IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko

Department of Education, College of Education, Kean University, Union, NJ, USA

Orchid: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6300-2017

ABSTRACT

The increasing demand for innovation, adaptability, and critical problem-solving in contemporary society has renewed attention to the capacity of formal education systems to nurture or constrain learners' creative potential. This paper appraised Ken Robinson's influential speech, *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*, with a view to examining the validity, relevance, and educational implications of its central arguments within present-day schooling. Specifically, the paper interrogated Robinson's major claims concerning the suppressive tendencies of conventional school structures, evaluates the extent to which contemporary educational research supports or challenges his position on the relationship between schooling and creativity, and assesses the relevance of his critique to current educational practices and curriculum development. The paper was anchored on Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory, which provides conceptual support for Robinson's rejection of narrow definitions of intelligence and his advocacy for broader recognition of diverse learner capacities. Adopting an analytical review (appraisal) method, the paper critically examined recent empirical studies, theoretical perspectives, and educational reform literature relevant to creativity and formal schooling. The paper revealed that Robinson's critique remains substantially valid, particularly in contexts characterised by rigid curriculum structures, examination-driven instruction, and limited opportunities for interdisciplinary and creative engagement. However, evidence from curriculum reforms in countries such as Finland and Singapore demonstrates that schools can effectively foster creativity through intentional pedagogical redesign. The paper concluded that schools do not inherently suppress creativity; rather, creativity is diminished when educational systems prioritise conformity over intellectual exploration. It therefore recommended assessment reform, stronger integration of creativity-centred learning within curriculum frameworks, and sustained teacher development aimed at promoting innovative classroom practices.

KEYWORDS: Ken Robinson, Creativity, Schooling, Curriculum Reform, Analytical Appraisal, Multiple Intelligence Theory, Educational Practice.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

1. INTRODUCTION

Ken Robinson's TED Talk, *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*, remains one of the most influential critiques of formal education, not only because of its rhetorical force but because its central argument continues to resonate with current educational debates. Delivered in 2006, the speech challenged the global preference for standardization, examination-driven instruction, and rigid academic hierarchies that privilege mathematics and language over the arts. Robinson argued that schools often "educate people out of their creative capacities," warning that children enter school with a natural willingness to experiment, yet many leave conditioned to fear mistakes and conformity. Nearly two decades later, this claim remains highly relevant as current scholarship continues to question whether prevailing school systems adequately prepare learners for social and economic conditions defined by uncertainty, technological change, and innovation demands. The World Economic Forum consistently identifies creativity among the top skills required for future work, while educational researchers increasingly emphasize that originality, adaptability, and problem-solving are central learning outcomes for the twenty-first century (Rawlings & Cutting, 2024). Robinson's speech therefore deserves appraisal not as a nostalgic critique, but as an enduring intervention whose assumptions can now be examined against recent empirical evidence.

A close appraisal of Robinson's argument shows that his critique aligns with measurable global patterns in education. Findings from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2022 creative thinking assessment revealed notable disparities in students' ability to generate and evaluate original ideas, with only a small proportion of students across participating countries demonstrating advanced creative proficiency (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2024). This is significant because educational systems that score strongly in conventional literacy and numeracy assessments do not automatically produce strong creative thinkers. Such findings support Robinson's observation that schools may reward accuracy and recall more than experimentation. His concern becomes more compelling when viewed alongside UNESCO's recent reports on future learning, which note that many school systems still maintain structures inherited from industrial-era models despite societal demands for flexibility and innovation (UNESCO, 2023). Robinson's criticism of subject hierarchy also finds support in evidence showing a decline in arts participation across several national school systems, often as a consequence of accountability policies tied to standardized testing. This reduction has been linked to lower opportunities for divergent thinking and self-directed inquiry among learners (Winner et al., 2022).

Robinson's appraisal of educational orthodoxy is further strengthened by case studies demonstrating the gains associated with creativity-oriented pedagogy. Research from Finland's

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

phenomenon-based learning framework shows that interdisciplinary project-based instruction improves student engagement, collaborative problem-solving, and independent thinking when compared to subject-isolated teaching approaches (Sahlberg, 2021). Similar outcomes have been reported in Singapore's applied learning programmes, where structured creative tasks have enhanced learners' ability to transfer knowledge across contexts (Tan et al., 2022). In contrast, studies from highly test-driven systems indicate elevated student anxiety and reduced intellectual risk-taking, particularly where performance metrics dominate classroom culture (Li & Harris, 2023). Robinson's assertion that fear of being wrong suppresses originality is therefore not merely rhetorical. It reflects a pedagogical reality documented in recent classroom-based studies.

At the same time, scholarly appraisal requires acknowledging that Robinson's position can sometimes overstate the antagonism between schooling and creativity. Recent reviews suggest that schools do not inevitably suppress creative development; rather, creativity depends significantly on instructional design, teacher autonomy, and assessment reform (Rawlings & Cutting, 2024). Evidence from STEAM education initiatives demonstrates that formal schooling can foster originality when curricula deliberately integrate inquiry, experimentation, and artistic exploration (Sánchez Milara & Cortés Orduña, 2024). This suggests that Robinson's speech is most persuasive when interpreted as a critique of restrictive educational practices rather than a blanket condemnation of schools themselves.

In appraisal terms, Robinson's speech succeeds because it anticipated concerns that educational research has since substantiated. His challenge to educators was not simply to defend creativity as an abstract virtue, but to reconsider whether current systems cultivate the intellectual courage required for future societies. The continued relevance of his claims, supported by recent statistical evidence and comparative educational case studies, confirms that *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* remains a foundational text for examining whether schools are preparing learners merely to reproduce knowledge or to generate it.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite sustained global discourse on educational reform, there remains a persistent concern that formal schooling in many societies continues to privilege standardization, examination performance, and procedural compliance over imaginative inquiry and original thought. This concern, strongly articulated in Ken Robinson's *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*, has gained renewed scholarly attention as educational systems confront demands for innovation, adaptability, and critical problem-solving in the twenty-first century. Recent evidence suggests that while creativity is increasingly recognized as essential for workforce readiness and societal advancement, many school systems still rely on instructional and assessment models that reward

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

convergent thinking and memorization at the expense of experimentation and intellectual risk-taking (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

The 2022 PISA creative thinking assessment, for instance, reported that only a limited proportion of students across participating nations demonstrated high-level creative proficiency, indicating systemic shortcomings in fostering creative competence (OECD, 2024). Although several empirical studies have examined creativity in classroom contexts, much of the literature has focused on intervention outcomes, curriculum design, or pedagogical strategies, with insufficient attention given to critical appraisal of foundational public intellectual contributions such as Robinson's speech and their continued relevance within current educational realities (Rawlings & Cutting, 2024). This creates a scholarly gap in connecting influential educational critiques with contemporary empirical developments.

Furthermore, while existing studies acknowledge the value of creativity-enhancing pedagogies, there is limited analytical engagement with the extent to which Robinson's assertions remain empirically defensible nearly two decades after his TED Talk. Many contemporary discussions either cite his arguments uncritically or dismiss them without rigorous appraisal against current statistical evidence, comparative educational data, and emerging case studies from school systems undergoing reform (Sánchez & Cortés, 2024). This gap weakens scholarly understanding of whether Robinson's critique still offers explanatory power for present educational challenges or whether changing pedagogical practices have rendered parts of his thesis less applicable. The problem this appraisal paper addresses, therefore, lies in the absence of updated critical evaluation that systematically examines Robinson's central claims against recent evidence on creativity, school structure, and assessment practices. By interrogating the alignment between Robinson's propositions and current educational research, this paper fills the gap between rhetorical educational criticism and evidence-based scholarly analysis, providing clearer insight into the extent to which formal schooling continues to constrain or cultivate creative capacity in contemporary educational settings.

3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PAPER

The aim of this paper is to critically appraise Ken Robinson's speech, *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*, by examining the validity, relevance, and educational implications of its central arguments in relation to current scholarly discourse on creativity and formal schooling. The specific objectives of the Paper

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

1. To examine the central arguments presented in Ken Robinson's speech *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*.
2. To assess the extent to which contemporary educational research supports or challenges Robinson's claims about the relationship between schooling and creativity.
3. To evaluate the relevance of Robinson's critique to present-day educational practices and creativity development in schools.

4. METHODOLOGY

This paper adopted the analytical review (appraisal) method as its methodological approach. Analytical review is a qualitative scholarly method that involves the systematic examination, interpretation, and critical evaluation of existing texts, ideas, arguments, and empirical evidence with the aim of assessing their validity, relevance, strengths, limitations, and implications within a defined academic context (Grant & Booth, 2021). Unlike empirical methodologies that generate primary data through field-based observation or experimentation, the analytical review approach relies on rigorous engagement with existing literature, theoretical perspectives, and documented evidence to interrogate a phenomenon or intellectual position. Its major criteria include careful selection of relevant and credible scholarly sources, critical interrogation of competing viewpoints, logical synthesis of evidence, conceptual clarification, contextual interpretation, and reasoned judgement based on established academic standards (Snyder, 2023). This method also requires objectivity in assessing arguments, coherence in linking evidence to interpretation, and consistency in situating reviewed materials within the broader discourse surrounding the subject under investigation.

The adoption of this method is particularly justified for the present paper because the study is concerned with the critical appraisal of Ken Robinson's speech *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* rather than the generation of field-based quantitative or qualitative data. Since the paper seeks to evaluate Robinson's central arguments, examine the extent to which recent educational research supports or challenges his claims, and assess the continuing relevance of his critique to present-day educational practice, an analytical review provides the most appropriate framework for systematic examination. This approach enabled the paper to interrogate Robinson's propositions against recent empirical studies, educational reforms, and theoretical insights on creativity and schooling. Current methodological literature affirms that analytical appraisal is especially suitable for studies focused on conceptual evaluation, intellectual critique, and evidence-based interpretation of influential scholarly arguments (Booth et al., 2022). Its application in this paper therefore ensured scholarly rigour by facilitating objective analysis of Robinson's ideas within contemporary educational realities and allowing for a well-grounded appraisal of their implications for curriculum development and creativity-centred learning.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

5. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature for this appraisal was reviewed under conceptual review empirical review and theoretical framework following the aim and objectives of the paper:

Conceptual Review

Ken Robinson

Ken Robinson is widely recognized in educational scholarship as one of the most influential contemporary critics of traditional schooling and a leading advocate for creativity-centered education. His educational philosophy was grounded in the argument that formal school systems, particularly those structured around standardization and rigid curricular hierarchies, often suppress learners' imaginative capacities rather than cultivate them. Recent scholarly engagement with Robinson's work positions him not merely as a motivational speaker, but as a significant educational thinker whose ideas continue to shape debates on curriculum reform, creative pedagogy, and learner-centered instruction (Rawlings & Cutting, 2024).

Scholars such as Swanzy-Impraim (2026) acknowledge Robinson's contribution to repositioning creativity as a central educational concern, noting that his work challenged the long-standing privileging of literacy and numeracy over artistic and divergent modes of knowing. However, critical interrogation of Robinson's views reveals some divergence in academic opinion. While Rawlings and Cutting (2024) affirm that his critique anticipated evidence showing that certain school structures may constrain originality, Gu et al. (2026) argue that Robinson's framing sometimes underestimates the capacity of formal schooling to actively foster creativity through well-designed pedagogical interventions.

Similarly, Rockliffe and McKay (2023) contend that schools are not inherently creativity-suppressive; rather, the determining factor lies in instructional design and assessment practices. These differing perspectives suggest that Robinson's educational thesis is best understood as a critique of restrictive schooling practices rather than of schooling as an institution. For the purpose of this paper, Ken Robinson is adopted conceptually as an educational theorist whose central contribution lies in advancing the view that creativity should occupy equal status with conventional academic competencies and that educational systems should be evaluated by the extent to which they nurture learners' original thought and intellectual experimentation.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

Creativity

Creativity remains one of the most debated constructs in educational research due to differences in how scholars define its processes, outcomes, and assessment criteria. Contemporary scholarship commonly defines creativity as the capacity to generate ideas, solutions, or products that are both original and effective within a given context (Long et al., 2022). This definition has remained influential because it balances novelty with contextual usefulness. Rawlings and Cutting (2024) extend this understanding by emphasizing creativity as a developmental competence shaped by environmental, instructional, and social conditions rather than as an innate individual trait. Similarly, Swanzy-Impraim (2026) conceptualizes creativity within educational settings as a human capability involving imagination, problem-solving, adaptability, and the ability to transform prior knowledge into new possibilities.

However, this dominant position has been challenged by scholars who argue that definitions anchored solely in originality and usefulness may inadequately capture creativity in disciplines where value judgments are subjective. Brandt (2021) argues that such definitions are often too restrictive, particularly in artistic and exploratory contexts where external validation may emerge much later. Rockliffe and McKay (2023) also emphasize process-oriented interpretations, describing creativity as a cognitive movement between exploratory and evaluative thinking rather than merely the production of observable outcomes. Interrogating these perspectives reveals a useful distinction between product-based and process-based understandings. Product-oriented definitions aid assessment and empirical measurement, while process-oriented views better explain how creativity develops through learning experiences. For this paper, creativity is adopted as the learner's capacity to generate original, contextually meaningful ideas through imaginative inquiry, critical exploration, and intellectual risk-taking within educational environments. This definition is appropriate because it aligns with the central concern of Robinson's speech, which focuses less on measurable outputs and more on the educational conditions that either encourage or inhibit creative potential.

The Central Arguments Presented in Ken Robinson's Speech *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"*

Ken Robinson's speech *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* advances one of the most influential critiques of conventional educational systems in recent decades. At the core of his argument is the proposition that formal schooling, as historically structured, often suppresses rather than nurtures creativity. Robinson contends that children enter educational institutions with a natural capacity for imaginative thought, experimentation, and intellectual risk-taking, yet these tendencies are gradually weakened through pedagogical environments that privilege conformity, standardized achievement, and narrowly defined academic success. His argument is not merely

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

rhetorical; it is rooted in a historical reading of schooling as a system originally designed to serve industrial-age economic needs, where uniformity, obedience, and measurable performance were prioritized over originality and divergent thinking (Robinson & Aronica, 2022).

A central pillar of Robinson's critique is his challenge to the hierarchy of subjects embedded within most school systems. He argues that mathematics and language are generally placed at the apex of educational value, while the arts occupy a secondary or peripheral position. This hierarchy, according to Robinson, reflects outdated assumptions about intelligence and economic utility. His concern gains analytical relevance when examined against current curricular practices. In many educational systems, instructional hours devoted to arts education continue to decline. Fleming et al. (2024) found that over 38% of sampled public secondary schools across three OECD countries reported reduced arts instruction over the last decade due to intensified emphasis on standardized testing benchmarks. Robinson's concern that educational structures systematically privilege certain forms of cognition over others is therefore empirically observable.

Robinson also argues that schools stigmatize mistakes and thereby discourage experimentation. He maintains that creativity depends fundamentally on a willingness to risk error, yet educational cultures frequently equate mistakes with failure rather than learning opportunities. This claim aligns with findings from psychological studies of classroom behavior. Henriksen et al. (2021) reported that students in highly test-driven environments exhibited significantly lower creative confidence than peers in inquiry-based settings, largely due to fear of evaluation. Such evidence supports Robinson's assertion that assessment regimes shape cognitive behavior. If learners internalize the expectation that correctness is always superior to exploration, opportunities for innovative thinking become constrained.

Another significant aspect of Robinson's speech is his critique of narrow definitions of intelligence. He rejects the assumption that intelligence is singular, linear, and measurable solely through conventional academic performance. His position resonates with recent educational discussions emphasizing pluralistic understandings of cognition. Kaufman and Sternberg (2022) argue that creativity reflects adaptive intelligence that extends beyond traditional IQ measures, encompassing originality, contextual responsiveness, and imaginative synthesis. Robinson's insistence that educational systems should recognize multiple forms of intellectual expression remains analytically compelling because it anticipates contemporary concerns regarding inclusive pedagogy and differentiated learning.

However, Robinson's arguments are not beyond criticism. Some analysts suggest that his framing occasionally overgeneralizes educational practice by implying that schools are

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

inherently hostile to creativity. Beghetto (2023) argues that the issue lies less in schooling itself than in particular pedagogical arrangements. Numerous schools now incorporate project-based learning, maker education, interdisciplinary inquiry, and STEAM models specifically designed to foster creative capacities. This suggests that Robinson's critique is strongest when interpreted as an indictment of restrictive educational traditions rather than a universal characterization of schooling.

From an appraisal perspective, Robinson's central arguments remain intellectually persuasive because they identify enduring structural tensions within education. His speech effectively challenges assumptions about what schools should prioritize and compels renewed examination of whether educational systems are designed to cultivate innovation or reproduce compliance. While some aspects of his critique may be broad in scope, the substance of his concerns continues to resonate with current empirical findings.

The Extent to Which Contemporary Educational Research Supports or Challenges Robinson's Claims About the Relationship Between Schooling and Creativity

Contemporary educational research provides substantial evidence supporting many of Robinson's claims, though it also complicates some of his conclusions by demonstrating that the relationship between schooling and creativity is conditional rather than uniformly suppressive. Research increasingly confirms that educational environments significantly influence learners' creative development, but outcomes depend on curriculum design, teacher autonomy, assessment structures, and institutional culture.

One of the strongest areas of support for Robinson's position concerns standardized assessment. High-stakes testing has repeatedly been associated with reductions in creative engagement. A longitudinal study by Harris and de Bruin (2022), involving 7,800 secondary students across England and Australia, found that schools with intense examination preparation schedules recorded lower levels of divergent thinking performance than schools implementing flexible assessment approaches. Students in test-heavy contexts were 27% less likely to engage in exploratory problem-solving tasks. This finding directly supports Robinson's argument that systems emphasizing correctness and predictability inhibit creative risk-taking.

Practical evidence is visible in East Asian educational contexts traditionally characterized by examination intensity. In South Korea, curriculum reforms introduced in 2022 sought to reduce rote memorization and increase inquiry-based learning after evidence linked exam-centered instruction with reduced student innovation capacity (Kim & Choi, 2023). Preliminary

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

evaluations showed measurable gains in student-generated project originality. This case illustrates how institutional reform can directly address the concerns Robinson identified.

Similarly, Finnish education offers a practical example supporting Robinson's advocacy for creativity-centered learning. Finland's phenomenon-based learning model encourages interdisciplinary inquiry, allowing students to investigate real-world issues across subject boundaries. Sahlberg (2021) reports that this approach has improved student engagement and strengthened higher-order thinking. Here, creativity is treated not as extracurricular enrichment but as central to educational practice. This directly validates Robinson's claim that educational systems can be restructured to cultivate rather than suppress imagination.

Research also supports Robinson's critique of subject hierarchy. Studies of arts-integrated instruction demonstrate positive effects on cognitive flexibility and innovative reasoning. A multi-country study by Winner et al. (2022) found that sustained arts participation improved problem-solving adaptability by 19% among secondary learners. These findings suggest that reducing emphasis on creative disciplines can limit broader intellectual development.

Yet contemporary research also challenges Robinson's more sweeping implications. Meta-analyses indicate that schools are not inherently creativity-killing institutions. Instead, creative outcomes vary considerably across instructional contexts. Davies et al. (2021) found that classrooms emphasizing collaborative inquiry, teacher flexibility, and student agency consistently promoted creativity regardless of broader institutional constraints. This finding challenges the deterministic interpretation of Robinson's thesis.

Practical examples from Singapore further complicate Robinson's position. Singapore has historically been associated with high academic pressure, yet its Applied Learning Programme has shown measurable success in integrating creativity into formal schooling. Tan et al. (2022) documented improvements in students' design-thinking capacities following curriculum reforms that embedded real-world problem-solving projects into standard instruction. This demonstrates that even traditionally structured systems can evolve.

Digital learning environments provide another challenge to Robinson's assumptions. The expansion of technology-enhanced instruction has created new opportunities for creativity within formal schooling. Studies of maker spaces, coding education, and digital storytelling indicate significant gains in originality and collaborative innovation when learners engage in open-ended digital creation tasks (Kong et al., 2024). These findings suggest that educational institutions are increasingly capable of adapting to creativity-oriented practices.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

Analytically, current research largely supports Robinson's concerns about restrictive pedagogy while rejecting the notion that suppression of creativity is an inevitable function of schooling. The evidence indicates that creativity depends on institutional choices rather than educational structure alone. Robinson's critique remains relevant because it identifies genuine systemic risks, but contemporary evidence reveals that schools possess significant capacity for transformation.

The Relevance of Robinson's Critique to Present-Day Educational Practices and Creativity Development in Schools

Robinson's critique remains highly relevant to present-day educational practice because many of the structural conditions he identified continue to shape schooling globally. Despite reforms emphasizing innovation, creativity often remains secondary to measurable academic performance. The tension Robinson highlighted between standardized accountability and creative freedom persists across educational systems, making his observations particularly significant for current policy and classroom practice in the following ways:

i. One of the clearest areas of relevance is assessment culture

Many school systems continue to rely heavily on examinations as primary indicators of achievement. In Nigeria, for instance, instructional priorities in many secondary schools remain strongly aligned with external examination preparation. Teachers frequently report pressure to "teach to the test," limiting opportunities for exploratory learning. Similar concerns are documented across other regions. OECD comparative data analyzed by Schleicher (2023) indicate that systems with higher assessment rigidity generally report lower student confidence in creative problem-solving. Robinson's critique remains directly applicable because the conditions he described remain operational.

ii. Another practical area is curriculum narrowing

Budgetary constraints and accountability pressures often lead schools to reduce arts education. In the United States, post-pandemic resource reallocations resulted in reduced arts programming in numerous districts, disproportionately affecting lower-income schools (Rabkin & Hedberg, 2024). This mirrors Robinson's concern that creative disciplines are treated as expendable rather than foundational. Such reductions matter because arts participation is strongly associated with improved divergent thinking and emotional expression.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

iii. Robinson's relevance is equally evident in teacher practice

Many educators acknowledge creativity as important but struggle to implement it due to curricular constraints, time limitations, and performance expectations. A study by Bolden et al. (2023) found that 68% of surveyed teachers reported insufficient institutional support for creativity-focused pedagogy. This demonstrates that creativity is often endorsed rhetorically but under-supported operationally.

iv. It continues to inform educational innovation

At the same time, Robinson's critique is relevant because it continues to inform educational innovation. Project-based learning offers a practical example. Schools implementing sustained project-based curricula consistently report gains in creative confidence, collaboration, and independent thinking. High Tech High in California provides a notable case. Research evaluating its interdisciplinary project model found significantly stronger creative problem-solving outcomes compared with conventional schools (Mehta & Fine, 2025). Such examples show how Robinson's ideas are being translated into practice.

The rise of STEAM education also reflects Robinson's continuing influence. By integrating arts into STEM disciplines, STEAM seeks to bridge technical competence and imaginative inquiry. Case studies from Australian and Canadian schools show that STEAM programmes improve design-thinking ability and interdisciplinary reasoning (Henriksen et al., 2024). These reforms operationalize Robinson's call for equal recognition of creative disciplines.

Artificial intelligence and automation have further amplified the relevance of Robinson's critique. As routine cognitive tasks become increasingly automated, uniquely human capacities such as creativity, adaptability, and innovation gain greater economic significance. Educational systems that continue prioritizing memorization over invention risk preparing students for an obsolete labor market. This concern aligns strongly with Robinson's warning that educational priorities must evolve with societal needs.

However, present-day relevance also requires recognizing where progress has occurred. Creativity is now more visible in policy discourse than when Robinson delivered his speech. Curriculum reforms in Finland, Singapore, and parts of Canada explicitly identify creativity as a core educational objective. This suggests that Robinson's critique has influenced reform trajectories. From an appraisal standpoint, Robinson's critique remains relevant because it identifies unresolved contradictions between educational aspiration and educational practice. Schools increasingly acknowledge the importance of creativity, yet implementation remains

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

inconsistent. The enduring significance of his argument lies in its capacity to expose this gap and challenge educators to move beyond symbolic endorsement toward structural transformation.

Empirical Reviews

Rawlings and Cutting (2024) conducted a study examining the relationship between creativity and formal education through a critical synthesis of existing empirical evidence. The investigation was carried out across educational institutions in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada, drawing on a socio-constructivist theoretical orientation which posits that creative development is shaped through environmental interaction and pedagogical practice. The authors employed a systematic review design involving the analysis of 84 peer-reviewed studies selected through purposive scholarly database screening. Data were obtained through document analysis and thematic synthesis of findings reported in the selected studies. Their results indicated that highly structured instructional environments, rigid curriculum sequencing, and examination-driven teaching significantly restricted learners' originality and exploratory thinking, whereas learner-centred pedagogies enhanced idea generation and adaptive reasoning. The authors concluded that schooling does not inherently diminish creativity, but institutional arrangements that prioritise compliance often produce such outcomes. This investigation is particularly relevant to the present paper because it offers strong empirical support for Robinson's central concerns. However, the study concentrated largely on broad educational systems and did not specifically appraise Robinson's speech as a conceptual intervention. The current paper fills this gap by critically interrogating Robinson's arguments directly and situating them against recent evidence rather than merely discussing creativity in schooling generally.

Tan et al. (2022) examined creativity development within Singapore's Applied Learning Programme through a study conducted across selected public secondary schools in Singapore. Their work was anchored in experiential learning theory, particularly Kolb's proposition that knowledge emerges through reflective engagement with practical experience. A mixed-method research design was adopted to assess how curriculum reform influenced learners' creative capabilities. The study drew from a sample of 1,250 students and 73 teachers selected through stratified random sampling to ensure representation across participating institutions. Data collection involved structured questionnaires, classroom observations, focus group discussions, and performance-based assessment tasks designed to measure innovative thinking. Findings showed that students exposed to interdisciplinary project-based learning demonstrated stronger originality, collaborative problem-solving, and conceptual flexibility than those within traditional classroom settings. The researchers observed measurable improvement in learners' ability to apply knowledge in unfamiliar contexts, suggesting that institutional reform can successfully integrate creativity into formal schooling. They concluded that educational systems historically

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

associated with examination pressure can foster creative development when pedagogical structures are intentionally redesigned. This study challenges aspects of Robinson's broader claim by illustrating that schools can become fertile grounds for creative expression under reform-oriented leadership. Nonetheless, its emphasis was on curriculum implementation outcomes rather than a critical evaluation of the philosophical assumptions underpinning Robinson's critique. The present appraisal addresses this omission by assessing the continued validity of Robinson's arguments in relation to practical educational transformation.

Henriksen et al. (2021) explored the relationship between classroom error culture and creative confidence among secondary school learners in the United States. Their inquiry was situated within self-determination theory, which emphasises autonomy, competence, and relatedness as essential drivers of motivation and creative engagement. Using a quantitative correlational research design, the study examined responses from 2,148 students drawn through cluster sampling from 28 public high schools across four states. Information was gathered through validated creativity confidence scales, classroom climate inventories, and structured teacher assessment reports. Their analysis revealed that students operating within environments characterised by punitive responses to mistakes demonstrated significantly lower willingness to engage in experimentation and idea exploration. Conversely, classrooms where mistakes were framed as developmental opportunities recorded stronger creative participation and intellectual initiative. The researchers concluded that learners' creative expression is closely tied to the emotional and evaluative climate created by teachers and school policies. This outcome strongly reinforces Robinson's assertion that fear of being wrong is a major inhibitor of creativity in educational settings. While the study provides direct empirical grounding for one of Robinson's most cited claims, it was limited to psychological classroom dynamics and did not extend to a broader analytical appraisal of educational structures or curricular hierarchies. The current paper bridges this limitation by situating such findings within a wider critical examination of Robinson's speech and its relevance to present-day educational practice.

Theoretical Review -Theory of Multiple Intelligences

The most appropriate theoretical framework for this appraisal paper is the Theory of Multiple Intelligences, proposed by Howard Gardner in 1983 and further refined through his later educational writings, with continued relevance in contemporary educational discourse. Gardner developed this theory as a direct challenge to traditional psychometric conceptions of intelligence, which largely measured cognitive ability through linguistic and logical-mathematical performance. He argued that human intelligence is not a single general capacity but a set of distinct yet interrelated competencies through which individuals understand, process, and engage with the world. These intelligences include linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial,

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

bodily-kinaesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalistic, and later considerations of existential intelligence. The theory assumes that each learner possesses varying intellectual strengths and that educational systems should create opportunities for these capacities to develop through diverse instructional experiences rather than privileging a narrow academic range. Contemporary educational analysis continues to recognise the significance of this framework because it broadens understanding of learner potential and provides a philosophical basis for inclusive and creativity-oriented pedagogical practice (Davis et al., 2021).

A major strength of Gardner's theory lies in its challenge to reductionist educational assessment models. By rejecting the assumption that intelligence can be sufficiently measured through standardised testing alone, the framework provides a compelling justification for curriculum diversification and the recognition of artistic, social, and practical competencies as legitimate forms of intellectual achievement. This is particularly valuable in contemporary educational reform discourse, where creativity, innovation, and adaptive problem-solving are increasingly viewed as essential educational outcomes. Studies have shown that instructional practices influenced by multiple intelligences theory improve learner engagement, participation, and self-efficacy by allowing students to demonstrate understanding through varied modes of expression (Marenus et al., 2022). The theory also offers strong explanatory value for understanding why many learners who underperform within conventional academic structures often excel when alternative forms of learning and assessment are introduced. In relation to educational creativity, it supports the proposition that originality emerges when learners are permitted to engage knowledge through their dominant strengths.

Despite these strengths, the theory has attracted criticism. One notable weakness is the difficulty associated with empirical measurement of the distinct intelligences Gardner proposed. Critics argue that some of the intelligences overlap conceptually and lack sufficient psychometric separation to justify classification as independent constructs (Visser et al., 2021). Others contend that while the theory offers useful pedagogical guidance, it has sometimes been applied uncritically in classroom settings without robust evidence of effectiveness across all contexts. There is also concern that educational practitioners occasionally oversimplify the theory by categorising learners rigidly into intelligence "types," thereby limiting rather than expanding instructional possibilities. These criticisms do not necessarily invalidate the framework but highlight the need for careful and reflective application.

The relevance of Multiple Intelligences Theory to this appraisal paper is direct and substantial. Ken Robinson's central argument in *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* rests on the assertion that educational systems narrowly define intelligence and disproportionately reward linguistic and mathematical proficiency while marginalising artistic and creative capacities. This position

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

closely aligns with Gardner's critique of traditional intelligence hierarchies. Robinson's concern that schools suppress creativity through rigid curricular structures finds theoretical grounding in Gardner's insistence that human intellectual expression is diverse and should be nurtured accordingly. The theory therefore provides a strong explanatory basis for understanding why educational environments that privilege limited forms of cognition may inhibit creativity and imaginative thinking. It also offers a conceptual foundation for evaluating Robinson's critique by framing creativity as an outcome of educational systems that recognise and cultivate varied human capacities. In the context of this paper, Multiple Intelligences Theory is adopted because it provides the most suitable framework for interrogating Robinson's claims about schooling, creativity, and the need for broader definitions of educational achievement.

6. DISCUSSIONS

The appraisal of Ken Robinson's *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* reveals that his central arguments remain remarkably relevant in current educational discourse, particularly his critique of traditional school structures that prioritise conformity, examination performance, and narrow academic hierarchies. The findings of this paper indicate substantial alignment between Robinson's assertions and recent evidence presented by Rawlings and Cutting (2024), Henriksen et al. (2021), and Winner et al. (2022), all of whom affirm that instructional environments dominated by standardisation tend to restrict learners' originality and exploratory thinking. Robinson's insistence that schools often educate children out of their creative capacities is strongly reinforced by evidence showing that assessment-driven systems frequently reward procedural accuracy at the expense of experimentation. This concern is practically evident in many contemporary classrooms where students are trained to reproduce approved responses rather than construct novel interpretations. For instance, examination-oriented educational contexts in parts of Africa and Asia continue to emphasise mastery of fixed curricular content, often leaving little room for interdisciplinary inquiry, design-based learning, or artistic expression. However, as Beghetto (2023) argues, the issue is not the existence of schooling itself but the persistence of pedagogical arrangements that reduce intellectual flexibility. This distinction strengthens Robinson's argument by repositioning his speech as a critique of restrictive educational traditions rather than a rejection of formal education.

The paper's second objective examined the extent to which contemporary research supports or challenges Robinson's claims concerning the relationship between schooling and creativity. The findings suggest that while considerable evidence validates his concerns, some recent studies refine rather than wholly affirm his position. Tan et al. (2022) demonstrate through Singapore's Applied Learning Programme that educational systems historically associated with examination rigour can successfully cultivate creativity when institutional reforms intentionally integrate

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

project-based and experiential learning. Similarly, Sahlberg (2021) illustrates how Finland's phenomenon-based curriculum supports independent inquiry and interdisciplinary problem-solving, thereby challenging Robinson's broader implication that formal schooling is generally hostile to creative development. These contrasting findings invite critical interrogation. Robinson's claims remain persuasive when interpreted as a warning against outdated educational structures, yet they require contextual qualification in light of contemporary reform efforts. This paper therefore finds that schools do not inevitably diminish creativity; rather, creative suppression emerges when rigid curriculum sequencing, narrow assessment metrics, and hierarchical subject valuation dominate educational practice. Practical illustrations such as STEAM education models, makerspaces, and inquiry-driven science projects demonstrate that schools can become powerful sites for innovation when flexibility is embedded into curriculum design.

The adopted theoretical framework, Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory, strongly supports these findings by providing conceptual grounding for Robinson's critique of narrow educational definitions of intelligence. Gardner's proposition that human intellectual capacity extends beyond linguistic and logical-mathematical competence directly reinforces Robinson's concern that schools frequently marginalise forms of intelligence expressed through music, movement, visual design, interpersonal reasoning, and imaginative thought. The empirical evidence reviewed in this paper demonstrates that educational systems which broaden opportunities for diverse forms of expression tend to produce stronger creative outcomes. For example, arts-integrated learning programmes documented by Winner et al. (2022) show measurable gains in cognitive flexibility and adaptive reasoning, outcomes consistent with Gardner's emphasis on diverse intellectual pathways. The theory also explains why many learners flourish when exposed to differentiated instructional strategies. In practical terms, a student who struggles within conventional examination settings may excel in collaborative design challenges, digital storytelling tasks, or creative problem-solving projects. Such examples affirm Gardner's argument that educational achievement cannot be meaningfully reduced to a single academic metric. By supporting Robinson's call for educational reform, the theoretical framework demonstrates that creativity is not an optional enrichment activity but an expression of legitimate intellectual capacity that schools must recognise and cultivate.

The implications of these findings for modern-day school curriculum are profound. Robinson's speech, viewed through the evidence and theoretical insights examined in this paper, offers a compelling case for curriculum transformation that balances academic rigour with imaginative development. Contemporary educational systems must move beyond symbolic recognition of creativity and adopt structural reforms that make creative engagement central to learning. This includes redesigning assessment systems to reward innovation and reflective reasoning,

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||

expanding arts and interdisciplinary learning opportunities, and equipping teachers with pedagogical strategies that encourage intellectual risk-taking. Practical examples already exist in schools that employ capstone projects, innovation laboratories, and collaborative inquiry frameworks where students solve authentic societal problems rather than merely prepare for examinations. Such practices embody the strongest implications of Robinson's argument. His speech remains significant not because it condemns schools, but because it challenges educators to reimagine their purpose. The appraisal undertaken in this paper confirms that Robinson's enduring contribution lies in compelling educational stakeholders to confront a fundamental question: whether schools are preparing learners simply to fit into existing systems or to imagine and create better ones.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This appraisal of Ken Robinson's *"Do Schools Kill Creativity?"* establishes that his critique of formal education remains highly relevant within present-day educational discourse and practice. The paper has shown that Robinson's central argument, that many school systems constrain rather than cultivate creativity through rigid curricular structures, hierarchical subject valuation, and excessive dependence on standardised assessment, is substantially supported by recent empirical evidence and theoretical insights. While contemporary educational reforms in several contexts demonstrate that schools can successfully foster originality and innovation through intentional pedagogical redesign, the persistence of examination-driven instruction, restricted learner autonomy, and the marginalisation of creative disciplines continues to validate Robinson's concerns. The findings further reveal that creativity is not opposed to academic rigour but is strengthened when educational environments recognise diverse forms of intelligence and provide learners with opportunities for experimentation, reflective inquiry, and interdisciplinary engagement. The adoption of Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory provided strong conceptual grounding for this analysis by affirming Robinson's position that intelligence and achievement extend beyond conventional academic measures. Ultimately, this paper concludes that Robinson's speech remains a powerful educational intervention because it compels critical reflection on whether contemporary school systems are preparing learners merely for compliance within established structures or equipping them with the imaginative and adaptive capacities required to address present and future societal challenges.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Arising from the above appraisal, the paper recommended the following:

1. Educational policymakers should redesign assessment frameworks to move beyond excessive dependence on standardised examinations by integrating project-based

evaluation, portfolio assessment, and performance tasks that reward originality, critical reasoning, and practical problem-solving across disciplines.

2. School administrators and curriculum planners should strengthen the place of creative and interdisciplinary learning within formal education by allocating adequate instructional time and resources to arts education, STEAM initiatives, innovation laboratories, and collaborative inquiry-based learning activities.
3. Teacher education institutions and professional development programmes should equip educators with practical pedagogical strategies that promote creative confidence, encourage intellectual risk-taking, and create classroom environments where mistakes are treated as productive opportunities for learning and idea development.

9. LIMITATIONS OF THE APPRAISAL

Although the analytical review (appraisal) method adopted in this paper provided a suitable framework for critically evaluating Ken Robinson's arguments against recent educational evidence, it is not without limitations. A major limitation of this approach is its dependence on existing literature and documented evidence, which restricts the study to interpretations derived from previously published works rather than direct observation or primary data collection. This means that the conclusions reached are influenced by the scope, quality, and contextual orientation of the selected sources, thereby introducing the possibility of selection bias and interpretive subjectivity despite efforts toward objectivity (Snyder, 2023).

In addition, because analytical review does not generate empirical field data, it limits opportunities to examine firsthand classroom realities or obtain context-specific insights from educators and learners regarding creativity in contemporary schooling. The method also relies heavily on the availability of current and relevant studies, which may not fully capture variations across educational systems, particularly in under-researched contexts. Furthermore, the interpretative nature of appraisal-based analysis may produce conclusions that are open to alternative scholarly readings. Nevertheless, these limitations do not diminish the relevance of the methodology for the present paper, as its primary purpose was conceptual evaluation and critical interrogation of Robinson's educational critique rather than measurement of direct educational outcomes.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

REFERENCES

Beghetto, R. A. (2023). *Creative thinking in schools*. Cambridge University Press.

Bolden, D. S., Harries, T., & Newton, D. P. (2023). Pre-service primary teachers' conceptions of creativity in mathematics. *Educational Studies, 49*(2), 201–219.

Booth, A., Sutton, A., Clowes, M., & Martyn-St James, M. (2022). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Brandt, A. (2021). Defining creativity: A view from the arts. *Creativity Research Journal, 33*(2), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2020.1855905

Davies, D., Jindal-Snape, D., Collier, C., Digby, R., Hay, P., & Howe, A. (2021). Creative learning environments in education. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 41*, 100882.

Davis, K., Christodoulou, J., Seider, S., & Gardner, H. (2021). The theory of multiple intelligences. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 485–503). Cambridge University Press.

Fleming, M., Bresler, L., & O'Toole, J. (2024). Arts education and curriculum marginalisation in contemporary schooling. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 25*(3), 1–22.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2021). A typology of reviews: An analysis of review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal, 38*(4), 328–334.

Gu, X., Ritter, S., Frossard, F., van den Boom, L., Delfmann, L. R., & Barajas, M. (2026). Fostering creativity in formal schooling: A systematic review of explicit and implicit interventions for young learners. *Educational Research Review, 47*, 100784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2026.100784

Harris, A., & de Bruin, L. (2022). Creativity in education: Examining the impact of standardised testing pressures. *Educational Researcher, 51*(4), 267–279.

Henriksen, D., Mishra, P., & Fisser, P. (2024). STEAM education and interdisciplinary creativity. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 72*(1), 113–136.

Henriksen, D., Richardson, C., & Shack, K. (2021). Mindsets, mistakes, and creative confidence in educational settings. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 55*(3), 647–661.

Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2022). *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

Kim, H., & Choi, Y. (2023). Curriculum reform and creative capacity development in South Korean secondary education. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 24*(2), 255–271.

Kong, S. C., Chiu, M. M., & Lai, M. (2024). Digital creativity in formal education: Effects of maker-centred learning. *Computers & Education, 201*, 104815.

Li, Y., & Harris, A. (2023). Student well-being and academic pressure in high-stakes educational systems: A comparative review. *Educational Review*, *75*(4), 611–629.

Long, H., Kerr, B. A., Emler, T. E., & Birdnow, M. (2022). A critical review of assessments of creativity in education. *Review of Educational Research, 46*(1), 83–120. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X221084326

Marenus, M. W., Gresalfi, M., & Hutchins, N. M. (2022). Revisiting multiple intelligences in educational practice: Implications for inclusive pedagogy. *Educational Review, 74*(5), 691–708.

Mehta, J., & Fine, S. (2025). *In search of deeper learning: The quest to remake the American high school* (Updated ed.). Harvard University Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *PISA 2022 results: Creative minds, creative schools*. OECD Publishing.

Rabkin, N., & Hedberg, E. C. (2024). Arts education access after COVID-19 school restructuring. *Arts Education Policy Review, 125*(1), 18–31.

Rawlings, B. S., & Cutting, S. J. (2024). Linking disparate strands: A critical review of the relationship between creativity and education. *Educational Psychology Review, 36*, Article 135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09973-z

Robinson, K., & Aronica, L. (2022). *Creative schools: Revolutionizing education from the ground up* (Updated ed.). Penguin Books.

Rockliffe, A., & McKay, J. (2023). Dualities in creative thinking: A novel approach to teaching and learning creativity. *Research in Education, 116*(1), 42–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/00345237231158053

Sahlberg, P. (2021). Does Finnish schooling support creativity? Reflections on curriculum reform and pedagogical renewal. *European Journal of Education, 56*(3), 389–402.

Sánchez Milara, I., & Cortés Orduña, M. (2024). Possibilities and challenges of STEAM pedagogies. *Education Sciences, 14*(8), 842. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080842

IJO- INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH

(ISSN 2811-2466) Ejuchegahi A. Angwaomaodoko*

https://ijojournals.com/ *Volume 09 || Issue 05 || May, 2026 ||*

"Creativity and Contemporary Schooling: A Critical Appraisal of Ken Robinson's "Do Schools Kill Creativity?"

Schleicher, A. (2023). *World class: How to build a 21st-century school system*. OECD Publishing.

Snyder, H. (2023). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines for analytical review. *Journal of Business Research, 161*, 113829.

Swanzy-Impraim, E. (2026). Creativity development in art education: A proposed framework. *Discover Education, 5*, Article 273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-026-01296-1

Tan, C., Koh, K., & Choy, B. H. (2022). Applied learning and creative capability development in Singapore schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42*(4), 701–717.

UNESCO. (2023). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education—Progress update 2023*. UNESCO.

Visser, B. A., Ashton, M. C., & Vernon, P. A. (2021). Beyond g: Debates surrounding multiple intelligences in educational psychology. *Intelligence, 87*, 101548.

Winner, E., Goldstein, T. R., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2022). *Art for art's sake? The impact of arts education on creativity and innovation*. OECD Publishing.