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**ABSTRACT**

Creativity is required for innovation, novelty, and survival. This paper is concerned with the study of creativity in education, specifically the training of lecturers and future lecturers to apply creativity theories in marketing syllabus. Marketing as a profession requires the ability to engage in a creative process to solve a problem or design a novel item. According to research, curricula that improve students' creative skills in business marketing are much needed.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The ability to engage in a creative process to define or solve a problem or design a novel artefact is critical to the marketing profession, particularly for future marketers. In the engineering sphere numerous reports emphasise the importance of fostering engineering students' ability to think creatively. This could not be more correct for the marketing students and programs. Creativity and innovative thinking have been linked. According to the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) report on Business Schools on an Innovation Mission, business schools should sharpen students' creative problem-solving skills to enable innovation (AACSB, 2010). Many factors influence solution success or failure, but creative thinking within the environment by individuals or teams is a key source of innovative ideas (Cropley, 2006). This paper identified four key domains from the literature and represent them in a conceptual model centred on: (1) Learning creativity, (2) Meanings of creativity, (3) Discourses on creativity, and (4) Impacts of creativity on future education.

**LEARNING CREATIVITY**

Learning focuses on international pedagogical and learning practises that encourage creativity with and through technology, hence, it is practice oriented. Because educational practises are contextual, technologies evolve, and pedagogy is deeply personal in the practises of teachers, this is a constantly shifting space, indicating a need for practitioner perspectives within research. The relevant literature on creativity and pedagogical practises is fragmented and does not provide a unified view of practical technological findings. In their scoping literature review, Aguilar and Turmo (2019) note that there has been a greater emphasis on technology as a tool for creativity rather than on teachers' practises. As Hong et al. (2009) discovered in a quantitative survey study of teachers' epistemological beliefs, motivation, and goal orientation around instructional practises that foster student creativity, creativity can be seen as an epistemological-pedagogical orientation, both as practise and discourse with students. Despite the large amount of literature advocating for a greater emphasis on developing students' creativity, there is a scarcity of evidence-based practises (Egan et al. 2017). The absence of evidence-based criteria could be attributed to the fact that many educational settings make it difficult to move beyond existing curricular/assessment practises that limit creativity. Furthermore, creative practises may have an emergent or temporary character that resists standardisation (MacLaren 2012). DeHaan (2009) proposed making explicit the goals of creative learning, i.e. proposing a focus on cognitive flexibility for creativity and making this clear in instructional design, to manage this type of emergent practise. The deliberate and well-designed use of ICT in learning environments may encourage students' flexibility and creativity. However, the literature is unclear about what such environments might look like, leaving teachers with little guidance for practise. While the arts are perceived to be more easily aligned with creativity, scholars have observed the importance of technologies as tools of scientific progress; Root- Bernstein et al. (1995) established this in a mixed-method study of the practises of highly accomplished creative scientists, and subsequent work has noted the importance of creativity and imagination to high-level scientific practise (Root-Bernstein and Root-Bernstein 2013), despite the fact that teaching for creativity is frequently a low priority in science education. Because art-centred integrated learning can foster flexible thinking and inquiry, the arts may offer new approaches to teaching and learning in science and mathematics (Marshall 2014).

In conclusion, the literature on creativity and technology is fragmented, making consistent or defined classroom practises difficult to implement. When compared to the larger body of psychology literature that addresses creative thinking in individuals, scholarly literature dealing with the messy socio-cultural spaces of classrooms is scarce. Educators have long recognised the arts' potential to foster and promote creativity and divergent thinking.

**MEANINGS OF CREATIVITY**

Creativity has been defined as a type of novel thinking in which people redefine problems, identify gaps in knowledge, generate ideas, analyse ideas, and take reasonable risks in the development of ideas. The ability to combine and connect ideas in novel ways has also been defined as creative thinking (Finke, Ward, & Smith, 1992). Everyone is capable of exhibiting creativity in different ways, at different levels, and under different conditions (Cropley, 2001); it is not an attribute or skill that one either possesses or lacks (Kirton, 2003). The "standard definition" considers creativity to be the ability, capacity, or skill to produce novel and effective things (Runco and Jaeger 2012). The term novelty refers to the creation of something that did not previously exist or is relatively new in context. However, a novel idea with no practical application cannot be considered creative (Cropley 2003). So, things that are creative must also be "effective”, that is, useful, logical, understandable, or valuable to others. There is uncertainty in the context of technologies and classrooms about whether and how shifts in knowing and doing in the digital age have shaped how creativity is done and conceived.

For example, do digital technologies hinder or facilitate creativity, and under what conditions? According to Glück et al. (2002), creativity is based on intrinsic motivation and imagination, but it is also subject to external constraints. The ability of a person to choose their tools, modality, and context influences their capacity for creative learning (Barroso-Tanoira 2017) However, in schools, teachers and students must deal with constraints, navigation tools, technologies, situational variables, and other constraining forces. A task for instructors in the classroom is how to use existing scholarly findings, definitions, and discourse about creativity in ways that align with the realities of pragmatism. Creativity is positioned as essential for future work and learning in twenty-first-century rhetoric. However, many scholarly meanings treat creativity as an individual construct based on traits. Definitions or models provide abstractions, whereas classroom spaces address practicalities and the social-situatedness of learning. In light of the realities of assessment, educators in systems built on strict standards, norms, and guidelines may be unsure what to do with creativity.

**DISCOURSE ON CREATIVITY**

 Globalization, educational change, and technologies have been linked with creativity and innovation in some literature, often through a linear model in which creativity leads to innovation, which leads to change (Dawson and Andriopoulos 2014). Scholars such as Pratt (2017) have used this discourse about change, creativity, and innovation to describe western cities and urban centres as new hubs for creativity with a global focus, leveraging creativity in shifting notions of cityscape. It has also been strongly linked to digital technologies and the emergence of design thinking and practises in society and educational settings, with the goal of cultivating the aptly named twenty-first-century skills. As a result, creativity is pragmatically oriented toward entrepreneurship and expressed through positive change, corporatization, branding, and industrial innovation (Jones 2010). According to Bassett-Jones (2005), in the context of organisations, creativity is frequently promoted as being essential for corporate success; however, the need for diversity (of approach and personnel) to foster creativity may conflict with promoting organisational cohesion and compliance. At the same time, it is critical to be conscious of the cultural context of contemporary discourses on creativity. Much research has also viewed creativity as a Western construct, presented as an idealisation with utopian connections to technology, innovation, and change (Saad 2009). According to Sawyer (2011), a distinctly Western cultural model or understanding of creativity may be based on potentially false assumptions. This translates to a dominant and pervasive narrative about what creativity can offer in the current social and economic order, which is driven by western concepts (Baer 2011). Creativity could be viewed as a term that has been colonised with the specific objective of supporting the progress-narrative of western society and being used as a transformation catalyst through entrepreneurial culture.

**IMPACTS ON FUTURE EDUCATION**

When used in reference to education, the term "futures" refers to patterns, trajectories, and changes in instruction and learning that indicate forthcoming problems and demands. At the same time, we acknowledge the contested nature of this term, its transdisciplinary application, and the various ways in which it has been understood and applied (Brown et al. 2016). A lot of the thinking about the future and creativity has been based on the idea of 21st-century skills, which combine creativity and critical thinking (Balcom Raleigh and Heinonen 2019). This has an impact on policymaking and the need for educators to design creative classrooms that foster "skills for the future." The concept of 'future' is also linked in academic literature and industry discourse to synchronous and asynchronous modes of digital education delivery, as well as new constructions and interferences of technologies that embody the concept of 'tech futures' (Perng 2019). These conglomerations refer to online, mobile, and emerging technologies associated with artificial intelligence (AI) and augmented reality (AR) (Leahy et al. 2019). Both students and instructors must learn and adapt to a rapidly changing economic environment as a result of technological advances that enhance creativity and analytical skills. Many countries' education courses and curricula have been transformed by technological advancement. The rapid adoption of new technologies best prepares students for the economic and social change dynamics. Even though technological responsiveness is not a new phenomenon, it has been established that the most successful teaching methods include complementary and supplemental courses that produce multi-skilled and creative graduates. These courses place a strong emphasis on self-development skills and are less concerned with traditional content. The current trend is toward horizontal focus and a student-centric balance, which is displacing vertical over-specialization of learning. However, where the goal is to equip graduates with creative and adaptive skills, the central role of educator is still seen as appropriate and necessary.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Creativity and technology have been elevated as critical components of educational outcomes and future prospects. Their significance in twenty-first-century learning environments is undeniable, especially in light of the corporatization of education, globalisation, and the perceived need to innovate in order to survive. Despite their significance, these constructs have yet to be linked in a cohesive body of research that informs classroom practices.

One of the difficulties in enacting creativity and technology in learning spaces is the diversity of these constructs' practical perspectives and disciplinary lenses. These variations increase the complexity and perceived subjectivity in research and practice, where different stakeholders may have competing needs, priorities, beliefs, or values about where and how creativity and/or technology should emerge in teaching and learning.
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