

**University of Canberra**

**Scott Brook**

**Managing creativity: practice-led research and training the person**

Abstract:

In an attempt to move debate beyond advocacy accounts of practice-led research, this paper asks whether craft-based research is sufficient as a research paradigm for creative arts disciplines. In the context of a broader account of practice theory, one that might enable disciplinary links across the arts, human sciences, government and the cultural industries, it asks whether the practice-led research model may in fact reify the notion of craft at the expense of considering the more mundane and uncreative domains of practice that underpin cultural value. It draws attention to the potentially counter-productive effects of the creative industries policy push in relation to creative arts education, and makes some tentative proposals concerning the supervision of research students.<sup>1</sup>

Biographical note:

Scott Brook is Assistant Professor of Writing at the University of Canberra. He has co-authored articles forthcoming in *Amerasia Journal* (US) and *Culture and Local Governance* (Can), and a chapter in *Australian Made: a Multicultural Reader*, ed. Sonia Mycak and Amit Sarwal (Sydney University Press 2010). He is also a co-author of the 2010 report 'Negotiating Cultural Insecurity', a cultural policy review conducted for the Community Cultural Development Department, City of Whittlesea, based on fieldwork funded by the City of Whittlesea and a Research Collaboration Grant from the University of Melbourne. Email: [Scott.Brook@canberra.edu.au](mailto:Scott.Brook@canberra.edu.au)

Keywords:

Practice theory – practice-led research – creative industries

In a recent survey of different uses of practice theory in the social sciences, Andreas Reckwitz suggests the notion of practice has provided a major alternative to semiotic and representation-based approaches to cultural analysis. Reckwitz draws a useful distinction between two major uses of the concept. He notes the term ‘practice’ has generally been used to conceptualise either;

1. a domain of activity that is the *other* of theory, philosophy and/or scholastic knowledge, or
2. the more-or-less routine behaviours that form *assemblages* of objects and activities, such as ‘forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge’ (Reckwitz 2002: 249).

These two definitions cover a wide range of distinct intellectual currents that have influenced the Anglophone arts faculty since the late-1960s, not all of which are compatible. For instance, we might suggest the first sense of practice was exemplified in the cultural sociology of Pierre Bourdieu where it was expressed as an all out critique of scholastic reason. In *The Logic of Practice*, Bourdieu’s most programmatic and comprehensive attempt to outline a general theory of practice that might work for both agrarian and post-industrial societies, the distinction between embodied ‘practical sense’ and academic intellectualism is not only the first move in defining practice, but establishes the latter as a key term for a reflexive critique of the social sciences (Bourdieu 1990 [1980]: 1-21). Although, as Alan Warde has recently noted, the second concept of practice cited above is routinely acknowledged in Bourdieu’s works, it is always subsidiary to a more basic epistemological critique (Warde 2004). By contrast, it is in the late writings of Michel Foucault that we find the second sense of practice in full swing, where it can be observed to provide a foundational category for an account of the techniques and rationalities associated with historically mutable forms of government, including those more intimate forms of government described as ethics (Foucault 1988). Foucault’s interest is in the *integrity* of specific assemblages of thought, speech and action rather than the various forms of class-specific ‘practical sense’ that mediate their application; that is, precisely those forms of technical rationality Bourdieu sought to escape. Nevertheless, what such utterly disparate intellectual projects have in common, according to Reckwitz, is that they shift attention away from issues of representation and signification toward a more empirical set of questions about technique and performance. We might suggest practice theory provides a theoretical lexicon for overcoming the *textualism* that has plagued post-War approaches to understanding phenomena we might describe as ‘cultural’: indeed, this would be one way of plotting the recent history of cultural studies.

It is perhaps not fortuitous this same concept has proved so amenable in describing the research output of the creative arts. Given the massive influence of the major continental exponents of practice theory on the Australian arts faculty in the second half of the 1990s, the two developments are no doubt related even if the extent of intellectual influence is not yet clear. In any case, it is obvious the concept of ‘practice’ in the phrases ‘practice-led research’ and ‘practice-based research’ has

served the more immediate need of articulating the identity of research in the creative arts. Loosely aligned with both senses cited by Reckwitz, it is argued—and here I am generalising—that the practice of *making of an object* (in all stages and activities) *constitutes* the research, and therefore *the made object* must be regarded as a legitimate research outcome. It is an argument that promises to be transferable across different domains of research assessment, in particular the examination of student work, the quantifying of research output by academic staff conducted by university administrators, and the assessment of research funding applications by the ARC. Although each of these domains is governed by quite local rationalities and techniques for conducting these exercises, the practice-led research model holds out the possibility of addressing them all at the level of epistemological critique, the premise of which is that knowledge can be produced and communicated in a mode other than scholarly dissertation.

Of course, a practice-orientated (if not simply *pragmatic*) approach to the notion of ‘practice-led research’ should lead us to consider what people do with this idea across a range of contexts, and away from reifying its content into an elegant theory that somehow possesses its meanings independently of their application. And it’s for this reason that I’ve always been in two minds about the idea.

On the one hand, the notion of practice-led research clearly speaks to major problems in the post-Dawkins reforms Australian university; namely, the lack of parity in opportunities for research funding and promotion for academic staff in applied arts disciplines, and the need to articulate a paradigm for higher research degrees in the creative arts specifically. The policy thinking that led to the creation of a unified national system of higher education in the late 1980s and an ‘open market’ for research funding did not consider the radically unequal effects this would have on those disciplines that had served the needs of the CAEs but were soon to find themselves migrating across the established universities. Of course, the expansion of the creative arts in the new context was an entirely unanticipated outcome of the reforms, and largely counter-intuitive from the point of view of many arts academics who feared the new HECS system would deter students from enrolling in the arts. The notion of practice-led research usefully addresses the contingencies of an increasingly market-driven system through proposing a conceptual shift in relation to how knowledge is accounted for. And as the section on ‘Non-Traditional Eligible Research Output Types’ in the recent *ERA 2010 Submission Guidelines* demonstrates, the general contours of this critique have made substantial headway (ARC 2009: 41-45).

If the notion of practice-led research is efficient from a bureaucratic perspective (no less than in terms of the recognitive justice it might achieve for academics in the creative arts), it also promises to pave the way for exciting intellectual links with those established disciplines that take ‘culture’ as their object. It clearly suggests strong links with neighbouring fields of inquiry that cut across the humanities and social sciences, such as cultural policy studies, cultural industries research, and cultural sociology. There are intellectual cross-currents here and I think the knowledge possessed by practice-based cultural researchers have a lot to offer these fields, perhaps more than they are aware of. It is certainly knowledge that might be

useful to students (as I argue below).

And yet we would have to admit that the notion of practice-led research also risks closing the door on this kind of work to the extent that it threatens to become *central* to the definition of research in the creative arts. The danger is that it limits the application of practice theory to an epistemological critique whose goal is simply that of legitimation. While there is nothing wrong with either this critique or this goal, we might ask is the notion of practice-led research *sufficient* for researchers in the creative arts? Are there limits to how useful it is beyond which other research paradigms would be preferred? The purposes of research funding and training aren't solely the creation of new knowledge; they are increasingly directed at encouraging both interdisciplinary approaches and multi-discipline collaborations, and transferring knowledge to where it can be applied through facilitating partnerships with non-university stakeholders, such as government agencies. Is the practice-led research model sufficient as a description of what creative arts academics can contribute to such endeavours? Is it even sufficient to the research *needs* of creative arts disciplines, including the research training of higher research degree students and especially those seeking professional careers in the cultural sectors?

The obvious danger with the notion of practice-based research is that it reifies *the* practice—the activity of making as evidenced by the object—over a relational analysis of how such activity is itself ‘made up’ of a plethora of non-art practices (of publicising, displaying, evaluating, discussing, funding, networking, manufacturing, selling *et cetera*) that relate to the *trade* (as distinct from craft) which provides any cultural object with its currency (in all senses of this term). Will the notion of practice-led research further reify the notion of ‘creativity’ around the individual act of making, or will it enable attention to the various forms of local infrastructure (social, industrial, governmental) that sustain such acts? If the concept of craft-based training in the creative arts has been important in overcoming the notion of innate talent, i.e. ‘the ideology of the gift’, then we might note how an exclusive research focus on the material practices associated with the making of cultural artefacts may lead to a disavowal all those far less prestigious but no less material practices that sustain the fields dedicated to their production, distribution, regulation, preservation and consumption. Indeed, the sociology of cultural practices might challenge us to consider whether the reification of *making* in research in the creative arts (and whose logical end-result would be a return to formalism) would constitute a new form of professional closure in so far as it *conceals* the structural conditions for cultural objects to circulate at all (Bourdieu 1996: 196-202).<sup>2</sup>

There are several rationales for expanding the remit of research and research training in the creative arts to include such ‘uncreative’ considerations, and they are not of course limited to cultural criticism. The directly ‘vocational’ rationales for arts education they support can accommodate a range of normative purposes and political dispositions<sup>3</sup>; they can equally accommodate the agendas of social reformers seeking to work in the cultural sectors of government no less than the aspirations of those looking for careers in the cultural industries.

The nexus between creative arts training and practice-led research brings me to a final

reason for feeling cautious. The notion of practice-led research has been strongly endorsed by the creative industries policy push as part of a broad set of new agendas for government policy that (among other things) proposes the transformation of the Australian arts faculty into an incubator for the creative arts and cultural industries (Green 2006; Haseman 2006; Hartley and Cunningham 2001). In both the UK (from 1998) and Australia (from 2001) the creative industries policy push has sought to enlist the support of the arts sector for a project that seeks to radically revise the terms on which the relation of ‘culture’ and ‘economy’ are discussed across a broad range of policy domains, including education and national research and development (McWilliams 2009; Cunningham 2004).

So what is wrong with this model? Firstly, there is no evidence that creative industries proposals for curriculum reform within the Australian arts faculty are aligned with either the expressed interests of students in enrolling in such degrees or the vocational destinations of graduates. We simply do not know whether there is any link between the aspirations of research students and the sorts of careers the creative industries model has in mind for them. In the absence of any analysis of the nature of student demand or graduate destinations in the creative arts, creative industries proposals at best amount to an argument for industry demand for ‘creative skills’, whether these are defined broadly as the generic social and communication skills that are redeemable across a range of occupations, or more narrowly as possession of a specific arts practice whose content is required by a discrete cultural industry (Oakely 2007). The two most plausible explanations for the general rise in demand for postgraduate degrees since the Dawkins reforms, an event that was crucial to the emergence of the notion of practice-led research, refer us not to the rise of a ‘creative class’ or ‘knowledge-based economy’, but to increased competition in the Australian labour market and the steep decline in value of tertiary qualifications in general (Linsley 2005; Marginson 1995; Marginson 1997). Beyond this, we simply do not know what motivates postgraduate enrolments in the creative arts.

At first glance, the support of the practice-led model by creative industries pundits would appear to lend further evidence to Nikolas Garnham’s thesis that the creative industries agenda for cultural policy represents (in the final analysis) ‘a return to an artist-centred, supply side defence of state cultural subsidies’ at the expense of a focus on the broader public benefits of such policies (Garnham 2005: 15). Of course, such a supply side agenda is as problematic for tertiary education providers as it is for cultural policy more broadly. The support given the notion of practice-led research in the creative industries model reveals the extent to which creative industries policies for arts education cannot be confused with ‘vocationalism’, at least not in the sense this term was understood in the 1980s. To take an example from my own field of writing studies: the enhanced focus on literary writing that has been a striking feature of discussions about practice-led research is clearly not aligned with the expressed needs of the publishing industry. The absence of any reference to creativity or creative writing in accreditation guidelines for Publishing Studies programs developed by the industry’s peak body, the Australian Publisher’s Association, in response to the massive increase in number of professional and creative writing programs is

conspicuous.<sup>4</sup> This is not to endorse the benefits of industry accreditation for writing programs, but simply to draw attention to the way in which elements of the creative industries package, such as the promotion of practice-led research, are clearly *not* aligned with the training requirements of a particular ‘core creative industry’.

A more significant reason for being wary of the creative industries agenda is that it simply has little to say about the historically fundamental relationship between arts education and cultural development. Any citizenly and ‘social’ rationales for the arts are regarded by creative industries researchers as nostalgic at best, and patronising at worst. But such rationales for arts education are embedded in the foundations of the public education system. The powerful techniques of person formation the arts represent for primary and secondary teachers, and the accumulative theories of human development upon which they are based, have assumed their place within the cultural infrastructure of the liberal state over the historical *longue durée* and are relatively impervious to radical experiments in economic theory. For instance, it was the deployment of creative writing in the secondary and primary school classroom as a specific technique for moulding the student as an educable subject that enabled the rise of creative writing in teacher training and then the adult education sector (see Mearns 1941; Hunter 1988). Such ‘human development’ rationales are quite autonomous from the economic fortunes of the cultural industries or any general labour market demand for creative skills, and are themselves an independent source of demand for tertiary-level training in the aesthetic disciplines. If we look at the most recent national survey report on teaching staff in Australian schools conducted by the Australian Council for Education Research and funded by DEEWR, we find that ‘creative and performing arts’ are one of the curriculum areas, along with English, Maths, Science and Languages other than English, in which Australian secondary schools have difficulty in attracting personnel (McKenzie *et al* 2008: xviii). Drawing on a national sample of 1,393 Principals and Vice/Deputy Principals, the survey found that 4% of all secondary school principals reported an unfilled vacancy in the curriculum area ‘creative and performing arts’ on the first day of teaching in 2006, and that 8% reported having to readvertise for a teaching position in creative and performing arts during that year (McKenzie *et al* 2008: 109). Furthermore, amongst the 5394 secondary teachers surveyed, 8% indicated they were currently engaged in tertiary study, with 37% of this group indicating they were enrolled in Masters Degree and 9% indicating they were enrolled in a PhD (McKenzie *et al* 2008: 30). Significantly, 5% of this group indicated their main focus of study was the creative and performing arts (McKenzie *et al* 2008: 31). The three most significant rationales teachers reported as guiding their decision to return to study were ‘to do my job better’ (52%), ‘to teach in another subject area or stage of schooling’ (24%) and ‘to prepare for promotion’ (18%) (McKenzie *et al* 2008: 32).

Of course, such ‘old school’ rationales hardly match the glamorous career futures advertised for a new generation of creatives, but then again perhaps this should give us reason to be sceptical of such career advertising. However much a macro-economic analysis might show that ‘social network markets’ fuelled by the competition for status amongst cultural producers is productive for the economy (such as contributing

to inner-city housing prices), the successful accumulation of symbolic and social capital necessary to a career in the arts is a high-risk option (Potts *et al* 2008; Bridge 2006). As Angela McRobbie's ethnographic study of fashion design graduates in the UK demonstrates, such pursuits require an advanced capacity to embrace financial insecurity and self-exploitation as personal opportunity and to indefinitely delay other life projects, such as having a family (McRobbie 2002). Given the latitude granted the notion of 'vocation' in this literature, the most coherent (and plausible) role allocated creativity in creative industries proposals for tertiary education reform would appear to be as a form of general training in the capacities demanded by an enterprise culture. The rationality of this approach dovetails with what the UK National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts describes as 'entrepreneurial graduates'; i.e. graduates able to capitalise on their capacity for 'innovation, creativity, collaboration, and risk-taking' in order to thrive in a 'volatile economy' (Herrmann, Hannon, Cox and Ternouth 2008: 6). Such a project is a direct descendent of the post-War creative management literature in the US in which it was argued creativity might be harnessed in the training of flexible, innovative and initiative-taking employees.<sup>5</sup> If the figure of the artist was once regarded by earlier generations of educators as embodying an exemplary moral sensibility students might emulate (Richards 1967 [1925]), such a figure is hailed in the new creative education literature as 'a template' for the general skills required for competing in the new economy (Hartly 2007: 140). Creative industries proposals for education reform signal a novel project here; namely that the erstwhile *aesthetico-ethical* sensibility of the artist once put to work in the civilizing mission of 'culture' might be redeployed as an exemplar of an *aesthetico-economic* sensibility.<sup>6</sup> This is a figure whose flexible work practices, blurred lines between work and leisure, capacity for high-risk investments in symbolic value, and working knowledge of status economies—all of which enable them to survive in the field of cultural production—might become the privileged exemplar of the capacities required by an insecure labour market. And just in case arts educators might have a *problem* with this account of the utility of creative education, it has been suggested such structural changes in employment are not a problem for young people as the new conditions accord with their lifestyle preferences. In a major study to come out of the Creative Workforce Program at the ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation, we are asked to believe

[t]he decline in overall employment permanency is not a problem for [young people], given their propensity as experience-seekers for being 'here today and gone tomorrow'. [...] They are comfortable with blurred boundaries between work and home, just as they are comfortable with the idea that 'job security' is a thing of the past (McWilliam 2008: 37).

While it is too early to know whether the recent global financial crisis will dampen enthusiasm for this market-consultant mode of cheerful conjecture about young people's futures ('here today, gone tomorrow'), we can only speculate whether training in the creative arts can realistically contribute to this endeavour. While 'creativity' has gone through several cycles of popularity in business management literature since the 1950s, the market for such works did not include arts students and

their instructors. But of course this is perhaps to misread the overwhelmingly *gestural* function of the term ‘creativity’ for such appeals, the rationality of these proposals being premised not on the protocols of academic research or debate, but the largely rhetorical postures of the policy process.

So finally, and in a more affirmative mode, what can we say about research training in the creative arts above-and-beyond the notion of practice-based research? Let me signal three broad and pragmatic considerations relating to the management of research higher degrees.

The first relates to *managing expectations*. While in the light of the above comments this might seem like a useful practice for creative arts faculty and their research students, it shouldn’t be taken to imply expectations need to be revised down. Managing expectations can also refer to lifting a student’s awareness of their opportunities as well as qualifying expectations in the light of a more pragmatic approach to the ways in which cultural fields and cultural industries function. What are the graduate outcomes of this kind of study? Where and how are such skills and credentials redeemed? This is information we need to be able to pass on to our students in the process of finding out what it is they want from their studies. ‘Managing’ first and foremost requires some *knowledge* of expectations, and this is as useful for the student as for the supervisors. Is a student’s study related to an established arts practice, and if so, to what extent is it intended to enhance that practice? What other rationales are in play? It cannot be assumed students are seeking careers in the arts sector or as practising artists specifically. The reasons given will reflect student perceptions about what is possible and may change substantially during the period of candidature.

The second set of considerations I would put forward concern *overseeing the project*. A higher research degree is project-based and this structure is important for setting limits to what might be achieved within the constraints of time and resources. A research degree in the creative arts needs to be prevented from becoming a vocation. Such a possibility is clearly an occupational hazard in disciplines that: a) offer training in techniques that have historically established relations to personal development (in a therapeutic sense) and the cultivation of particular ‘forms of the person’ (see below); b) are adjacent to those sectors of the cultural field which are relatively low in economic capital and in need of the institutional resources some universities can offer; and c) coincide with these sectors in so far as they offer a plethora of opportunities for professional development whose value is ultimately uncertain and in which waiting is an established career strategy. These characteristics of graduate arts study constitute a clear and present danger in a higher education system that is increasingly reliant on the casualised labour of graduate students (Percy *et al* 2008). Overseeing the project refers us to a host of questions of feasibility, from the self-assessments of students in relation to their capacities to the formal constrictions of university ethics committees. Overseeing the project also refers to situating the project within a broader field; it rests on the assumption that value is socially produced rather than a substantive property of the project. To what fields does the work appear orientated? What are the stakes of these fields and who or what are the relevant stake-holders? How may the

outcomes of the research be situated *vis-a-vis* these agencies? What will be their relevance? What can others both within and outside the university potentially do with this project? These are complex questions and rest on unique sets of disciplinary and project-based concerns. Ideally a supervisor has some capacity for judgment of how the outcome of the work will be received across different contexts (from university examination to public exhibition), and this might inform the research strategies from an early stage.

Managing expectations and overseeing the project are exemplary teaching strategies intended to shape the self-practice of the student. They are therefore good examples of the final consideration: training the person. Obviously there are broader skills involved beyond the specific creative practice and which are transferable across social and professional contexts: the object of research training (as with most applications of creative practice) is not simply the work itself, but the ‘forms of the person’ it both facilitates and demonstrates. This account of creative work can be usefully distinguished from ‘personal development’ to the extent we associate the latter with a practice that takes subjectivity as its object. Unlike the deep self of psychology, the notion of ‘the person’ reaches us from the social anthropology of culturally and historically distinct techniques of personhood developed by Marcel Mauss. A significant precursor to Foucault’s histories of ‘technologies of the self’, Mauss’s research proposed the category of the person might be analysed in relation to the variable material techniques and technologies (‘practices’ in the second sense cited by Reckwitz) through which it is socially produced (Mauss 1985 [1935]). In educational theory it is predated by the notions of ‘character’ and ‘personality’ which have provided universities with rationales for liberal education since the nineteenth century (Hunter 1991; Meredyth 1991).

Forms of the person are skills-based assemblages that are specific to particular contexts. The relevant question for individual creative arts disciplines would be what forms of the person are relevant to the field? What forms of personhood tend to dominate which sectors of the field, and what is the room for manoeuvre here? What forms of the person are mobile across which fields, or sectors of the field, and alternately which appear to lack mobility? What sorts of professional persona might it be useful for a student to develop in view of their own ambitions for the research?

I’m aware these general comments on research training in the creative arts are hardly exciting when compared to other agendas currently on offer. They don’t flag a particularly unique mission that might excite the imagination of students or their supervisors, nor do they contest the perimeters of established epistemologies or research methods. I have argued that although the practice-led research model is clearly laudable as a project for achieving recognitive justice for teaching staff, it is insufficient as a paradigm for research output: it reifies the notion of art to the detriment of the needs of students, and reneges on the possibilities for articulating research to the interests of stakeholders in the cultural sector. Furthermore, I have suggested that the creative industries approach to graduate curriculum planning does not so much redress this problem, as rhetorically join the dots between the established interests of teaching staff and the rhetoric of a ‘new economy’. Rather than seek out

new terms on which to consecrate the unique importance of a special class of cultural producers, creative arts academics might contribute to the more mundane project of articulating their knowledge to broader and established rationales for research (in the case of research funding) and pedagogy (in the case of research training): only thus might they evade the legacy of their special social status.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on a presentation made at the ‘Creative and practice-led research symposium’ held at the University of Canberra, October 9, 2009. I would like to thank the symposium organisers, Donna Lee Brien and Jen Webb, for their invitation to present at this event.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, there are less sceptical ways of thinking about the centrality afforded the concept of craft in the self-perception of Australian creative arts academics than via the sorts of sociological exposé found in Bourdieu. We might note that the creation of a caste of educators whose vocational identities are based on an applied knowledge of technique had its historical rationale in the charters of the CAEs. The creation of the CAEs following the 1964 Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (otherwise known as the Martin Report) reflected a policy division between vocational/technical and liberal education streams that was translated (unsuccessfully) into Australia’s binary system of tertiary education (Davies 1989). While the binary system no doubt enabled diverse vocational classes and status groups to occupy the education system and begin the slow project of interpolating their interests into the curriculum, the space created for such classes and groups was the planned outcome of governmental reform.

<sup>3</sup> Although for a persuasive argument that cultural criticism is itself a form of vocational training see Hunter 1988.

<sup>4</sup> See the ‘Accreditation guidelines’ available from the Australian Publishers Association’s website, at [http://www.publishers.asn.au/training.cfm?doc\\_id=507](http://www.publishers.asn.au/training.cfm?doc_id=507) (accessed 26/2/2019)

<sup>5</sup> The key figure here was the advertising executive and trust fund manager Alex Osborn whose popular works on the importance of creativity for modern business professionals founded a genre of motivational primers and training guides. The relevant titles are *Your creative power: how to use imagination to brighten life, to get ahead* (Osborn 1991 [1941]), *Wake up your mind: 101 Ways to develop creativeness* (Osborn 1952) and *Applied imagination: principles and procedures of creative thinking* (Osborn 1993 [1953]). Osborne’s works were soon followed by the Reinhold Business Reference Series which included the titles *Creative thinking* (Whiting 1958), *Management games: a new technique for executive development* (Kibee, Craft and Nanus 1961) and *Creativity and innovation* (Haeefe 1962). These books, whose authors were business managers and staff trainers in large US manufacturing companies, were published as practical reference works on a range of new techniques, such as ‘brainstorming’ and ‘thinking outside the square’, to instil creative thinking in senior management. While the Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter is often cited here in relation to his work on entrepreneurs and his theory of ‘creative destruction’, of more direct significance for the production of these texts was the massive expansion of college business studies in the inter-war period (Levine 1986), and the migration of progressive pedagogy from the ‘Creative education’ departments of teachers colleges to the business sector (see Mearns 1941: 194-98).

<sup>6</sup> An anonymous reader of an earlier version of this article raised a key concern with my argument that can be paraphrased as follows: ‘Although you put forward the project of liberal education as preferable to the creative industries agenda, this latter project for arts education is also clearly a project of citizen-formation, one that seeks to slot students into a neo-liberal economy. Isn’t the real problem the assumption that we should engage in citizen-production in the first place?’ Let me respond by saying I entirely agree with the first part of this reply: as the quotations cited above suggest, current models for ‘creative education’ are absolutely focused on training students for what we might call neo-liberal citizenship. I think this will prove to be the most plausible and enduring element of CI proposals so far as arts education is concerned. In terms of the second part of this response, an initial reply might be to look to the Foucauldian liberalism of Ian Hunter and suggest that the project of reproducing a

population endowed with citizenly attributes (of whatever kind) is a non-negotiable element of public education systems. Despite the evidence for this, I think a second response that tries to think through some of the implications of Nikolas Rose's account of advanced liberalism (1999) for cultural and educational policy is perhaps more timely: Rose's account would suggest that the possibility that states might allow the institutions of liberal citizenship to be partly dismantled in favour of more targeted agendas (whose rationalities may be those of national or regional economy, but which may also simply be clothed in the garb of economic analysis in order to foster the interests of specific status groups, such as artists) is part of the advanced liberal policy terrain we must now negotiate. While this article is clearly not the place to debate the political rationalities of the liberal settlement (such as the right of all individuals to the benefits that attend the possession of citizenly capacities, and the legitimate needs of the liberal state for trained citizens), let me simply suggest that the idea arts academics could detach themselves from this project in favour of caste-specific objectives is arguably an effect of the new forms of advanced liberal rationality universities are increasingly harnessed to.

### List of works cited

- Bourdieu, Pierre 1990 *The logic of practice*, trans. R Nice, Stanford, California: Stanford UP
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1996 *The rules of art: genesis and structure of the literary Field*, trans. S Emanuel, Stanford, California: Stanford UP
- Bridge, Gary 2006 'Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighbourhood' *Urban studies* 43: 4, 719-30
- Certeau, Michel de 1984 *The practice of everyday life*, trans. S Rendall, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P
- Cunningham, Stuart 2004 'The humanities, creative arts, and the international innovation agendas', in J Kenway, E Bullen and S Robb (eds.) *Innovation and tradition: the arts, humanities and the knowledge economy*, New York, Frankfurt am Main and Oxford: Peter Lang, 113-24
- Davies, Susan 1989 *The Martin committee and the binary policy of higher education in Australia*, Melbourne: Ashwood House
- Foucault, Michel 1988 'The political technology of individuals', in LH Martin, H Gutman and PH Hutton, *Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault*, Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 145-62
- Garnham, Nicholas 2005 'From cultural to creative industries: an analysis of the implications of the "creative industries" approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom', *International journal of cultural policy* 11: 1, 15-29
- Haefele, John W 1962 *Creativity and innovation*, New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation
- Hartley, John 2007 "'There are other ways of being in the truth'": the uses of multimedia literacy' *International journal of cultural studies* 10: 1, 135-44
- Herrmann, Keith, Paul Hannon, Juliet Cox and Philip Ternouth 2008 'Developing entrepreneurial graduates: putting entrepreneurship at the centre of higher education', London: National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts
- Hunter, Ian 1991 'Personality as a vocation: the political rationality of the humanities', in I Hunter, D Meredyth, B Smith and G Stokes (eds.) *Accounting for the humanities: the language of culture and the logic of government*, Nathan, Qld: Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University, 7-66
- Hunter, Ian 1988 *Culture and government: the emergence of literary education*, London: Macmillan
- Kibbee, Joel M, Clifford J Craft and Burt Nanus 1961 *Management games: a new technique for executive development*, New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation
- Levine, David O 1986 *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1915-1940*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP

- 
- Linsley, Ingrid 2005 'Causes of over education in the Australian labour market' *Australian journal of labour economics* 8: 2, 121-43
- Marginson, Simon 1995 'The decline in the standing of educational credentials in Australia' *Australian journal of education* 39: 1, 67-76
- Mauss, Marcel 1985 [1935] 'The category of the human mind: the notion of person; the notion of self', in M Carrithers, S Collins and S Lukes (eds.) *The category of the person: anthropology, philosophy, history*, Cambridge, London and New York: Cambridge UP, 1-25
- McKenzie, Phillip, Julie Kos, Maurice Walker and Jennifer Hong 2008 *Staff in Australia's schools 2007*, Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
- McRobbie, Angela 2002 Fashion culture: creative work, female individualization' *Feminist review* 71, 52-62
- McWilliam, Erica 2008 *The creative workforce: how to launch young people into high-flying careers*, Sydney: University of New South Wales
- Mearns, Hughes 1941 *The creative adult: self-education in the art of living*, Garden City and New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company
- Meredyith, Denise 1991 'Personality and personnel: rationalities for the humanities', in I Hunter, D Meredyith, B Smith and G Stokes (eds.) *Accounting for the humanities: the language of culture and the logic of government*, Nathan, Qld: Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University, 117-89
- Oakley, Kate 2007 'Educating for the creative workforce: rethinking arts and Education', Brisbane: ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation and the Australia Council for the Arts
- Osborn, Alex 1952 *Wake up your mind: 101 Ways to develop creativeness*, New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons
- Osborn, Alex 1991 [1941] *Your creative power: how to use your imagination to brighten life, get ahead*, Schaumburg, Illinois: Motorola University Press
- Osborn, Alex 1993 [1953] *Applied imagination: principles and procedures of creative problem solving*, Buffalo, New York: Creative Education Foundation
- Percy, Alisa *et al.* 2008 'The red report: the contribution of sessional teachers to higher education', Strawberry Hills, NSW: The Australian Learning and Teaching Council
- Potts, Jason, Stuart Cunningham, John Hartley and Paul Ormerod 2008 'Social network markets: a new definition of the creative industries' *Journal of cultural economics* 32, 167-85
- Reckwitz, Andreas 2002 'Toward a theory of social practices: a development in culturalist theorizing' *European journal of social theory* 5: 2, 243-63
- Richards, IA 1967 [1925] 'The normality of the artist', in *Principles of literary criticism*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 191-98
- Rose, Nikolas 1999 *Powers of freedom: reframing political thought*, Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge UP
- Warde, Alan 2004 'Practice and field: revising Bourdieusian concepts', CRIC Discussion Papers 65, Manchester: Centre for Research on Innovation and Competition, U of Manchester
- Whiting, Charles S 1958 *Creative thinking*, New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation