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Abstract:

Although there is a new and welcome focus worldwide on teaching for creativity and creative thinking in education (creative pedagogies), that is aligned with Froebelian perspectives, teachers report finding creative pedagogies difficult to implement in classrooms. Frameworks have been designed to support teachers with creative pedagogies, but it has been claimed that the structure imposed by frameworks can destroy opportunities for students’ creativity. Based on evidence from the study described in this paper, we argue that one such framework, the ‘Steps to Inquiry’ framework, designed to support teachers implementing creative pedagogies in the area of science, does provide opportunities for students’ creativity. This qualitative case study focused on a Year One class using the ‘Steps to Inquiry’ framework. Videos collected over three cycles of inquiry along with verbatim transcriptions were analyzed looking for opportunities for students’ creativity, using a deductive thematic analysis with creativity themes garnered from a recent review of the literature. Themes included *generating and exploring ideas*; developing *autonomy and agency*; exhibiting *playfulness, problem-solving*and*risk-takin*g; and *co-constructing* *and collaborating*. Findings demonstrated the presence of all themes. Implications are that while the ‘Steps to Inquiry’ framework does structure activities to support teachers, opportunities for students’ creativity are maintained. This paper is significant not only because it indicates the value of the ‘Steps to Inquiry’ framework for supporting teachers implementing creative pedagogies in the area of science education, it also shares an in-depth look at an example of  the use of the framework with an early primary class.
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