Exploring Teacher Creativity through Duoethnography and Reflection

Peter Brereton & Shoko Kita

Abstract

Although creativity is commonly promoted in language teaching, there is often little understanding or agreement regarding what this actually constitutes (Jones & Richards 2016). With the aim of exploring their own beliefs, understandings, and experiences of teacher creativity, and as a form of self-directed professional development, the authors carried out a duoethnography in which - informed by a range of relevant literature - they discussed and reflected upon various facets of teacher creativity. Through this study, the authors gained a greater insight of what creativity means to them, why principled creativity matters in teaching, and how to further develop as creative practitioners.

Introduction

Creativity is increasingly understood to be integral to the success of foreign language education, playing "a central role in equipping teachers and learners with essential 21st-century skills" (Ollerhead & Burns 2016 p. 227), and helping learners develop a better mastery of language (Taylor 2014 in Richards & Cotterall 2016). However, the general term often evades definition, and there is little common understanding of what creativity in foreign language teaching actually means (Jones & Richards 2016; Xerri & Vassallo 2016). Indeed, in their edited book on creativity in language teaching, Jones and Richards (2016, p. 4) themselves avoid providing a definition, instead placing the onus on their chapter contributors and asking them to consider 'what does creativity mean to *you*?'

Through informal discussions, the two authors of this paper were aware that teacher creativity was an area in which we were both interested. However, it was equally apparent that we struggled to articulate much of what we believed and understood about creativity. We therefore decided to carry out a duoethnography as a form of self-directed, collaborative, reflective professional development in order to deconstruct, discuss, and develop our own beliefs, and ultimately deepen our understanding of what teacher creativity means to *us*.

Context

The two authors of this paper, Peter Brereton and Shoko Kita (hereafter Peter and Shoko) first met when we began working together on an academic discussion program at Rikkyo University in Tokyo, Japan in 2017. When this duoethnography began in early 2019, Peter was a program manager and Shoko was an instructor. During this duoethnography, Shoko became a program manager, while Peter took up a teaching position at another university in Tokyo.

The career journeys Peter and Shoko took to arrive at Rikkyo were markedly different. Peter is originally from the UK and studied French and German at university. As part of his undergraduate degree, he worked as an assistant language teacher (ALT) in a French school which only served to convince him that teaching was not a career he wished to pursue. However, due to his desire to live and work overseas, he obtained a CELTA after

graduating in 2007 with the initial intention of teaching for a few years. As a post-service teacher, he became more interested in teaching as a profession, working in a range of contexts in Ireland, Australia, the UK, and Spain before joining British Council in Madrid in 2010. He then moved to British Council in Tokyo, gaining a Delta and becoming Academic & Corporate Course Coordinator, responsible for the development of both teachers and course materials. This role developed his interest and experience in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and, after obtaining an MA in TESOL, he moved to Rikkyo.

In contrast, Shoko's interest in teaching started to develop when she was young, as both her parents worked as school teachers. Though she is from a small town in Japan and had limited contact with people from different cultural backgrounds, she became interested in English through learning in class, communicating with an ALT, and participating in international events in her hometown. She therefore decided to study linguistics and education at university, and obtained a Japanese high school teacher's license. She then moved to San Francisco where she obtained an MA in TESOL and taught EAP from 2012 to 2014. After returning to Japan in 2015, she taught general and academic English at a private English school in Tokyo before joining Rikkyo.

As colleagues, we frequently found ourselves discussing aspects of our teaching and discovered a shared interest in a number of areas, most predominantly reflective practice and teacher development. Through these informal discussions, we soon established a non-judgmental, critical friendship, which allowed us to feel we were "being heard in a sympathetic but constructively critical way" while being challenged to "have a deeper understanding of [our] teaching" (Farrell 2007, p. 149). This encouraged us to collaborate in a more formalized way. As keen reflective practitioners, we were interested in exploring our own experiences and beliefs, which drew us to the idea of carrying out a duoethnography together. Although duoethnographies are typically used as a form of qualitative research, we felt they also encompassed three vital elements for effective professional development: "a focus, dialogue with another professional, and reflection" (Mann & Walsh 2017, p. 12).

Despite our interest in a number of topics, we ultimately chose to explore the topic of creativity as it complemented the "Creativity and Craft" theme of the upcoming ExcitELT conference, held in Tokyo in May 2019. Due to our desire to reflect on our own teaching practices as well as our shared interest in teacher development, we decided to focus primarily on teacher creativity. Given that most work on creativity in ELT has centered on the role of the learner with teacher creativity often taken for granted (Constantinides, 2016), we hope that this duoethnography will also be useful for our fellow creative practitioners.

Methodology

In its most basic form, duoethnography is a conversation between two critical partners about an area of interest. Through collaborative dialogue, duoethnographers explore their chosen issue in order to interrogate existing beliefs, and generate new meanings and understandings. The strong focus on collaboration and narrative in this research method makes explicit the voice of each duoethnographer, juxtaposing their own life experiences and beliefs with the aim of discovering and exploring contrasts and connections (Sawyer & Norris 2013).

The exact methodology of duoethnographies is intentionally open and unprescribed, to the point of being ambiguous (Norris & Sawyer 2017). The procedure is therefore unique to each set of duoethnographers, with the precise methodology emerging as the

duoethnography progresses. This relies heavily on the researchers' ability to identify emergent themes and questions and develop these strands by interweaving them with their own narratives to "open new windows on experience" (Sawyer & Norris 2013, p. 61).

Our duoethnography was conducted between March and May 2019. We had five face-to-face sessions lasting around 90 minutes each with the overall theme centering on creativity in English language teaching. The basic structure of our duoethnography followed a broad cycle beginning with us engaging in a discussion on the topic of creativity, which we audio recorded. In the days following the discussion, we listened back to the recording individually, producing broad transcriptions of the discussion, at times editing what was said to more accurately represent our views. This was done using a shared Google Doc to enable us to work simultaneously. We then interacted, both with the transcript and with each other, using the comment function on Google Docs to reflect upon and respond to ideas expressed in the session. We also used this function to identify emergent themes of interest and potential avenues of future discussion. At the beginning of the following session, we discussed these online reflections and revisited any areas which we felt required clarification or which would benefit from further discussion.

Due to the aforementioned unprescribed nature of the research methodology and our relative inexperience as duoethnographers, we felt it would be beneficial to reflect upon not only the product but also the process of our project. We therefore used a second Google Doc to document and justify our approach, consider potential alternatives, and evaluate our own "performances" during the discussions. As a result, we were better able to develop a method which complemented our relationship as duoethnographers. In particular, we became more aware of our joint responsibility for keeping ourselves on track and using questions to guide each other down potentially useful pathways (Sawyer & Norris 2013).

After the first session, we felt that our duoethnography would benefit if we were more aware of existing literature and current issues regarding creativity in education. As such, we decided to prepare for each subsequent discussion by reading and reflecting upon selected publications. A full list of our reading can be seen in the Appendix. This scaffolding through literature was deemed necessary as we felt it may better guide our approach, help us shape and articulate our own views more clearly, and ultimately lead us to more meaningful discussions. However, this also meant that our approach diverged from most other duoethnographies, in which referring to literature has generally been discouraged (Sawyer & Norris 2013), and instead incorporated aspects of data-led reflective discussions (see Mann & Walsh 2017).

After four sessions, we presented some of our findings from the duoethnography in an interactive workshop (see Brereton & Kita, 2019). The reader or the audience of a duoethnography is not just a passive receiver of the data, but is instead "invited to enter the conversation, contrast their own experiences within the narratives, and welcome new insights afforded by the duoethnographic process" (Banting & De Loof 2017, p. 40). As such, the workshop included several small group discussions for participants to express their own views on the points we raised more generally on the topic of creativity. These group discussions were audio recorded (with participants' consent), transcribed, and used as the basis for a final discussion session, in which we reflected on the process as a whole.

Duoethnography

In this section, excerpts from our discussions are laid out in the form of a script. SK is used to identify Shoko's speaking turns and PB for Peter's. These dialogues have been edited and reconstructed to create dialogues which accurately reflect our views, yet at times may be fictionalized accounts of what was actually said (Lowe 2018). In lieu of a formal literature review, references are included within the dialogue where appropriate.

Understandings, beliefs, and perceptions

In this first dialogue, we discuss our understandings of teacher creativity, our perceptions of our own creativity as teachers, and our belief in the importance of "principled creativity".

PB: I was thinking that it would be difficult to find teachers who didn't think creativity is important, but if you ask them to explain what creativity actually is, they'd struggle to do so. I wonder if this is why most teachers struggle to describe themselves as creative (Xerri 2013). What do you think, Shoko?

SK: I think other people's creativity can sometimes stand out more than our own creativity. Maley (2016, p. 10) describes that reaction of "Hold on...why didn't I think of that?" when we see creative ideas. While this evokes "feelings of pleasurable recognition" (Maley 2016, p. 10), it could also highlight what we ourselves couldn't come up with. In contrast, for our own ideas, it might not give us that same feeling. I sometimes feel that if I can come up with something, anyone could. This is why I can't confidently say I am creative though I don't consider myself a *non*-creative teacher. When I see creative teaching or research ideas by other teachers, I feel there's more room for development in my own creativity. For instance, within our curriculum, teacher autonomy is restricted. However I'm constantly surprised by teachers' ability to find ways to make their lessons more interesting and meaningful for their learners. One teacher recently interviewed instructors from different countries to add some cultural elements to an activity in our textbook.

PB: I felt a similar reluctance and I wonder if we fear that it sounds presumptuous or even arrogant. I made a conscious decision to embrace it and "identify" as a creative practitioner, adding it to my bio and joining the C Group. It might seem trivial but I felt like giving myself that label meant I was able to get more involved in the idea of teacher creativity. That lack of confidence may also stem from the shortage of discussion around creativity, or its perceived "wooliness". There's no clear or agreed upon definition, no real "best practices", no one way of doing things, and that may mean it seems too vague, too nebulous to adopt as a teaching identity. This could cause a lack of awareness amongst teachers of their own creativity; as humans, we're all fundamentally creative to some extent. I'm not sure we could teach communicatively if we weren't creative. As it's impossible to anticipate everything, a lot of what we do is improvised. That in itself is an incredibly creative act (Sawyer 2019).

SK: That's true. Why do you think creativity isn't a bigger topic in teacher discussions?

PB: I think one reason is that the lack of definition leads to a misunderstanding that creativity is all about art and games, it's not particularly principled and that it can be used as an excuse for doing any old thing in class. I sometimes read suggested activities where, for example, learners take random verbs, nouns, adjectives and make nonsense sentences and I think, "How is that activity working to further their language and

communicative abilities?" That's not creativity as I understand it: it sounds like an activity designed for learners to have a bit of fun or, if I'm being cynical, for teachers to eat up a bit of time.

SK: Richards (2013) used the term "mis-placed creativity" to describe that kind of activity, those which lack a good knowledge base. In previous discussions, we've agreed that, whatever the activity might be, there needs to be a clear link to the course or lesson aims. Everything we do in class needs to be working towards developing learners' language ability, whether it's creative or not.

PB: Precisely. My issue is that I've seen lots of bad lessons that people have tried to justify because it was "creative". In my first year or two of teaching, I definitely taught some lessons which were guilty of that - one where learners created their own comic strips springs to mind - and I think it's idealistic to think that because teachers are attempting to be creative, it's automatically a good lesson.

SK: So there's a difference between being creative and just being different.

PB: Right. Just being different for the sake of it is not what I understand as being creative. Xerri and Vassallo (2016) said there was no recipe for a perfect lesson. This is totally true, and I couldn't agree more. However, I noted alongside it,"...but there are plenty of recipes for bad lessons…"

Through comparing our understandings of creativity, we identified that we both believe that mis-placed creativity is a risk both to the quality of the teaching and to the reputation of creativity. We also uncovered a reluctance to label oneself as a "creative practitioner", perhaps due to the impression of creativity as vague and relatively unprincipled.

Training and developing creativity
In these next dialogues, we try to identify how we developed as creative teachers and attempt to gain a better understanding of how, as teacher trainers, we can help others develop their own creativity.

Developing as creative practitioners

SK: Xerri & Vassallo (2016) suggest teachers are not "born creative," but I've also read that some people are more creative than others. What does that mean for developing creativity?

PB: I'm inclined to think it can be tacitly learned but not explicitly taught. This is another reason why I think creativity may be neglected in teacher education: we don't know how to train it, so we shy away from it as a topic. You can't teach somebody to be creative in a top-down way, you know "Okay, step 1, step 2, hey, now you're more creative". As a form of experiential knowledge, it's basically something you develop in yourself through experimentation and reflection.

SK: Right. As soon as you tell people what to do, it loses a sense of creativity, doesn't it?

PB: So what factors influenced your creative development?

SK: For me, discussing teaching and seeing other teachers' ideas helped me develop my creativity. However, I do think there were a few missed opportunities for developing teachers' awareness of creativity during both my teacher training as an undergrad and on my MA program. For example, most of the assignments were giving ten-minute demo

lessons, after which we reflected on our lesson and received feedback from classmates and the trainer. We got to see a variety of materials and activities, but it might have developed our creativity more to go one step further and discuss how we could adapt those activities in different contexts like different levels, or learners with different learning purposes. How have you developed your creativity?

PB: I also found that sharing materials and discussing my lessons with colleagues was most beneficial. For the first few years of my career, I got lots of practical "ready-to-teach" lesson ideas, which was great for a novice. However, I rarely kept them as they were: I used them as inspiration, adapted them for myself, and let them evolve into distinct ideas of my own. For example, a colleague in Australia mentioned that she kept a list of emergent language from class and recycled it when she had spare time in lessons. I began to do the same but the idea grew so much that it eventually became an interactive weekly 90-minute lesson involving learner mingles and a focus on negotiation of meaning through revision of vocabulary. That actually became a staple of my courses for a long time.

SK: When I started teaching, I also wanted practical ideas, but I didn't want to rely too much on other people's ideas because I thought getting their ideas might limit my creativity. I wanted to think on my own first and then check what other teachers created.

PB: Yeah, that's a good point. I think knowing what other teachers are doing really is a huge source of inspiration - both creatively and motivationally. A few years ago, I used to do regular informal observations with a colleague. They were so invaluable for giving us both fresh perspectives. By way of example, I noticed my colleague monitoring learners in my lesson and taking notes as if he was teaching. Later, we compared my actual feedback with the points he had scribbled down. It was totally different and a really interesting discussion emerged. Overall, that was a really creative relationship; we trusted each other enough to be able to do that kind of thing spontaneously and then reflect on whatever emerged.

Training creativity in others

SK: As a program manager, I've found it challenging to ensure that teachers meet the institutional goals and learners' needs while not discouraging them from exploring creativity. How can we, as teacher trainers, help teachers develop creativity that is based on solid principles?

PB: I believe the biggest part of a manager's role is fostering an atmosphere conducive to teacher development, in which they can experiment in their own classes and reflect on the results. There's often very little we can do as individuals to actually invoke or provoke a change in teachers' classroom practices. However, if there are certain institutional requirements which need to be met, then clear pre-lesson instructions and post-lesson guided reflection plus feedback are obviously going to play a role, too.

SK: I think my training in America illustrates your approach. New teachers there had a weekly meeting with their supervisor about their lesson plans and classroom issues. As a passionate new teacher, I wanted to try out different activities. My supervisor would always ask about my rationale for my choice of activities. Through justifying my activities, I would often realize myself if I had designed an activity based on principles or just because it seemed novel or interesting. What I liked about her approach was that she made me feel safe to take risks and experiment, trusting that she would help me

anticipate potential problems and that she valued my ideas, which created a non-judgmental environment (Maley 2016). Without rejecting my ideas, she would guide me to modify the activity in a way that met the learners' needs or encourage me to consider alternative contexts where the activity may be appropriate.

PB: That's great for encouraging autonomy in trainee teachers. Do you think a different approach is needed for more experienced teachers?

SK: I know from experience that giving them increased responsibility can reignite their creativity. In America I was responsible for a new teacher, which involved observing each other's lessons and giving her feedback on lesson plans. Working with her really challenged me in a different way. If I'd been alone, I would likely have stayed in my comfort zone. However, her ideas challenged me to find a way to incorporate other people's ideas into my lessons. So, as a trainer, assigning a task like "You are planning a lesson with a trainee teacher and they want to use this activity in their class. How would you help them?" might help develop experienced teachers' creativity.

PB: That's a really creative approach to raising awareness of creativity; using Loop Input (Woodward 2003) to help teachers' notice the possibilities of experimenting with something a little different. I often wonder why so much teacher training prioritizes careful, methodical planning. A challenging task "Quick, your colleague has called in sick! You have ten minutes to rustle up a lesson." That would be a real test of the ability to think on your feet and show another aspect of a teacher's skillset.

In this dialogue, we identified a few key beliefs which inform our own teaching and training approaches. Rather than being explicitly trained, our experiences suggest that creativity is best developed through dialogue, reflection, and collaboration with others.

Interacting with our workshop discussion
This dialogue is constructed from views expressed by participants in our workshop at the 2019 ExcitELT conference, interwoven with our own views from subsequent reflections. Although a wide range of themes was discussed, we focus here on the relationship between teacher creativity and teaching experience due to the differences in opinions expressed.

Workshop Participant (WP)1: In the first two years of my current job, I followed the script very carefully and, thinking back, I wasn't very creative. This year I feel more knowledgeable about the course and the aims, so I have more scope to try new things.

WP2: Whenever I change jobs, I become a rookie again: back to square one. In my job, I lacked the confidence and awareness to take many risks in the first year. I felt more comfortable in the second year but I'm still not confident enough in my third year to be really creative in class.

WP3: I'm not sure. I was much more creative in my first year than I am now in my second as I made almost all of my materials from scratch. This was down to "beginner's excitement": materials were available but I wanted to create my own partly to impress my learners and colleagues. This year I've been doing more fine-tuning than actual material creation.

PB: Different interpretations of creativity are emerging here: WP1 and WP2 mention trying new things or taking risks while WP3 suggests material creation is creative. While the latter is technically a creative act, my understanding of creativity means I don't

automatically associate material creation with teacher creativity: plenty of uncreative handouts have been created.

WP4: I think I've become more creative as I've gained teaching experience; I can think better on my feet and dig myself out of problems in class. Having said that, I think you can work in a job for too long. If you're too far into your comfort zone, you get stuck repeatedly doing the same thing, relying on routine and resting on your laurels. I've definitely seen that in colleagues who have become part of the furniture.

WP5: I think that can be the case but it doesn't have to be. I think we are all creative as kids but some people just really pursue it. Improving your craft requires discipline and hard work. But getting regular fresh perspectives is really important.

PB: In a way, I find myself agreeing with everyone here, despite the range of opinions! I draw a distinction between the contextual experience discussed by WP1 and WP2, and the teaching experience that WP4 refers to. I definitely feel less confident when I'm not as aware of the wider context. I'm usually a very reactive teacher: I prepare thoroughly but plan a lot of flexibility into my lessons. In my current job, I structured the first few weeks of lessons much more rigidly than usual until I developed more trust with the learners and more understanding of the course. Having said that, my ability to be creative in this way has improved with general experience so I'd say each time I begin a new job, I'm a little better able to do it, even if I then regress a bit due to the unfamiliar context. What do you think, Shoko?

SK: These reflections remind me that it's a learning process and a lot of teachers who are new to a context can actually learn themselves how to design lessons based on principles through experimenting. I see my job as learning about their backgrounds and experiences to provide the optimal amount of information at each stage of their learning process and ensure opportunities for them to reflect on their own learning process.

Reflections on the duoethnography product and process

Sawyer and Norris (2013, p. 93) suggest that conclusions ought not to have a place in a duoethnography: "Life goes on. Things change. Meanings are contextually situated." As such, with this section we aim to reflect on both the duoethnographical product and process but to draw no definitive conclusions. This was written five months after our workshop. This break, though unintentional, provided us with a valuable opportunity to reflect on the longer-term impact of the duoethnography on our beliefs and identity as teachers and as trainers.

Product

PB: What we didn't realize when we began our duoethnography was just how well-suited the topic of creativity was to this form of research. One quote I particularly like is from Sawyer (2007, p. 7), who says "When we collaborate, creativity unfolds across people; the sparks fly faster, and the whole is greater than the sum of its parts." Collaboration is so pivotal to a successful duoethnography and it's something we both felt brought out the best in us.

SK: So many ideas wouldn't have occurred to me without collaborating with you. Every stage - the in-depth discussions in the duoethnography, planning our workshop, attending other sessions, and analyzing our data for this paper - enabled me to revisit the literature, reevaluate our views, and make new connections between my experiences, the literature, and fellow teachers' views, which in turn has helped me

effortlessly remember the key points of creativity. ExcitELT was the first conference where I felt I was well-prepared to discuss the topic of every session with other participants. For example, Ryan's (2019) idea of creativity being transformative resonated with me and I immediately made the connection with our discussion that creativity may not be trained but developed through collaboration.

PB: Our duoethnography has been an incredibly powerful tool for professional development and it has shaped my beliefs and identity of who I am as a teacher, and has also influenced my classroom practices. Xerri (2013, p. 24) suggested that, "By encouraging teachers to deconstruct their beliefs about creativity there is a better chance of allowing it to prosper in their English lessons." This is very true for me. I've developed creativity into a real habit and, as I work, creativity is never far from my thoughts.

SK: Me, too. I believe this project made my first year as program manager slightly easier. I constantly find inspiration for facilitating teacher creativity in our discussions. After observations, I've been trying to understand more about teachers' thought processes before giving my own opinions to ensure reflective opportunities and a non-judgmental environment.

PB: In the Japanese university context, teachers are expected to be self-directed in their professional development, and many are often required to carry out and publish research. A duoethnography fulfills both of these criteria but I'd argue this probably has a more powerful impact on teaching than many other research projects. We do research to better understand our context and, ultimately, to improve as a teacher. By definition, this requires reflection on teaching beliefs and practices. Golombek and Johnson (2004, p. 308) suggests that "teachers' knowledge is structured through stories" and it has been very valuable to explore our own.

SK: At times we felt entirely absorbed by the process and in a real state of flow. As Csikszentmihalyi (2008, p. 74) suggests, the experience "provided a sense of discovery, a creative feeling of transporting [us] into a new reality. It pushed [us] to higher levels of performance, and led to previously undreamed-of states of consciousness."

PB: Csikszentmihalyi's theory of flow was really interesting to learn more about. I procrastinate less now and find it easier to achieve flow, regardless of the task. Much like with creativity, increasing my awareness of the concept has made it easier to incorporate it in my life. This project has changed my approach to research projects too. In the past I've been involved in projects that I haven't necessarily been entirely invested in but now I'm more selective about what I decide to take on. I want to do what I feel passionately about and, as a direct result of this duoethnography, I've decided to explore teacher improvisation for my PhD.

SK: One thing I want to explore more is teachers' perceptions of my training. I've developed my understanding of potential approaches to help develop creativity in both novice and experienced teachers. I have incorporated some of those ideas but I haven't asked for any feedback on my approaches. As we learned in our workshop, teachers differ in their experiences and preferences. I'm curious to know what works well for those in my context and what changes I can make to provide better support.

Process

PB: Fortunately the duoethnography methodology is sufficiently flexible and researcher-led that we could experiment and be creative without feeling we were breaking the rules. However, we both felt we should have allowed more time for our own ideas to develop

before we began consulting literature. It was a good idea but it interfered with our ability to discuss our own experiences and beliefs at times. The editing has been useful though; I think it's helped our own voices emerge more clearly.

SK: Yes, when reading back over the transcripts six months after our final session, we both felt we could have shared more concrete examples for some sections, and more questions emerged while organizing our ideas for this paper.

PB: However, we did well to reflect on the process after each session, which allowed us to address minor issues before they took us too far off track. We noticed after transcribing the first session that the balance of speaking wasn't as equal as it perhaps should have been but we were more aware of that from then on and took steps to remedy it.

SK: Despite our differing backgrounds, we actually found we had a great deal in common. It was also interesting to invite our audience into the duoethnography to gain different perspectives on our ideas.

PB: Yes, I don't remember ever seeing that in other papers. Involving the audience was something we were very keen to do but we were ultimately analyzing and selecting from just under 39,000 words over two Google Docs. As such, it's really impossible to offer readers more than just a short preview of what we discussed.

SK: This project was initially for our own benefit but we really would welcome further dialogue with readers. The more teachers explore their own narratives, and make these public, the bigger the impact they will have on the field (Johnson & Golombek 2011).

PB: Overall, there is no blueprint for teacher creativity, but my belief has only been strengthened that reflection, collaboration and experimentation are key. I think I speak for both of us when I say that, for a short time, we reached a new level of all of these through our duoethnography.

Biographical note
Peter Brereton teaches at International Christian University in Tokyo and is also a Delta Local Tutor and External Assessor. He has worked in ELT since 2007 and holds a Delta and an MA in TESOL. His main professional interests include teacher development, teacher creativity and improvisation, and reflective practice.

Shoko Kita teaches at Rikkyo University in Tokyo. Shoko earned her MA in TESOL from San Francisco State University. Her research interests include teacher development, reflective practice, teacher and learner creativity, and developing critical thinking skills.

References

Banting, N & De Loof, S. 2017. Right and wrong (and good enough): A duoethnography within a graduate curriculum studies course, in R.D. Sawyer, & J. Norris (eds.), *Theorizing curriculum studies, teacher education, and research through duoethnographic pedagogy*, Palgrave, New York, 39-62.

Brereton, P & Kita, S. 2019. A creative look at creativity: discussion & duoethnography, paper presented at the *ExcitELT Conference*. 12 May, Tokyo.

Constantinides, M. 2016. Creating creative teachers, in A. Maley & N. Peachy (eds.), *Creativity in the English language classroom,* British Council, London, 115-122.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2008. *Flow: The Psychology of optimal experience*, HarperCollins, New York.

Farrell, S. C. T. 2007. *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*, Continuum, London.

Golombek, P.R. & Johnson, K.E. 2004. Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development, *Teachers and teaching* 10(3), 307-327.

Johnson, K.E & Golombek, P.R. 2011. The transformative power of narrative in second language teacher education, *TESOL Quarterly* 45(3), 486-509.

Jones, R. H & Richards, J.C. 2016. Creativity and language teaching, in R.H. Jones, & J.C. Richards (eds.), *Creativity in language teaching: Perspectives from research and practice,* Routledge, New York, 3-15.

Lowe, R. 2018. Duoethnographic projects in the language class, *Modern English Teacher* 27(1), 74-77.

Maley, A. 2016. Creativity: the what, the why and the how, in D. Xerri & O. Vassallo (eds.), *Creativity in English language teaching*, ELT Council, Floriana, 9-18.

Norris, J & Sawyer, R.D. 2017. Introduction: The efficacy of duoethnography in teaching and learning: A return to its roots, in R.D. Sawyer, & J. Norris (eds.), *Theorizing curriculum studies, teacher education, and research through duoethnographic pedagogy*, Palgrave, New York, 1-14.

Ollerhead, S & Burns, A. 2016. Creativity as resistance: Implications for language teaching and teacher education, in R.H. Jones, & J.C. Richards (eds.), *Creativity in language teaching: Perspectives from research and practice*, Routledge, New York, 227-240.

Richards, J.C. 2013. Creativity in language teaching, paper presented at the *Summer Institute for English Teacher of Creativity and Discovery in Teaching University Writing*, 5 June, Hong Kong, https://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/Creativity-in-Language-Teaching.pdf

Richards, J.C & Cotterall, S. 2016. Exploring creativity in language teaching, in R.H. Jones, & J.C. Richards (eds.), *Creativity in language teaching: Perspectives from research and practice*, Routledge, New York, 97-113.

Ryan, S. 2019. Craft and creativity in the language classroom: A conflict of competence?, paper presented at the *ExcitELT Conference*. 12 May, Tokyo.

Sawyer, R.D, & Norris, J. 2013. *Duoethnography,* Oxford University Press, New York.

Sawyer, K. 2007. *Group genius: The creative power of collaboration*. Basic Books, New York.

Sawyer, K. 2019. *The creative classroom: Innovative teaching for 21st-century learners,* Teachers College Press, New York.

Woodward, T. 2003. Loop input, *ELT Journal* 57(3), 301-304.

Xerri, D & Vassallo, O. 2016. Creativity in ELT: an introduction, in D. Xerri & O. Vassallo (eds.), *Creativity in English language teaching*, ELT Council, Floriana, 1-8.

Xerri, D. 2013. The value of creativity: Language teachers as creative practitioners, *NATE* 3, 23-25.

Appendix

Session	Pre-discussion tasks
1	Reflect on the general area of teacher creativity
2	Read Xerri, D & Vassallo, O 2016, Creativity in ELT: an introduction. Read Maley, A 2016, 'Creativity: the what, the why and the how'. Read Richards, J.C 2013, 'Creativity in language teaching'. Read any other literature of interest. Listen, transcribe, and reflect on our previous discussions and on the duoethnographical process.
3	Read Constantinides M 2016, 'Creating creative teachers'. Read Graves K 2016, 'Creativity in the curriculum'. Read any other literature of interest. Listen, transcribe, and reflect on our previous discussions and on the duoethnographical process.
4	Read any literature of interest. Listen, transcribe, and reflect on our previous discussions and on the duoethnographical process.
5	Read any literature of interest. Listen, transcribe, and reflect on our previous discussions and on the duoethnographical process. Listen, make notes, and reflect on ExcitELT workshop participants' discussions