). One is psychometric assessment of creative thinking skills, such as Torrance tests, which focus on divergent thinking and are popular but for which predictive validity in terms of creative achievement is not strong (Runco, 2008). They typically take time to administer and require some training in grading. Another is the global assessment of others by those who know them, such as teachers and peers. However, these are widely seen as unreliable. A third approach is self-assessment and self-report. This can be reports of creative behaviour in everyday life or life history, creative achievement (such as awards), or a direct assessment of one's own creativity (self-efficacy).

Both this study and the original study adopted two methods of creativity self-assessment: creative self-efficacy and an adapted form of a short creative behaviour inventory, translated into Japanese. Short surveys of creative self-efficacy (in which, e.g., participants are asked the extent of agreement with the statements "I am good at coming up with ideas," "I have a lot of good ideas," and "I have a good imagination"), with the scores tallied to create a global figure, have been shown to relate to real-world creative behaviour (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008, p. 123). Creative behaviour inventories, in which respondents are asked to state the frequency with which they have engaged in creative behaviours (e.g., "I have painted a picture," "I have written a computer program," "I have acted on stage") have limited evidence for predictive validity, but are used here to investigate possible relationships between kinds of creative thinking and language measures that were suggested by the first study. An adapted version of the inventory from Hocevar (1980) was used. Scoring included both a global score and subcategories of behaviours classified into more divergent-thinking, more convergent-thinking, and performance-oriented behaviours.

Subjects and Language Measurements

The subjects were 1st-year university students at a Japanese university in the Department of English Language and Cultures taking five compulsory English courses. Their average TOEIC score was 380. The students were considered in two groups: (a) the whole 1st-year cohort of 118 students, and (b) within that one class of 21 students taught by the researcher. For the whole cohort, the data points gathered were TOEIC scores and placement test scores, as well as scores from the two self-assessed creativity questionnaires. For the group of 21, I additionally looked at simple fluency measures taken from midterm and end-of-term speaking tests, the global score awarded in those tests (given by another teacher as per regular assessment protocols in the department), and question-writing tests. The whole cohort was divided into five groups according to a placement test, with the lowest two fifths of the students divided at random so that the bottom two classes were, ostensibly, of the same level. The previous study considered two classes (upper and lower) who were doing the same course, but for logistical reasons, in this study it was only possible for one class to be recorded and analysed in detail in terms of fluency measures. On the other hand, creativity tests, placement tests, and TOEIC-IP results were available for the entire student cohort, which was not possible in the previous study.

The midterm test was an interview with another teacher (not the researcher) on self-introduction and family, and the final test was a paired conversation about hometown and school life observed by the same other teacher. Fluency measures based on audio recordings were a simple word count excluding repetition as verbal stumbling or thinking time, and the assessor-given grades were done in real time. Question tests were part of the approach to teaching conversation. In these tests, students were asked to write questions on a variety of aspects of the topic (e.g., for hometown, these could be factual geographic questions about the location and size of the place, questions about what there is to do for fun in the town, etc.). Questions had to be accurate, appropriate to the topic, and natural (e.g., "What is your father's salary?" would not be considered natural despite being grammatical and on-topic for a conversation about families). In the weeks before the test, students were given samples of questions that they were free to memorise but were also encouraged to write their own, meaning that they learned to apply question patterns across a broad variety of topics. Limited repetition of question patterns was allowed in any one test to demonstrate command of the pattern. This particular task therefore required both divergent and convergent thinking skills. It should



be noted that the teacher-assessed speaking scores and question test scores were not included in the previous study and are here employed for exploratory purposes.

The data were analysed using PSPP software (a freeware SPSS clone). Two-tailed Pearson correlation tests were applied. If the null hypotheses to those hypotheses stated above are to be rejected, we should find

- significant negative correlations either between placement or TOEIC tests, and student self-assessed creativity (some of these correlations may occur at lower levels), and
- significant positive correlations between fluency and self-assessed creativity.

Results and Interpretation

No relationship of any kind was found between self-reported creativity and language test scores (see Table 1). Similar lack of correlation was found between these measures and within individual group measures (the identical results for the relationship between the creative behaviour inventory and TOEIC and placement test scores was merely a surprising coincidence). The significant relationships between (a) TOEIC and placement scores, and (b) creative self-efficacy and creative behaviour scores are to be expected.

Table 1. Correlations Between Language Test Scores and Self-Reported Creativity

Measure	1	2	3	4
1. TOEIC	1.00	.78***	.05	09
	<i>n</i> = 118	<i>p</i> = .000	<i>p</i> = .587	<i>p</i> = .361
		<i>n</i> = 110	<i>n</i> = 110	<i>n</i> = 109
2. Placement	.78***	1.00	.02	09
	<i>p</i> = .000	n = 110)	<i>p</i> = .816	<i>p</i> = .361
	<i>n</i> = 110		n = 110)	<i>n</i> = 109
3. CSE	.05	.02	1.00	.35***
	<i>p</i> = .587	<i>p</i> = .816	<i>n</i> = 111	<i>p</i> = .000
	n = 110)	n = 110)		<i>n</i> = 110
4. CBI	09	09	.35***	1.00
	<i>p</i> = .361	<i>p</i> = .361	<i>p</i> = .000	<i>n</i> = 110
	<i>n</i> = 109	<i>n</i> = 109	<i>n</i> = 110	

Note. CSE = creative self-efficacy (combined score); CBI = creative behaviour inventory. Numbers of respondents reflect absences from assessment points.

***significant

The results in Table 2 indicate no significant relationship between creative self-efficacy (a measure validated in the literature) and language outcome. There is also a similar lack of significant correlation between the creative behaviour inventory and its elements and language outcomes, with two exceptions: the final test word count and the global speaking test scores, in which students were assessed in real time on interviews. Here, creative behaviour in general, and particular performance and divergent thinking behaviour in particular, correlated well with the scores the teacher gave them.

Table 2. Correlations Between Self-Reported Creativity and Language Output Measures for One Class

Measure	WC1	WC2	Diff	QT	Midterm	Final	ST
CSE	017	.27	.45	.09	.28	.26	.09
	<i>p</i> = .502	<i>p</i> = .290	<i>p</i> = .080	<i>p</i> = .701	<i>p</i> = .243	p = .285	p = .703
	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 16	n = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	n = 19	n = 19
CBI	.33	.41	.32	.24	.06	.54**	.51**
	<i>p</i> = .184	p = .098	<i>p</i> = .226	<i>p</i> = .315	<i>p</i> = .803	<i>p</i> = .016	<i>p</i> = .025
	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19
Div	.29	.55**	.40	.40	09	.55**	.45
	<i>p</i> = .237	<i>p</i> = .023	<i>p</i> = .122	<i>p</i> = .088	<i>p</i> = .724	<i>p</i> = .014	<i>p</i> = .055
	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 16	n = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19
Conv	.24	.20	.06	.16	.07	.42	.40
	<i>p</i> = .346	<i>p</i> = .442	<i>p</i> = .832	<i>p</i> = .796	<i>p</i> = .796	<i>p</i> = .076	<i>p</i> = .090
	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19
Perf	.13	.22	.17	.26	.31	.54**	.63***
	<i>p</i> = .599	p = .399	<i>p</i> = .532	<i>p</i> = .288	<i>p</i> = .195	<i>p</i> = .017	<i>p</i> = .004
	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19	<i>n</i> = 19

Note. Div = divergent creative activities (CBI); Conv = convergent creative activities (CBI); Perf = performance-oriented activities (CBI); WC1 = midterm speaking word count; WC2 = end-term speaking test word count; Diff = WC2 - WC1; QT = average score in question tests; Midterm = midterm speaking scores (teacher-student interview); Final = final term speaking scores (paired conversation); ST = average score in speaking tests. Numbers of respondents reflect absences from assessment points. Differences in *n* between word-count scores and speaking scores are due to two students making up missed tests (unrecorded).

p* < 0.05; *p* < 0.005



The hypotheses from the previous study that I wished to investigate in this study about the relationship between fluency and creativity and between test scores and creativity—were not strongly supported by the evidence. There appears to be neither a positive relationship based on creativity helping language progress or fluency nor a negative relationship based on any anti-creative aspect of closed-answer testing.

The results did show a correlation between teacher scores on one kind of speaking test and reported creative behaviours, notably performance behaviours. However, this may be a chance relationship. It is largely this one language measure with which there is any significant correlation found with self-assessed creativity scores. It is a language assessment method that is done in real time and so may not be as reliable, and the creativity behaviour measure is itself considered a far weaker measure of creativity than self-efficacy. In addition, the performance variable shows no relationship at all with any other language measures.

Discussion

Why General Personal Creative Ability May Not Have an Important Impact on Language Learning Success

I first began considering this question of personal creative aptitude because my personal professional experience suggested there may be a relationship between language outcomes and how creative someone was. Students seemed to have striking success in terms of output and quality with fiction writing tasks compared to their academic writing tasks. Conversely, I have argued elsewhere for the importance of creative writing activities in helping students go beyond the intermediate plateau (Smith, 2013b). If creative tasks aided language learning, would that mean that students who are innately more creative do better in language learning?

However, despite much focus on the need to develop personal creativity in educational curricula around the world and given the investment in creativity training in many businesses, the evidence for the existence of a general creative ability is actually very weak—in two important ways. One is that creativity in itself is not enough as an ability: One requires domain competence and knowledge of and training in the subject in which one is trying to be creative (Simonton, 1997). A second issue, and here more crucial, is that creative aptitude appears to be domain specific (Baer, 2015). For example, although polymaths—people creative across several disciplines—do exist, they are as rare as they should be if there were no general creative ability, even when the domain competence condition is met. In addition, as Baer (2015) also pointed out, general creativity training that is aimed at trying to raise an individual's general creative aptitude does not appear to work. We should therefore not expect any kind of relationship between general assessed creative ability and either creative ability as a language learner or outcomes of language learning.

General Creative Behaviours and Success in Language Learning

A second argument for a relationship between creativity and language learning is based not on creative ability assisting language acquisition, but on behaviours and attitudes associated with creativity, such as risk-taking and extraversion (although the relationship between creativity and extraversion is ambiguous [Batey & Furnham, 2006]). Here, the results offer some weak support for this idea but only in an exploratory manner: a specific correlation between reported general creative behaviour and real-time teacher assessment of speaking in one kind of speaking test. As stated above, my suspicion is that this result is anomalous, but perhaps there are grounds for further investigation.

We may misunderstand the impact of creative behaviour by presuming that creativity always leads to positive outcomes, ignoring its "dark side." This association with goodness is problematic empirically because, as James and Taylor (2010) pointed out, although studies of creative ability and personality typically measure positive creative achievements (when the product is universally seen as beneficial), there is substantial indirect evidence that certain empirically well-established relationships between personality traits and creative success only hold for positive creative outcomes, whereas others hold for more negative ones, such as creativity in criminal acts and artful revenge.

Thus, we may mistakenly assume that creative behaviour in language learning will lead to improved proficiency. However, for some students, the goal is to meet the requirements of the course, for which valuable outcomes may include compliance with the least effort, plagiarism (for innocent and less innocent reasons), or other behaviours extrinsically motivated. Creativity may therefore be directed towards achievement of this goal rather than language learning. It may therefore be difficult to distinguish creative effects from motivation-to-learn effects. This may particularly be the case in which academically less able students in a test-based competitive system find that their return on genuine learning effort is lower. Indeed, Ellis (2015) argued from the mixed research by Otto (1998) and Albert and Kormos (2004) that studies into the relationship between personal creativity and language learning need to control for motivation levels.



Conclusion

The results here reflect the findings emphasised by Baer (2015) that general creative ability as a concept may not be justified by the evidence, and thus, suggestions that generally creative students will be better at language learning are not warranted. On the other hand, there was some evidence of a relationship between student engagement in creative behaviours and teacher global assessment of student output, but this evidence is weak. Based on this and on the literature, I argue that creativity in language learning is likely specific to language learning both as a learnt skill and as an aptitude, rather than reflective of general abilities or approaches. Therefore, teachers wishing to maximise student creativity need to be aware of the impact of language levels on student creativity and of the need to actively train students in creative approaches and techniques specific to language learning and output, as well as good general management of creative processes (such as creating a supportive environment).

Bio Data

Cameron A. Smith is a lecturer at Aichi Gakuin University. He taught English in Russia in the 1990s and in Japan since 2002. He received his PhD in Russian health reform from Edinburgh University before returning to language teaching. His research interests include the relationship between creativity and language learning and fiction writing for foreign language learners. <casmith@dpc.agu.ac.jp>

References

- Albert, A., & Kormos, J. (2004). Creativity and narrative task performance: An exploratory study. *Language Learning*, *54*, 277-310.
- Baer, J. (2015). The importance of domain-specific expertise in creativity. *Roeper Review*, *37*, 165-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2015.1047480
- Batey, M., & Furnham, A. (2006). Creativity, intelligence, and personality: A critical review of the scattered literature. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 132,* 355-429. https://doi.org/10.3200/MONO.132.4.355-430
- Central Council for Education. (2012). *"Souzou-teki fukkou kyouiku" no suishin* [Promotion of "creative reconstruction education"]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/ chukyo9/shiryo/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2012/06/25/1322792_9.pdf
- Cropley, A. J. (2001). Creativity in education and learning. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ellis, R. (2015). Creativity and language learning. In R. H. Jones & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Creativity in language teaching: Perspectives from research and practice* (pp. 32-48). New York. NY: Routledge.
- Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. American Psychologist, 5, 444-454. https://doi.org/10.1037/ h0063487
- Hocevar, D. (1980). Intelligence, divergent thinking, and creativity. Intelligence, 4, 25-50.
- Hood, C. P. (2001). Japanese education reform: Nakasone's legacy. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- James, K., & Taylor, A. (2010). Positive creativity and negative creativity (and unintended consequences). In D. H. Cropley, A. J. Cropley, J. C. Kaufman, & M. A. Runco (Eds.), *The dark side of creativity* (pp. 33-56). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, R. H., & Richards, J. C. (2015). Creativity and language teaching. In R. H. Jones & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Creativity in language teaching: perspectives from research and practice* (pp. 3-15). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four c model of creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, *13*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688
- Kaufman, J. C., Plucker, J. A., & Baer, J. (2008) *Essentials of creativity assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kozbelt, A., Beghetto, R. A., & Runco, M. A. (2010). Theories of creativity. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (pp. 20-47). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mumford, M. D. (2003). Where have we been, where are we going? Taking stock in creativity research. *Creativity Research Journal*, *15*, 107-120.
- Niu, W., & Sternberg, R. J. (2006). The philosophical roots of Western and Eastern conceptions of creativity. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *26*, 18-38. https://doi.org/10.1037/ h0091265
- Ottó, I. (1998). The relationship between individual differences in learner creativity and language learning success. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*, 763-773.
- Runco, M. (2008). Commentary: Divergent thinking is not synonymous with creativity. *Psychology* of Aesthetics. Creativity and the Arts, 2, 93-96.
- Simonton, D. K. (1997). Creative productivity: A predictive and explanatory model of career trajectories and landmarks. *Psychological Review*, 104, 66-89.
- Smith, C. A. (2013a). Student creativity and language performance. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT2012 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 285-297). Tokyo: JALT.
- Smith C. A. (2013b). Creative writing as an important tool in second language acquisition and practice. *The Journal of Literature in Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 12-18.



- Smith, C. A. (2016). Creativity east and west: Preconceptions and misunderstandings. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner* (pp. 44-50). Tokyo: JALT.
- Swann, J., & Maybin, J. (2007). Introduction: Language creativity in everyday contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*, 491-496.
- Yumino, K. (2005). *Sekai no souzousei kyouiku* [Creativity education in the world]. Kyoto, Japan: Nakanishiya Shuppan.

Appendix A

Survey on Creativity

Part 1

以下の文章を読んであなた自身にどのくらいあてはまりますか。該当すると思われる番号に〇をつけてください。

例:	あてはまら ◀	ない			あてはまる ━━━►
	1	2	3	4	5
2. 私はいいアイディアをよく思いつく。	1	2	3	4	5
3. 私は想像力が豊かなほうだ。	1	2	3	4	5

Part 2

あなたがしたことのある頻度を答えてください

		全くない	1回	2~3回	4~5回	6回以上
1.	絵を描いたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
2.	歌詞や曲を書いたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
3.	お祭りなどの飾り付けを自作したこ とがある	1	2	3	4	5
4.	ダンスの振り付けをしたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
5.	漫画やアニメを描いた事がある	1	2	3	4	5
6.	オリジナルレシピの料理を作ったこ とがある	1	2	3	4	5
7.	コンピュータプログラムを自分で作 成したことがある	1	2	3	4	5
8.	短編小説を書いた事がある	1	2	3	4	5

	全くない	1回	2~3回	4~5回	6回以上
9. 詩を書いたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
10. ジョーク、コメディ、お笑いのネタを 書いたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
11. 科学分野の活動で賞をもらったこ とがある	1	2	3	4	5
12. 舞台で演劇を演じたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
13. アクセサリーを自作したことがある	1	2	3	4	5
14. 演劇、ダンス、祭りなどの衣装の製 作に関わったことがある	1	2	3	4	5
15. 自分で衣類をデザインまたは縫っ たりしたことがある	1	2	3	4	5
16. 人前で音楽を演奏したことがある	1	2	3	4	5
17. 自分のため、また人のためにおもち ゃを造ったことがある	1	2	3	4	5
18. 人前でダンスを踊ったことがある	1	2	3	4	5

ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix B

Translations of the Survey Questions

Creative Self-Efficacy

How much are the following statements true for you personally:

	Not at all				Very true
1. I am good at coming up with new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have a lot of good ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have a good imagination.	1	2	3	4	5



RANSFORMATION

JAPAN ASSOCIATION FOR LANGUAGE TEACHING • JALT2016 » Transformation in Language Education

Smith: Student-Reported Creativity and Language Output: Assessing Hypotheses

Creative Behaviour Inventory

How often have you:

		Never	Once	2 or 3 times	4 or 5 times	6 or more times
1.	Painted a picture	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Written a song (words or music)	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Made your own festival deco- rations	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Choreographed a dance	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Drawn cartoons or manga	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Cooked an original dish	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Written an original computer program	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Written a short story	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Written a poem	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Written something funny, such as jokes or a comedy sketch	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Won a prize for a science project	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Acted on stage	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Made your own accessories	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Helped to design costumes (for a play, dance, festival, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Designed or made your own clothing	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Performed music in public	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Made toys for yourself or for others.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Performed a dance in public.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

Divergent, Convergent, and Performance Thinking Measure Components From the Creative Behaviour Inventory

Divergent	Convergent	Performance
(open-ended)	(specific end)	
1. Painted a picture	3. Made your own festival	12. Acted on stage
2. Written a song (words or	decorations	16. Performed music in
music)	6. Cooked an original dish	public
5. Drawn cartoons or	7. Written an original com-	18. Performed a dance in
manga	puter program	public
8. Written a short story	11. Won a prize for a sci-	
9. Written a poem	ence project	
13. Made your own acces-		
sories		