Creative Writing Pedagogy: Creating an Integrated Instructional Approach based on Moseley and Lenning Taxonomy Models

Komal Ansari
Shamim Soomro
M. Tufail Chandio

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to illustrate varied "learning approaches," or a broad array of learning experiences rooted in learning theory, which can be used by teachers to foster creativity in students effectively. This will include details pertaining to the developmental, cognitive and instructional learning taxonomies identified by Moseley et al. (2005a, 2005b) and supported by Lenning et al. (2013) in their research. The account will also exhibit how the mentioned learning frameworks directly correlate to the usefulness of modular teaching, and workshop model of instruction, as reliable teaching methods. Learning theories pertaining to the utilization of these models have been detailed on the grounds established by Sharples (2002) as their research setup as well. The specifics contained within this article will:

- *Provide ways to help other writers understand the researcher's 'thinking and working' (Sharples, 2002, p.xii).*
- *Allow 'academics and writing researchers build up their own forms of understanding,' following an evaluative study or critique of the researcher's perspectives (ibid).*

Keywords: Creativity, Creative Writing Pedagogy, Behaviourism, Constructivism, Learning Theory, Learning Approaches, CW Taxonomy, CW Frameworks

Introduction

Since the inception of writing programs in higher education institutes, especially in terms of its correlation with the praxis of academic

teaching and research, Creative Writing has emerged as a discipline that has given rise to an oblivious stance. It appears to be a form wherein the relation of theory to practice, and the establishment of pertinent standards, procedures and policies for gaging artifacts and researched study produced within the field are confined by complex perspectives and unusual methodologies (Harper & Kroll, 2008). Like all academics, implies Sharples (1999), Creative Writing experts propagate their own perception of fostering creativity and are often censorious of other critical outlooks. Socratic Constructivists, for instance, reproach Isocratic Behaviourists for not looking into a creative writer's individual mind and for reducing a complex artistic activity to a set of learning techniques labelled 'instruction', 'strategic mechanism,' 'predetermined learning outcomes' and so on (Dobson, 2008, p.27). Behaviourists berate the Constructivists for not seeing that creativity, like other forms of learning, is all about compliance and conformity to an instruction pedagogy and not about 'exploration or uncertainty,' directed to make 'students realise their potential as creative, independent learners' (ibid). And against all of this we have all remaining groups of 'literary theorists' who get accused for exhibiting 'a lack of rigour and for making an everyday activity unnecessarily complex by using language in deliberately obscure ways, bringing everything into doubt including the very existence of the writer' (Sharples, 2002, p.xii). Nash & Pyatt (2009) additionally note within a similar context how "direct instruction" correlates to the "behaviourist" learning theory, while "constructivist instructional design model" is shaped almost entirely by "cognitivist learning approaches" (p.1). The selection of instructional methods, therefore, depends on the practitioner's 'philosophy toward learning,' whereas 'a model becomes a support system or the backbone for instructional delivery in response to the learning theory,' designed specifically 'to streamline the learner's experience - providing efficiency in delivery and effectiveness with content' (ibid).

This article attempts to do justice to the different approaches on teaching of Creative Writing by establishing a middle ground. An amalgamation of a variety of learning theories will be indicated, and arguments on the rational of their utilization for developing teaching methods for the present area of studies will be discussed as well. It is

not within the scope of this paper to draft a conceptual framework comprising of exhaustive details of learning theories and teaching models in depth. Instead, the purpose of the account is to provide an overall framework of learning theories that can be used to assist the design and implementation of certain teaching methods to foster creativity in students effectively. In their study on various learning approaches fostering creativity, Lenning et al. (2013) and Moseley et al. (2005a, 2005b) have presented three taxonomy models which will serve as the theoretical frameworks for developing teaching pedagogies for the discipline of Creative Writing. The models deal with the creation of a setup fostering cognitive structure or development, a mechanism building the productive and creative thinking process, and an instructional design extending critical and creative learning. The present article acknowledges that 'a framework is a generic term' which alludes to a structural setup supporting some form of practice or thought (Moseley et al., 2005a, p.34). 'On this basis… taxonomies are frameworks that may support such thought' (ibid).

Cognitive Structure and/or Development Frameworks

There exist various theories of learning and individual perspectives of knowing or understanding the world that appear in a variety of research contexts (Doherty, 2008). Lenning, et al. (2013), citing from Evans, et al. (1998) and Moseley, et al. (2005a), present an overview of certain models dealing with cognitive structure and/or cognitive development that are underpinned by such learning theories. The approaches used by various practitioners within these frameworks are diverse and tend to analyse the concept of intelligence in different formats (Moseley, 2005a, p.6). Most theories have been developed by psychologists, though each tend to 'differ considerably in aims and epistemological assumptions' (2005, p.185). Some are concerned with the progression of perceptive thinking of all individuals across their lifespan, while others deal with thought processes specific to adults alone (ibid). Research additionally identifies a paramount extent to which the frameworks differ, seeing as they either emphasise genetic influences to affect individual thought process, or environmental factors are taken into account (Moseley, 2005a, p.185). What stands

common amongst these development frameworks is their depiction of "learning process" as an excessively complex entity, that is conditioned entirely by individuals and their circumstances or learning contexts (Lenning, et al., 2013, p.99). The idea behind these frameworks is to enable professionals conceive 'purposeful ways about applying theoretical approaches in order to design learning experiences that recognize the holistic nature of cognition, its structure and development' (ibid). This, in turn, can be applied to fostering creative learning within students from multi-cultural communities as well (Mansoor, 2010, 2011).

It has long been established that within a Creative Writing training environment, the learning mechanism should be supportive and meant to encourage all sorts of students, even those belonging to diverse backgrounds (Cole et al., 1999; Green, 2008; Harper, 2010; Khan, 2011, 2012; Mansoor, 2010). A concrete manifestation of this form of environment has been 'linked very closely with collaborative group work' (Khan, 2012, p.57). Second, the above has also been found to imply the reliance of learning on an eclectic stance: people learn in different ways (Cole, et al., 1999, p.17; Dobson, 2008, p.27; Lenning et al., 2013, p.96; Mansoor, 2010, p.205, 207). Third, given that Creative Writing instructional philosophies recognize the complexity and diversity inherent in learners' perceptions and their learning capacities, teaching methods need to be fully aligned with individual cognition and include a variety of activities accompanied by a freedom of choice (Cole, et al., 1999, p.11; Lenning et al., 2013, p.96; Mansoor, 2012). Fourth, the setup must encourage higher order thinking skills, such as independence and risk-taking, etc., as they have been found to be most favourable to critical aptitude and to creativity (Anderson et al., 1970; Hill & Amabile, 1993; Richardson, 1988; Shaughnessy, 1991; cited in Cole et al. 1999, p.4). And finally, teaching emphasis should be on a set of integrated learning goals – students would be required to link knowledge acquisition with previous learning experiences, in an individually meaningful format, to foster creativity (Cole, et al., 1999, p.6-7; Gandini cited in Carter, 1992, p. 38; Lenning et al., 2013, p.8; Moseley et al., 2005a, p.6).

Table 1 presents a general idea of eight thinking frameworks identified by Moseley et al. (2005a, pp.187-189), and adopted by

Lenning et al. (2013, p.100), which focus on cognitive, affective and behavioural levels of development of individuals. As suggested earlier, the same can be successfully extended to support innovative learning in Creative Writing study environments, seeing as they are directly proportionate to the pre-requisites of the Creative Writing learning as mentioned in the beginning of this paragraph.

TABLE 1

Cognitive structure and/or development frameworks in chronological order

Development Framework	Development Elements
Piaget's stage model of cognitive development (1950)	This is based on social interaction and constructivist learning theories; well-designed external "inputs" encourage individuals to manipulate existing schemes in ways that allow new relationships to emerge and learning to increase; Sensorimotor, representational, and formal are the 3 principle phases associated with intellectual development; during the median childhood stage, intuitive deliberation is replaced by logical thinking, though the formal operations phase is not reached by all adults, who continue thinking using abstract means
Sanford's readiness, challenge, & support 1966	Experiences (in a supportive learning setup) encompassing critical conflict or difference of opinion can maximize the level of challenge
Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development (1970)	Individuals make meaning of their experiences in different ways (e.g. duality, multiplicity, relativism, etc.), which shapes how they learn
Astin's involvement theory (1984)	Amount of learning and development is proportional to the quality and quantity of involvement
Kolb's learning cycles (1984)	Effective learning is viewed as a cycle in which leaners need to master the 4 components: 1-experience doing something, 2- observe and reflect on that experience, 3-analyse the learning attained from that experience to draw conclusions on that observation, and 4-use the conclusions to test hypothesis in future situations, resulting in new experiences; 4 equivalent learning styles help design experiences that support each of the four components (1-feeling for concrete experience, 2-Watching for reflective observation, 3-Thinking for abstract conceptualization, and 4-Doing for active testing).

Development Framework	Development Elements
King and Kitchener's model of reflective judgment (1994)	A seven-stage progression model from adolescent to adult reasoning; individuals learn to solve vexing or ill-structured problems by using strategies while moving from pre-reflective through quasi-reflective to reflective stages
Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authored learning (1999)	Learning is promoted by validating individuals as knowers, situating learning in individuals' experiences, and inviting groups to construct meaning mutually
Freire's dialogic model of educational practice, 2000	Dialogue within a learning community is designed to be a means of transforming social relations into new understandings of content

A common feature correlating with the creative learning environment, visibly perceptible in the majority of above mentioned learning approaches, is their emphasis on collaborative learning amongst individuals or supportive learning being possible within social, interactive or communicative group settings (Piaget's stage model of cognitive development, 1950; Sanford's readiness, challenge, and support, 1966; Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development, 1970; Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authored learning, 1999; Freire's dialogic model of educational practice, 2000). Given that 'knowledge is socially constructed,' in wake of numerous learning experiences and inconsistencies in peers' thought processes, or discrepancies and disagreements encountered in different collaborative situations between the ways different people view the world, individuals can both be challenged and motivated to 'strike a balance by developing new understandings' (Sanford's readiness, challenge, and support, 1966; Astin's involvement theory, 1984; Kolb's learning cycles, 1984; cited in Lenning et al., 2013, p.101).

Against the given models, learners are also able to formulate a better and more enhanced understanding if they assimilate their individual sympathies and perceptions with socially constructed information by using higher level creative thinking skills (Piaget's stage model of cognitive development, 1950; Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development, 1970; Astin's involvement theory, 1984; Kolb's learning cycles, 1984; King and Kitchener's

model of reflective judgment, 1994; Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authored learning, 1999). Whereas a final feature of the Creative Writing training environment that ties these frameworks together is their recognition of diverse personnel being at 'different development levels,' which implies that each individual has 'different needs to facilitate growth (Lenning et al., 2013, p.100). All that remains is for instructors and relevant practitioners to develop a teaching philosophy to encourage learners 'to work with each other to reflect on newly acquired knowledge and remake meaning based on their previous experiences' (ibid). And this is one creative learning criterion that has been 'recognised in the fields of productive thinking and instructional design frameworks' as well (Moseley et al., 2005a, p.185).

Several research studies have emphasised, in this regard, the establishment of a positive impact upon learners once 'specific cognitive and metacognitive strategies are embedded in the teaching of academic subjects…' (De Corte, et al., 2001; Fuchs, et al., 2003; cited in Moseley, et al., 2005b, p.369). What follows is a discussion of certain productive and holistic knowledge building frameworks, and specific techniques and strategies utilized within several instructional designs, which are contained in the next sections respectively. These are alternative guiding frameworks that can 'help in the design and implementation of effective teaching models,' especially to foster constructivist and participant-led forms of instruction (Lenning et al., 2013, p.98); Creative Writing being one of them (CLPM, 2007; and Warschauer, 1997, p.471; cited in Chizek, 2008, p.36-37).

Productive Thinking & Knowledge Building Frameworks
Within the contemporary higher educational context, even more important than cognitive development structures, learning theories or specific knowledge is the ability of individuals 'to learn and make sense of that new knowledge' (Gough, 1991; cited in Doherty, 2008, p.34). Teachers today are surrounded by a plethora of learners 'with learning difficulties,' who 'experience particular problems with metacognitive and self-regulatory functioning, involving, for example, checking, planning, monitoring, reviewing, predicting and evaluating their tasks' (Wong & Jones, 1982; cited in Moseley et al., 2005b, p.369). Seeing as it is, the academic community should never overlook

the all-embracing and wide scope of the way learners think and learn, which is conditioned by assimilated stimuli of their previous as well as their present educational environments (Lenning et al., 2013, p.98). These influences have an impact on both the learners' critical as well as creative thinking processes; and to attain a better understanding of how effective learning can be conditioned, practitioners need to explore all established frameworks for developing students' thinking skills (Doherty, 2008, p.34). Such skills have been identified as standing synonymous to 'decision-making, problem-solving, analysing information, sorting and classifying data, generating new ideas, hypothesising, evaluating options, making predictions, monitoring progress towards a goal, drawing conclusions, determining cause and effect, understanding about content knowledge and metacognition' abilities (Doherty, 2008, p.33). And although it is rather difficult to link these defining markers of thinking praxis to any one specific field of studies (ibid), yet the same have been deemed correlative to the Creative Writing practice of learners across varying geographic contexts (Anderson et al., 1970; Hill & Amabile, 1993; Richardson, 1988; Shaughnessy, 1991, cited in Cole et al., 1999, p.4; Chandio, et al., 2013, p.322; Haider, 2012a, p.221; Khan, 2012, p.57; Mansoor, 2010, p.201; Mansoor, 2011, p.6).

Table 2 presents an overview and brief description of some of the most commonly used frameworks for developing students' productive thinking. The given taxonomies 'span psychological and philosophical approaches to understanding both critical and creative thinking' (Moseley et al., 2005a, pp.119-22), and call for 'the development of effective and equitable materials, pedagogies and assessment tools capable of cultivating and extending such thinking beyond the narrow instructional setting to encourage the application of such "habits of mind" to personal life' (ibid, p.120).

TABLE 2
Productive thinking frameworks presented by Moseley, et al. (2005a)

Frameworks	Productive Thinking Elements
Altshuller's TRIZ Theory of Inventive Problem Solving (1956)	TRIZ is a systematic, creative and innovation process devised as an aid to practical problem-solving; there are four main steps: problem definition; problem-solving tool selection; generating solutions; evaluating solutions.
De Bono's lateral and parallel thinking tools (1976/85)	The tools have been designed to broaden the scope of critical thinking by redirecting it away from conventional thinking paradigms and emphasising cross-situational problem-solving techniques which promote generative, innovative, creative or productive thinking instead
Halpern's reviews of critical thinking skills and dispositions (1984)	This framework's skill categories are: memory, thought and language, deductive reasoning, argument analysis, hypothesis testing, likelihood and uncertainty, decision-making, problem-solving, and creative thinking
Lipman's three modes of thinking and four main varieties of cognitive skill (1991/95)	Judgment & reasoning can be strengthened through a tripartite model of thinking - critical, creative & caring thinking (as they are equally important and interdependent); in education the four major varieties of higher-order thinking/cognitive skill relate to: enquiry, reasoning (preserving truth), information-organising (concept formation), translation (preserving meaning)
Jewell's reasoning taxonomy for gifted children (1996)	The taxonomy argues that "giftedness" manifests as learned behaviour, and comprises of 1) creative thinking 2) logical/rational/critical thinking 3) caring thinking or interpersonal skills and moral behaviour (as they not mutually exclusive and should be regarded as complementary aspects of human behaviour)
	emphasises this taxonomy being applied to text-based and other classroom activities which have been designed to provide a foundation for advanced reasoning (to determine what the activities are trying to achieve and how best to match them to student needs)

Frameworks	Productive Thinking Elements
Petty's six-phase model of the creative process (1997)	Uses the term 'creative' in a broad sense to refer to invention, design, problem-solving and entrepreneurial initiatives, as well as to the creative arts and household decision-making; portrays the creative process as complex and variable, yet disciplined, requiring above all flexibility in making appropriate choices at different phases of problem finding & problem-solving
	while acknowledges that there are individual personality factors which affect creativity, yet teachers can help bring about massive improvements in learners' creative processes and products;
Bailin's intellectual resources for critical thinking (1999)	Considers critical & creative thinking to be overlapping concepts; demonstrates flaws in approaches to critical thinking that favour a pedagogy based on identifying and teaching specific skills; argues that educators need novel approaches to develop critical and creative thinking together

As is apparent in the above frameworks, Moseley, et al. (2005a) see no point in separating 'critical thinking from creative thinking' domains, since 'in many situations they overlap and are interdependent' (p.119). The named researchers have presented both variations of thinking in the form of 'Productive Thinking Frameworks,' which include an assortment of different thinking skills: 'analysis, synthesis, evaluation and various combinations of these and other processes leading to a deeper understanding, a defensible judgment or valued product; planning, what to do and say, imagining situations, reasoning, solving problems, considering opinions, making decisions and judgments, or generating new perspectives or ideas, etc.' (2005a, p119).

The *Productive Thinking Frameworks* clearly support a large-scale scope, and an 'applied educational purpose,' rather than just trying to explain cognitive, metacognitive, psychomotor or social learning domains (Lenning et al., 2013, p.98; Doherty, 2008, p.34). For one thing, the frameworks do not just list skills or focus on higher order thinking areas, but actually employ processes that deal with learners' acquisition and build-up of 'knowledge and understanding through action, sensation, perception and memory' (Moseley, et al.,

2005a, p.250). These theories dealing with mental operations can be applied to groups that contain a learning process based upon 'gathering of information and formation of ideas, moving to a phase involving some kind of doing experience, and concludes with reflective dialogue' (Lenning et al., 2013, pp.98-99). In comprehensive terms, the process according to Swanson (1999, 2000), and elaborated by Moseley, et al. (2005b, p.369), would include:

> *The use of advanced organisers (statements in learning materials that remind learners of procedures that they should employ in order to be more strategic in their approach), elaboration (in which students are actively encouraged to link material to be learned to information or ideas which they already have in mind), attributions (in which the reasons for a strategy succeeding or failing are considered), and thinking (metacognition).*

The method sketched above has also been found to correlate with the pedagogical mechanism of Creative Writing training (Burroway, 2003; Monteith & Miles, 1992), which implies such theories could be extended to support innovative learning in Creative Writing study environments as well. Secondly, they all discuss rational capabilities – decision-making, problem-solving, information analysis, data management and classification, idea generation, assessing preferences, formulating predictions, examining progress towards achieving aims/goals, drawing conclusions, determining cause and effect, understanding about content knowledge (Doherty, 2008) – that have been mentioned by Cole, et al., (1999), Cuddy (2012), Dobson (2008) and Nilsson (2012) in their reference to developing creativity.

Khan (2012) likewise follows by identifying Creative Writing as a complicated process that involves the use of cognition and thinking skills to produce and shape something innovative (p.59). Citing Harmer (2004), Chandio, et al. (2013) list four basic steps involved in this process: 'thinking about the ideas, arrangement of the ideas, writing the ideas and revising the ideas' (p.322). Genuine expressive writing, suggests Arnold (1991), grows out of writers' search for meaning, or their communication or exploration of issues

through vivid imagination or creative thinking (p.9). Once a cognitive process becomes activated, such creative thinking generates multi-ranging ideas that explore an even wider gamut of possibilities (ibid). Given that due attention to this mechanism of productive thinking is a pre-requisite for developing learners' creativity, research deems the inclusion of authenticated approaches of thinking skills within all associated instructional design frameworks necessary (Chandio, et al., 2013, p.322, 323; Lenning et al., 2013, p.98-99). 'One way of taking this idea forward,' suggests Doherty (2008), 'is by using taxonomy of thinking' in terms of its relevance to higher education teaching (p.33-34). Some well-established taxonomies of this sort exist, and 'whilst there are some differences in scope and emphasis, there are also many commonalities that provide a useful framework for understanding or developing student thinking,' that may help transform learning environments and instruction models as well (ibid, p.34). The *Frameworks Dealing with Instructional Design* by Moseley, Baumfield, Elliott, Gregson, Higgins, Miller, and Newton provide exactly such a setup (Lenning et al., 2013, p.96).

Instructional Design Frameworks

A number of teaching models can provide insight into ways whereby the learning experiences and instruction techniques could be designed for the Creative Writing pedagogy. As established in the section on *Cognitive Structure and/or Development Frameworks* (see p.3 of this article), a Creative Writing learning environment needs to be sympathetic to learners and designed in accordance with the socio-cultural background and learning capacity of different individuals. It also needs to foster teaching material(s) that include a variety of activities accompanied by freedom of choice, and encourage higher order thinking skills, such as creative problem solving, thinking outside the box, independence and risk-taking, etc. With the exception of Dobson's Model of Unstructured Instruction (2008), Marquis's Revision and Expansion of Bloom's Taxonomy (2012), and Nilsson's Taxonomy of Creative Design (2012), Lenning, et al. (2013) and Moseley, et al. (2005a, 2005b) present an overview of certain frameworks dealing with instructional design models that are underpinned by such teaching rudiments. Table 3 identifies a taxonomy of instructional design as follows:

TABLE 3
Instructional design frameworks in chronological order

Design Framework	Significant Design Elements
Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (1956)	Improves performance through the use of learning objectives that target increasingly complex goals (comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis & evaluation are applied to/help build knowledge)
Gagne's eight types of learning and five types of learned capability (1965)	Similar to Bloom, offers a hierarchy of learning goals, with problem solving at the top; also highlights the need to establish conditions for learning according to individual needs
Ausubel and Robinson's six hierarchically-ordered categories (1969)	These are: representational learning, concept learning, propositional learning, application, problem-solving, and creativity; stresses importance of relating prior knowledge to new knowledge, scaffolding understanding, and teacher-structured learning
Williams' model for developing thinking and feeling processes (1970)	Develops creative talents; teachers can use 18 teaching techniques of promoting fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, curiosity, risk taking, complexity and imagination to encourage creativity
Hannah and Michaelis' comprehensive framework for instructional objectives (1977)	Guides skill development and supports learner inquiry, critical thinking, and creativity; the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains are covered (interpreting, comparing, classifying, generalising, inferring, analysing, synthesising, hypothesising, predicting and evaluating are listed as intellectual processes)
Stahl and Murphy's domain of cognition taxonomic system (1981)	Designs learning experiences (a multi-stage model of information processing from preparation to generation) to promote 21 cognitive process (e.g. classifying, organising, selecting, utilising, verifying), which may be used singly or in combinations at different levels
Biggs and Collis' SOLO taxonomy (1982)	Improves cognitive performance through accommodating assessment and feedback

Design Framework	Significant Design Elements
Quellmalz's framework of thinking skills (1987)	Models five cognitive processes (recall, analysis, comparison, inference/interpretation and evaluation), and three metacognitive processes (planning, monitoring and reviewing/revising), to infuse critical thinking across the curriculum
Presseisen's models of essential, complex and metacognitive thinking skills (1991)	Uses complex and challenging tasks to develop metacognitive thinking skills involved in strategy selection, understanding and monitoring; also lists five basic processes which are used in problem-solving, decision-making, critical thinking and creative thinking
Merrill's instructional transaction theory (1992)	Identifies 13 cognitive strategies (to identify, execute, interpret, judge, , execution, interpretation, judgement, classification, generalisation, decision making, transference, propagation, analogy usage, substitution, design formatting and discovery) to support learners' construction of mental models
Anderson and Krathwohl's revision of Bloom's taxonomy (2001)	Improves cognitive performance by refining and developing Bloom's taxonomy (1956) into a two-dimensional framework emphasising alignment of learning objectives with instruction
Gouge and Yates' Arts Project taxonomies (2002)	A matrix of educational objectives for the visual arts, music and drama promoting learning through peer coaching and collaboration
Dobson's Model of Unstructured Instruction (2008)	Emphasises the freedom of unstructured activities and learning which stimulates automatic creative writing and employs an assessment criteria without predetermined learning outcomes
Nilsson's Taxonomy of Creative Design(2012)	Ties diverse instructional strategies explaining how creativity works, can be understood, improved, or developed incrementally; offers a progression from imitation to original creative creation
Marquis's Taxonomy 2012	Flips Anderson's (2001) modified version of Bloom's taxonomy

A common element across the various instructional design models is their emphasis on the need to establish the supportive learning environment, by focusing on conditions for learning according to individual needs, peer collaboration and non-judgemental

assessment protocol (Gagne's eight types of learning and five types of learned capability, 1965; Biggs and Collis' SOLO taxonomy, 1982; Merrill's instructional transaction theory, 1992; Gouge and Yates' Arts Project taxonomies, 2002; Dobson's Model of Unstructured Instruction, 2008). The models highly advocate for increased attention to advanced level goals, abilities or skills that help build both critical knowledge and creativity (Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives, 1956; Gagne's eight types of learning and five types of learned capability, 1965; Ausubel and Robinson's six hierarchically-ordered categories, 1969; Williams' model for developing thinking and feeling processes, 1970; Hannah and Michaelis' comprehensive framework for instructional objectives, 1977; Quellmalz's framework of thinking skills, 1987; Presseisen's models of essential, complex and metacognitive thinking skills, 1991).

The models also offer a strong environment for enabling learners to relate their knowledge to information from their personal experiences, and view the same as a gateway to active and creative learning (Ausubel & Robinson's hierarchically-ordered categories, 1969; Williams' model for developing thinking and feeling processes, 1970; Hannah and Michaelis' comprehensive framework for instructional objectives, 1977; Stahl and Murphy's domain of cognition taxonomic system, 1981; Quellmalz's framework of thinking skills, 1987). While the majority of teaching models hypothize the educational context in general, Dobson, Marquis and Nilsson expand particularly on how Creative Writing practices can be understood or fostered within learners. Dobson's (2008) teaching methods rely on the needs and the mind-set of their writing students. Marquis (2012) builds on an updated version of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy by his own student, Lorin Anderson, who developed a teaching model correlating to the various 'attributes of the Creative Arts and higher level thinking' (Rohrer, 2012). Whereas Nilsson (2012) theorizes on the nature or disposition of creativity, various stages involved in the writing process, and presents means of analysing, evaluating or measuring creative work, both in terms of form and content. All these factors seem to have a remarkably direct relevance to Creative Writing pedagogy, which emphasises just the same (Khan, 2012; Cucciarre, 2008).

Conclusion

The provision of effective and challenge-oriented learning environments, such as workshops or other training programs, entails students be engaged in 'authentic problem solving experiences like design, inquiry to explain, troubleshooting to repair, and synthesizing information/data to make decisions and generate new knowledge' (Brophy, 2011, p.2). Such an environment can only be established by incorporating principles of learning, knowledge and instructional design frameworks, and integrating them to guide the development and implementation of an instructional model in that 'effective learning environment' (ibid). Similar to Brophy (2011), Lenning, et al. (2013) and Moseley, et al. (2005a, 2005b), the present article suggests fundamentals of "*Cognitive Structure and/or Development frameworks,*" "*Productive Thinking and Knowledge Building frameworks*," and "*Instructional Design frameworks*" inform the successful adoption and adaptation of learning materials and environments various academics have constructed for creative subjects. When viewed holistically, 'Flexible Modular Writing Approach' by Atkinson T S (2003) and Emotin-Bucjan (2011), against the 'Supportive Workshop Setting' established by Cole et al. (2008), fulfil the various pre-requisite conditions of the given learning theories to a great extent. In the first case, teachers are seen as vessels allowing students to have a genuine say when it comes to control on format, topic, and purpose in their writing (Mansoor, 2010, 2011, 2012). This flexibility of permitting students to make responsible yet guided choices forces them to think unrestrained about their reading preferences, make unforced assumptions on the information they encounter, and leads them to a fuller comprehension and thorough terrain of thought (Racco, 2010). Much of this automatically connects with research outcomes established by Emotin-Bucjan (2011) in the context of promoting creative and literary writing through the design, production and implementation of flexible course modules. Thus she argues:

> *The instructional materials make available the ability*
> *to write and empower students with sense of efficacy*
> *and achievement. Therefore the need to see learning as*
> *an activity without beginning or end and to create the*

right environment and materials for continued learning is a good stimulus to the learning process of the students (Emotin-Bucjan, 2011, p.68).

This necessitates the development of a learner centered, flexible and supportive 'self-made' text for creative writing students, 'as a strategy that can help develop their skills in writing' with confidence (Vitasa, 2006; cited in Emotin-Bucjan, 2011, p. 67). Modular instruction is additionally valuable in terms of creative writing pedagogy, since, by taking the 'variable learner needs' into consideration, modules 'place maximum responsibility' on and 'provide for active participation' by the learners (Parsons, 1975, p. 31); an aspect inherently significant for the development of creative writing skills of students (Holthouse, 2002). However, this has to be done in the right atmosphere (ibid). Atkinson T S (2003) argues that creative writing students are likely to experience unease when subjected to an atmosphere of 'creative writing coupled with critical theory.' This is nothing short of an 'unfamiliar discipline' or an unchartered territory for them. Naturally, to create a productive and supportive learning environment, it's better if practitioners establish a *workshop based instruction*, wherein assessment protocol takes into account these 'different challenges' (Atkinson, 2003, p.2). To do so, Atkinson promotes the use of 'low-stakes' writing assignments, which are 'informal' weekly assignments subject to 'informal' formative assessment 'without having to classify or grade' them (p.2). Further research conducted by various art practitioners in this regard indicates the need for teachers to 'adopt a learner centred focus' if they wish to develop their students' creative skills effectively (Grainger, et al., 2005, p. 183; cited in Khan, 2011, p. 113). Quoting Barnes (2001), Khan further suggests creative writing teachers need to engage their students to learn without detaching them from their individual 'perspectives, passions, capabilities and personalities' (Khan, 2011, p.113). To help students determine their 'individual talents' and discover 'their own voice,' Gureghian (2010) stresses the necessity of establishing 'unique writing exercises' amidst the 'comfortable learning environment' (2010, p. 120). Citing Moffat (1986), Racco likewise elaborates on writing as an intricate and complex, yet a better

means related to the process of holistic learning. Through their participation in writing workshops, seminars and other writing courses, learners attain information about the mechanics of writing creatively from inside out, and continuously discover, create, and learn during the various stages of the writing process, thereby transforming their dormant writing skills into a confident and often well voiced textual production of literary thought (Donnelly, 2010).

References

- Arnold, R., 1991. *Writing Development*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Atkinson, T.S., 2003b. *Formative and Summative Assessment in Creative Writing*. Course Module. Aberystwyth: Department of English and Creative Writing, Aberystwyth University.

- Azerbaijan University of Languages and UNESCO, 2010. *A Sample Creative Writing Workshop Curriculum for High School and University Classes*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK file:/// C:\\Users\\komal\\AppData\\Local\\Temp\\Rar$DI82.520 \\www.translit.az\\ELEKTRON%20KITABXANA\\...\\Curriculum.pdf" www.translit.az/ELEKTRON%20KITABXANA/./Curriculum.pdf [Accessed 19 July 2011]. 14.20 pm.

- Batzoglou, A., 2012. *Towards a Theatre of Psychagogia: An Experimental Application of the Sesame Approach into Psychophysical Actor Training*. PhD Thesis. London: Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London.

- Brophy, S., 2011. Frameworks for Designing Effective Learning Environments. *NEESacademy Instructional Design*, 1, pp.1-12. Available at: HYPERLINK "http://nees.org/resources/3554/download/ frameworksforchallengebaseddesign_v1.pdf" http://nees.org/ resources/3554/download/frameworksforchallengebaseddesign_v1.pdf [Accessed 09 January 2014].

- Burroway, J., 2003. *Imaginative Writing: the Elements of Craft (Penguin Academics)*. Florida State University: Longman.

- Carter, L.F., Haythorn, F.W., Meirowitz, B. & Lanzetta, J., 1951. The Relation of Categorizations and Ratings in the Observation of Group Behavior. *Journal of Human Relations*, 4, pp.239-54.

- Chandio, J.H., Khan, H.M.A. & Samiullah, M., 2013. Condition of Creative Writing in the North and South Punjab. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(2), pp.321-30. Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.jespk.net/publications/126.pdf" http://www.jespk.net/publications/126.pdf [Accessed 24 March 2014].

- Chizek, L.M., 2008. Constructivist Learning Through Wikis in the Writing Classroom. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, 23(2), pp.35-41. Available at: HYPERLINK http://www.junipershorepublications.com/uploads/2/1/0/7/2107754/lajm.pdf http://www.junipershorepublications.com/uploads/2/1/0/7/2107754/lajm.pdf [Accessed 26 May 2012].

- Cole, D.G., Sugioka, H.L. & Lynch, L.C.Y., 1999. Supportive Classroom Environments For Creativity in Higher Education. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 33(4), pp.277-93.

- Cucciarre, C.P., 2008. *Audience Matters: Exploring Audience in Undergraduate Creative Writing*. PhD Dissertation. Bowling Green, OH, United States: Graduate College of Bowling Green State University.

- Cuddy, A., 2012. *Frank Williams's Taxonomy of Creativity*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK http://prezi.com/nbeqdrkwnce8/frank-williamss-taxonomy-of-creativity/ http://prezi.com/nbeqdrkwnce8/frank-williamss-taxonomy-of-creativity/ [Accessed 15 April 2014].

- Dobson, T., 2008. The Rise and Fall Of Mr Choakumchild – Learning Outcomes and The Teaching Of Creative Writing. *The Assessment, Learning and Teaching Journal*, 3, pp.25-29.

- Doherty, J., 2008. Thinking Skills and the Context of Higher Education Teaching Today. What is Known?. *The Assessment, Learning and Teaching Journal* , 3, pp.32-36.

- Donnelly, D., 2010. Introduction. In D. Donnelly, ed. *Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?* New York: Multilingual Matters. pp.1-28.

- Emotin-Bucjan, M.D., 2011. Development and Validation of Modules in English 2: Writing in the Discipline. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, pp.65-76. Available at: HYPERLINK http://www.eisrjc.com/documents/Development_and_Validation_of_Modules_1325756635.pdf http://www.eisrjc.com/documents/Development_and_Validation_of_Modules_1325756635.pdf [Accessed 26 May 2012].

- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S. & Guido-Dibrito, F., 1998. *Student Development in College*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Green, J.E., 2008. *Useful Things: The Creative Writing Discipline and its Relevance to the Liberal Arts Tradition*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "http://rompers.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/2008.pdf" http://rompers.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/2008.pdf [Accessed 7 April 2014].

- Gureghian, S., 2010. The Writing Workshop for Dummies: How the New Teacher can Mentor First-time Writing Students. *Creative Writing: Teaching Theory & Practice*, 2(2), pp.120-136.

- Haider, G., 2012a. Teaching of Writing in Pakistan: A Review of Major Pedagogical Trends and Issues in Teaching of Writing. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(3), pp.215-25.

- Harper, G., 2010. *On Creative Writing*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Harper, G. & Kroll, J., 2008. Creative Writing in the University. In G. Harper & J. Kroll, eds. *Creative Writing Studies: Practice, Research and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp.1-9.

- Holthouse, A., 2002. Unit Lesson Plan: Creative Writing. In Brown, L. et al. *Writing Revelations: 17 Resources for Teaching Writing*. Illinois: Department of English, Ellinois State University.

- Khan, H.I., 2011. Testing Creative Writing in Pakistan: Tensions and Potential in Classroom Practice. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(15), pp.111-19. Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_15_Special_Issue_October_2011/14.pdf" http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_15_Special_Issue_October_2011/14.pdf [Accessed 20 December 2011].

- Khan, H.I., 2012. Perceptions about Creativity and Teaching Creative Writing in Pakistan. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(3), pp.57-67.

- Lenning, O.T. et al., 2013. Conceptual Frameworks for Creating Powerful Learning Communities. In *Powerful Learning Communities: A Guide to Developing Student, Faculty, and Professional Learning Communities to Improve Student Success and Organizational Effectiveness*. Virginia: Stylus publishing, LLC. pp.89-108.

- Mansoor, A., 2010. Teaching Creative Writing to University Level Second Language Learners in Pakistan. *New Writing*, 7(3), pp.201-18.

- Mansoor, A., 2011. *Using Audio-Visual Aids To Stimulate Inventiveness In University- Level Second Language Creative Writers*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "https://iiu-pk.academia.edu/AsmaMansoor/

Conference-Presentations" https://iiu-pk.academia.edu/AsmaMansoor/ Conference-Presentations [Accessed 26 March 2014].

- Mansoor, A., 2012. The Recipe for Novelty: Using Bilingualism and Indigenous Literary Genres in an Advanced Level L2 Creative Writing Context in Pakistan. *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, 10(1), pp.52-66.

- Marquis, J., 2012. *Flipping and Expanding Bloom's Taxonomy*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.onlineuniversities.com/ blog/2012/06/flipping-expanding-blooms-taxonomy/" http:// www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/06/flipping-expanding-blooms- taxonomy/ [Accessed 15 April 2014].

- Monteith, M. & Miles, R., 1992. *Teaching Creative Writing: Theory and Practice*. 1st ed. Buckingham: Open University.

- Moseley, D. et al., 2005a. *Frameworks for Thinking: A Handbook for Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Moseley, D., Elliott, J., Gregson, M. & Higgins, S., 2005b. Thinking Skills Frameworks for Use in Education and Training. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), p.367–390. Available at: HYPERLINK "https://www.academia.edu/446544/ Thinking_Skills_Frameworks_for_Use_In_Education_and_Training" https://www.academia.edu/446544/ Thinking_Skills_Frameworks_for_Use_In_Education_and_Training [Accessed 26 April 2014].

- Nash, Y. & Pyatt, K., 2009. *Instructional Design Model, Instructional Strategy Comparison*. EDUC 533: Instructional Systems Design & Development. Available at: HYPERLINK "http:// ynash.wikispaces.com/file/view/ Instructional+Design+Models+and+strategies.doc/79459343" http:// ynash.wikispaces.com/file/view/ Instructional+Design+Models+and+strategies.doc/79459343 [accessed 3 May 2014].

- Nilsson, P., 2012. Taxonomy of Creative Design. *Sense and Sensation: Writing on Education, Creativity, and Cognitive Science*, 3, Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.senseandsensation.com/2012/03/taxonomy-of -creative-design.html" http://www.senseandsensation.com/2012/03/ taxonomy-of-creative-design.html [Accessed 15 April 2014].

- Parsons, J., 1975. Book Review on James D. Russell's Modular Instruction (1974). *Journal of Extension*, 13(4), pp.31-32. [Accessed 2012].

- Racco, G., 2010. Creative Writing: An Instructional Strategy to Improve Literacy. Attitudes of the Intermediate English Student. *Journal of Classroom Research in Literacy*, 3, Available at: HYPERLINK "file:/// C:\\Users\\komal\\AppData\\Local\\Temp\\Rar$DI82.520\\Creative% 20Writing:%20An%20Instructional% 20http:\\jcrl.library.utoronto.ca\\index.php\\jcrl\\article\\download\\6904 \\pdf" Creative Writing: An Instructional http://jcrl.library.utoronto.ca/ index.php/jcrl/article/download/6904/pdf [Accessed 10 August 2012].

- Rohrer, K., 2012. *Bloom's Taxonomy – Incredible @rt Department*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.incredibleart.org/ files/blooms2.htm"   http://www.incredibleart.org/files/blooms2.htm [Accessed 1 May 2014].

- Sharples, M., 1999. *How We Write: Writing as Creative Design*. London: Routledge. Available at: HYPERLINK "http://www.questia.com/ library/102901691/how-we-write-writing-as-creative-design"   http:// www.questia.com/library/102901691/how-we-write-writing-as-creative-design [accessed 27 March 2014].

- Sharples, M., 2002. *How We Write: Writing as Creative Design*. New York: Routledge. Available at: HYPERLINK "http:// books.google.co.uk/books?id=Eq6EAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover" \l "v=onepage&q&f=false"   http://books.google.co.uk/books? id=Eq6EAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 29 March 2014].

- Stewart, J.L. & Wilkerson, V.L., 1999. *A Guide To Teaching With Modules*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "http:// chemlinks.beloit.edu/guide/superim.pdf"   http://chemlinks.beloit.edu/ guide/superim.pdf [Accessed 13 April 2014].

- Wright, S., 2012. *Flipping Bloom's Taxonomy*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK   "http://plpnetwork.com/2012/05/15/flipping-blooms-taxonomy/%20"   http://plpnetwork.com/2012/05/15/flipping-blooms-taxonomy/ [Accessed 1 May 2014].