Creativity in Schools in Europe: A survey of Teachers
This brochure presents the first results of an online survey of teachers about their opinions concerning creativity in schools, launched by the European Commission in the context of the European Year of Creativity and Innovation 2009. The impressive number of responses, a historical high in European surveys of teachers so far, leaves no doubts about the interest of European teachers in creativity and innovation.

This initial analysis shows also a remarkable agreement (over 95% of responses) in the understanding of creativity as an attribute that can be applied to every domain of knowledge and to every school subject, and therefore as a fundamental competence to be developed at school. Teachers believe to a very large extent that Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) can be used to enhance creativity. Furthermore, six teachers out of ten declare that they have received training in innovative pedagogies.

These results are extremely encouraging for the development of a specific line of policy cooperation on creativity and innovation in Europe, with education as a key actor. They resound well with the guidelines of President Barroso for the new European Union strategy EU 2020, and they are in line with the high level of interest raised by this European Year across Europe and beyond. The Year has been successful in mobilising external partners at national, regional and local levels, in the public sector as well as in the private. During 2009, over 1000 events on creativity and innovation have been organised in Europe.

I would like to thank all participants in this survey. First and foremost, the thousands of teachers who have taken the time and the effort to tell us about their work and their ideas. Special thanks also to the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) and European Schoolnet (EUN) for their design and analysis work and to the eTwinning National Support Services, the National Agencies for the Lifelong Learning Programme and the national coordinators of the European Year for their help and support.

This document warrants careful reading, as will the more in-depth analysis that will be presented in 2010.

Odile Quintin
Director General for Education, Training, Culture and Youth
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Overview

This brochure provides the preliminary results of an online survey of around 10,000 teachers from the 27 Member States of the European Union, about their opinions concerning creativity in schools, as a contribution to the 2009 European Year of Creativity and Innovation.

An overwhelming majority of teachers believe that creativity can be applied to every domain of knowledge and every school subject. They do not see creativity as being only relevant for intrinsically creative subjects such as the arts, music or drama. This is of paramount importance for the development of creative thinking as a transversal skill.

A high proportion of teachers who responded to the survey also believe that everyone can be creative. Furthermore, they support the idea that creativity is a fundamental skill to be developed in schools. Teachers also believe that Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) can be used to enhance creativity. They are mostly convinced of the usefulness of ‘traditional’ technologies: computers, Internet, and educational software. The potential of more recent social media applications such as social networks, blogs, and digital games remains untapped, even though most students use these new applications extensively outside of the classroom.

However, creativity does not seem to play a central role in the curriculum or learning objectives that teachers are asked to follow in every country. There are considerable differences between countries, due to the fact that every Member State develops its own national curriculum.

A relatively large proportion of teachers have received training in innovative pedagogies or methods. In contrast, training in creativity and moreover in ICT seems to be less widespread. Comprehensive and integrated training programmes linking all these dimensions are certainly needed. Nevertheless, many teachers from the Member States which joined after 2004 have had a different training experience as a notable number declare to have undergone specific training in creativity and in ICT.

Teachers also reported positively about the ways in which the school culture tends to support creativity. They observe that schools promote a number of factors which favour creativity, such as learners’ empowerment and open-mindedness, to rather a surprising extent. Nonetheless, schools tend to promote other important creativity enhancing factors, such as risk-taking and mixing academic work and play, to a lesser degree.

Teachers’ understanding of and belief in creativity is a promising starting point for any future educational policy targeted at developing teaching practices and education in support of students’ creative and active learning.
What does creativity mean to teachers in Europe? This brochure gives an overview of the preliminary results of a survey collecting teachers’ opinions on creativity and their perceptions concerning its relevance to school curricula, teacher education and school culture.

Both the European Commission and academic research recognise the importance of creativity for education. The wide range of meanings attributed to the word creativity is embedded in a series of assumptions and implications. As a loose concept, the meaning of creativity can be associated with the arts and creative industries, as it can with the outputs of eminent people, such as Einstein or Mozart, or equally the imaginative and original play of young children. Creative learning entails a component of curiosity, analysis, and imagination, accompanied by critical and strategic thinking. Any attempt at analysing creative practices cannot avoid mapping stakeholders’ connotations and tacit understanding of creativity.

This is the first aim of the current survey: to understand how teachers in Europe frame and conceptualise creativity. The second aim is to collect some information on the kind of systemic support they receive and need to foster students’ creativity.

The survey collected a total of 12,893 responses from 32 countries. This figure is indeed impressive, as it is the first time that a survey has collected such a high number of teachers’ opinions from all European countries. For the purposes of the closing conference on the European Year of Creativity and Innovation, only responses from the 27 Member States of the European Union have been analysed, amounting to a total of 9,460 responses.

The survey was launched by European Schoolnet on the eTwinning platform (www.etwinning.net). It was composed of 29 closed questions, translated into 22 languages and available online from 15 September until 15 October 2009. The eTwinning National Support Services promoted and advertised the survey, which was also disseminated through various national channels (national Lifelong Learning Agencies, Ministries of Education, and national EU Permanent Representations).

Despite the high response rate of the survey, the reader needs to be alerted to a series of biases in the sample. First of all, although teachers from all 27 Member States responded, the survey is not representative of all teachers in the European Community. This is due in particular to fewer responses from the United Kingdom, France and Germany, which under-represent their countries large populations. On the other hand, some countries are overrepresented, namely; Italy, Greece, Spain and Poland. In the case of Greece, responses clearly outweighed the relatively small population of
this country in comparison to other European countries. Moreover, countries where the number of responses was below 50 were not considered for the preliminary analysis presented in this brochure. These countries are: Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. It is also quite likely that respondents have a positive bias towards the issue being analysed. Firstly, creativity is not a particularly controversial topic in education; therefore many teachers do not have strong views against it. As a consequence, the survey could have attracted those teachers who tend to have a positive attitude towards the topic, as it was answered on a voluntary basis. Secondly, the way in which the survey was administered and promoted favoured respondents who are familiar with ICT, as not only was it an online survey, but it was also advertised on internet websites.

The design of the questionnaire was mainly based on a review of the literature on creativity and innovation undertaken by JRC-IPTS (Institute for Prospective Technological Studies). The literature highlights that teachers can have different views on creativity, leading to conceptual pitfalls and myths about what creativity is and how it can be promoted in school settings. A section of the questionnaire was therefore conceived to understand how respondents framed creativity and what they thought its relevance was for learning.

The literature also draws attention to a series of requisites for creative learning and innovative teaching. These enablers provide the circumstances or support mechanisms that make creativity and innovation more likely to thrive.

Enablers were identified in the following areas: assessment; school culture; curriculum; individual skills (of teachers and learners); teaching and learning format; teachers (their education, their professional culture and identity); technology; and tools (such as resources, material and spaces). The rest of the questionnaire was drafted on the basis of these enablers. For each area, the survey questions and sub-items proposed a series of options identifying practices working in support of and against creativity. For the present brochure not all enablers have been included.

In the context of the 2009 European Year of Creativity and Innovation, the teachers’ survey on creativity presented in this brochure, as well as being a stand-alone investigation carried out by European Schoolnet and JRC-IPTS, is also a part of a larger study entitled ICEAC (Creative Learning & Innovative Teaching: A study on Creativity and Innovation in Education in EU Member States) conducted by JRC-IPTS in collaboration with DG Education and Culture. The results of the ICEAC study will be published in 2010 and consists of (in addition to the teachers’ survey discussed in this brochure): a scoping workshop with experts, a literature review, an analysis of school curricula or learning objectives for compulsory education, interviews with education stakeholders, case studies of good practice, and a validation workshop.

The formulation of the survey and the analysis of the preliminary findings in this brochure are the result of a joint collaboration between JRC-IPTS and European Schoolnet.

6 - Please refer to section 5 for detailed information on the profile of respondents.


8 - The Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) is one of the seven scientific institutes of the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC). The mission of the JRC-IPTS is to provide customer-driven support to the EU policy-making process by developing science-based responses to policy challenges that have both a socio-economic as well as a scientific/technological dimension.

9 - See http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/iceac.html
Creativity can be applied to every school subject and everyone can be creative

An overwhelming majority of teachers are convinced that creativity can be applied to every domain of knowledge and that everyone can be creative. They also subscribe to the idea that creativity is a fundamental skill to be developed in schools, even if they are more ambiguous about how it can be taught, and less sure still about how it can be assessed.

Survey respondents were asked to express their opinion about how they view creativity, as a general concept as well as in the school context, on a scale of 5 ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The results are displayed in Figure 1.

Literature reports that very often people, including teachers, refer to creativity as being related exclusively to artistic or musical performances, as springing from natural talent, and as being the characteristic of a genius. These myths about creativity stifle the creative potential of students and create barriers to fostering creativity in schools.

To a large extent, the teachers that took part in our survey have an understanding of creativity which goes against such myths. Almost all teachers who took part in the survey are convinced that creativity can be applied to every domain of knowledge (95.5%) and to every school subject. More than 60% are even strongly convinced of this. They confirm this view very clearly by disagreeing to a large extent with a statement restricting creativity to the realm of artistic and cultural expression (85%).

An impressive majority of teachers believe that everyone can be creative (88%) and that creativity is not solely a characteristic of eminent people (80%). However, only 45.8% disagree that creativity is an inborn talent. This contrasts substantially with an overwhelming majority of teachers (94%), who support the idea that creativity is a fundamental skill to be developed in schools. Some teachers nevertheless express a more nuanced opinion when it comes to the feasibility of teaching creativity (70% agreeing that it can be taught, 23% neither agreeing nor disagreeing) and are even more dubious regarding the possibility to assess it (50% agreeing that it can be assessed, 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing).

Around half of the respondents believe that creativity varies according to the age of pupils. Interestingly, more than 70% of respondents understand creativity as being concerned with finding connections between things that have not been connected before. This reflects existing research which understands the encouragement of finding connections between unrelated things as a positive way of fostering creativity in schools.

Teachers’ views are in close alignment with what we know from research concerning the idea that everyone can be creative and that creativity applies to every domain of knowledge and to every school subject. This is an excellent starting point for any future educational policy targeted at grounding learning and teaching processes in more creative and innovative ways, supporting students’ active learning and empowerment. It also underlines that teachers need and would welcome support and guidance concerning ways of teaching and assessing creativity.
Fig. 1 % of teachers agreeing with statements about creativity
Teachers believe to a very large extent that Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) can be used to enhance creativity. They are more convinced of the usefulness of what can nowadays be considered as more traditional technologies (computers, Internet, educational software, etc.) than by more recently developed innovative and interactive technologies (social networks, blogs, digital games, mobile phones, etc.).

Survey respondents were asked to express their opinion about the extent to which ICT can be used to enhance creativity on a scale of 5 ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The results are displayed in Figure 2.

In each country, more than 80% of teachers who took part in the survey agree that ICT can be used to enhance creativity. However, the degree to which teachers believe in the usefulness of ICT for creativity varies substantially between countries. In around half of the countries, as many as 90% of teachers support the idea that ICT can enhance creativity (Portugal, Cyprus, United Kingdom, Spain, Malta, Bulgaria, Italy, Lithuania, Czech Republic and Estonia). More than 50% of teachers from Portugal, Cyprus, the United Kingdom, Spain, Malta and Bulgaria are even strongly convinced of the benefits of ICT for creativity. By contrast, only less than 25% of teachers from Finland, Estonia, Germany and Slovenia strongly believe in the usefulness of ICT for creative learning.
Fig.2 % of teachers by country agreeing with "ICT can be used to enhance creativity"
To investigate in more detail about the contribution of ICT to enhancing creativity, a specific question targeted teachers’ opinion about the importance of specific technologies. The results are displayed in Figure 3. Computers, educational software, videos, online collaborative tools, virtual learning environments, interactive whiteboards, and free online material and courses were all considered as very important. By contrast, blogs, social networking sites, podcasts, bookmarking and tagging sites, RSS feeds, digital games, and mobile phones were considered less important for learning.

Fig.3 Extent of agreement with the importance of certain technologies, on a scale from 0 to 10
To complement the question on teachers’ opinions on the usefulness of certain technologies, a further question inquired about teachers’ use of certain ICT tools, and more importantly, the context in which they use them. The results are displayed in Figure 4. Again, traditional technologies, like computers and the Internet are the most popular and most frequently used tools. Teachers mostly employ them to prepare their lessons, produce teaching materials and update their own knowledge and competences. Using computers to send assignments to pupils and keep track of their progress online is much rarer, as is the use of digital games.

**Fig. 4** Extent of use of ITC by teachers, on a scale from 0 to 10
The perception of the role of creativity in the curriculum varies considerably between teachers. On average, around half of teachers believe that creativity plays an important role in the curriculum and about a quarter consider that it does not. Moreover, teachers’ perception of the role and relevance of creativity in the curriculum varies considerably between countries. This is not surprising as school curricula are country specific. At first glance, there seems to be large scope for the development of creativity within the curriculum.

Survey respondents were asked to express their opinion about the importance of the role played by creativity in the curriculum, on a scale of 5 ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The results are displayed in Figure 5.

On average in a EU country, around 53% of the teachers surveyed agree that creativity plays an important role in the curriculum, and 20% are strongly convinced of this.

Teachers from Italy, Latvia, and the United Kingdom are particularly convinced of the important role creativity has in their national curricula. Around 75% of teachers in each of these 3 countries share this opinion, i.e. 78% in Italy, 77,5% in Latvia and 73,5% in the United Kingdom. Most notably, a large proportion of teachers from Italy and the United Kingdom strongly support this idea (48% and 47%, respectively).

Less than 50% of teachers from Portugal, Spain, Belgium, Slovakia, Slovenia, Germany, Hungary, France and Estonia consider that creativity plays an important role in the curriculum of their national education system. Only a small share of teachers in most of these countries are strongly convinced about the relevance of creativity in their country’s curricula.

In addition to contrasting situations across countries, the different views within countries are also to be noted. This calls for discussion and debate regarding the conceptualisation and implementation of creativity in the curriculum, so as to reach a more common understanding and shared practice within each national context.
Fig. 5  % of teachers agreeing with
"The development of students' creativity plays an important role in the curriculum"
Training in innovative pedagogies or methods seems to be widespread. Six teachers out of ten declare that they have received training in innovative pedagogies, compared to a relatively lower number of 4 teachers out of 10 who claim to have received training in creativity, and an even lower 36% who have received training in using ICT in the classroom.

The relatively lower ranking of training in the use of ICT in the classroom, compared to the other two types of training, does not come as a surprise as it is confirmed by a large number of recent national and international analyses and reports.

Some particular effort on the three issues in the Member States which joined after 2004 is to be noted, for example in Romania and Estonia.

The following pages look more in detail at each of the following issues separately: training in innovative pedagogies or methods, training in creativity, and training in the use of ICT in the classroom.

On average, about 4 teachers out of 10 have received training in creativity, with large differences between countries.

Respondents were asked to specify whether creativity had been covered by their teacher education, with the option of choosing between 'yes', 'no' or 'I don’t know'. The results are displayed in Figure 6.

On average (EU median value across countries), 40% of teachers in Europe declare to have received training in creativity. The situation however largely varies between countries. In Slovakia (66%), Estonia (65%) and Romania (62%) a notable number of teachers report they have received training in creativity, in contrast with only 14% of teachers in France, 25% in Lithuania, 27% in Hungary, 28% in the United Kingdom and 33% in Spain.
On average, about 4 teachers out of 10 have received training in creativity, with large differences between countries.

Fig. 6  % of teachers agreeing with "Creativity was covered in my teacher training"
Six teachers out of ten have received training in innovative pedagogies or methods, again with substantial differences between countries.

Survey respondents were asked to specify whether innovative pedagogies or methods had been covered by their teacher education, with the option of choosing between ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘I don’t know’. The results are displayed in Figure 7.

Innovative pedagogies or methods are better covered by teacher education than creativity. Around 60% of teachers in Europe (EU median) declare that these innovative pedagogies or methods have been covered by their teacher education, compared to 40% who declare creativity has been covered.

Again, the situation varies within Europe. In some countries, more than 70% of teachers declare to have received training in innovative pedagogies: Romania (76%), the United Kingdom (74%), Estonia (70%), and Poland (70%).

By contrast, around 30% of teachers in Finland (32%), Sweden (34%) and France (34%) declare to have received this type of training.
Fig. 7  % of teachers agreeing with "I have received training on innovative pedagogies or methods"
Over a third of teachers have received training in the use of ICT in the classroom, again with large between countries

Survey respondents were asked to specify whether the use of ICT in the classroom had been covered by their teacher education, with the option of choosing between ‘yes,’ ‘no’ or ‘I don’t know’. The results are displayed in Figure 8.

Around 36% of teachers declare to have received training on the use of ICT in the classroom.

Here again, the situation varies between countries. Teachers in Romania (67%) and Latvia (66%), as well as teachers in Greece (57%), Cyprus (56%), Malta (55%), Bulgaria (53%) and the Czech Republic (51%), declare that their education had covered this issue.

By contrast, much lower percentages of teachers from Germany (20%), Belgium (21%), Sweden (23%), Spain (24%), Portugal (25%), Lithuania (27%) and Slovenia (29%) claim they had received such training.
Fig. 8 % of teachers agreeing with "During my teacher training, I was taught how to use ICT in class"
Teachers’ opinions on creativity are to a certain extent reflected in what they report about school culture. Teachers were asked to agree or disagree on a series of factors fostered in their schools. From their responses it appears that creativity is widely encouraged (7.3/10 on a scale of agreement), as are other factors conducive to developing creativity, including empowering students’ learning processes (7.29/10) and open-mindedness (7.11/10). However, teachers consider that other important creativity enhancing factors, particularly mixing academic work and play (6.06) and risk-taking (5.43), are fostered to a much lesser degree in their schools.

Respondents were asked to express their opinion on the extent to which particular factors are fostered by their schools, ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’, which was later converted to a scale of 10 levels. The results are displayed in Figure 9.

The agreement on the extent to which schools address creativity (7.3/10) is in line with the view of the majority of teachers (94%), that creativity is an important skill to be developed in schools. Other creativity enhancing factors which are also reported as being fostered in schools to a high degree include extra curricular-activities (7.31), visits to museums (7.3), empowering students’ learning processes (7.29) and open-mindedness (7.11).

At the same time, factors that are not as obviously conducive to developing creativity, such as discipline (7.4), accuracy (7.1), and getting high marks (7.01), are also rated to a similar high extent. While these factors may have a positive or negative impact, or no impact at all on the development of creativity in students, it is widely recognized that they may stifle the flourishing of creativity if they are emphasized excessively in schools. There clearly exists a tension between teachers’ desire to foster learners’ creativity while at the same time striving for high attainment and effective class management.

Other factors mentioned in the academic literature as enhancing the development of creativity, such as allowing students to make mistakes (6.5), divergent and other thinking skills (6.46), and experimentation/trial and error (6.35), are rated relatively low. In particular, two factors which were rated considerably lower were mixing academic work and play (6.06), and risk-taking (5.43). A word of caution should be mentioned with regard to ‘risk-taking’ however, as although this can have positive connotations in relation to the development of creativity, it may also have been interpreted by teachers in more of a negative sense, considering that part of a school’s responsibility is to provide a safe learning environment.
Fig. 9  Extent to which particular factors are fostered by schools

- Rewarding of effort/perseverance: 7.47
- Discipline: 7.41
- Extra-curricular activities: 7.31
- Creativity: 7.30
- Visits to museums etc.: 7.30
- Empowering students learning process: 7.29
- Open-mindedness: 7.11
- Accuracy: 7.10
- Getting high marks: 7.01
- Cross-curricular activities: 6.92
- Allowing space for imagination: 6.80
- Organisation of arts activities: 6.72
- Applying skills/knowledge to real life: 6.63
- Allowing students to make mistakes: 6.50
- Divergent thinking and other thinking: 6.46
- Inviting external professionals into school: 6.45
- Experimentation / Trial and error: 6.35
- Conformity: 6.19
- Student initiatives: 6.18
- Giving students homework every day: 6.16
- Competition: 6.11
- Mix of academic work and play: 6.06
- Risk-taking: 5.43
Participation by country

Respondents were asked to specify the country in which they teach; only one answer was possible out of a closed list of countries. The results are displayed in Figure 10.

Just above half of respondents from the EU27 (54.5%) come from four countries, i.e. Italy (18%), Greece (15.5%), Spain (12%) and Poland (9%).

Some largely populated countries are under-represented in the sample. This is specifically the case for France, Germany and the United Kingdom, even though extra effort to increase the response rate was dedicated to these countries.

Several reasons can explain the differences in participation: the nature and extent of the survey’s promotion at national level, some countries’ higher participation rate in eTwinning (representing one of the channels through which the survey was disseminated), European initiatives enjoying higher popularity in some national education systems, etc. This aspect will be investigated further and more specific hypotheses will be presented in the final analysis.

10 - The average values that result from the survey may therefore deviate somewhat from the EU average. For that reason, weighting methods will be used in the forthcoming detailed analysis, in order to calculate “EU averages”. In the present brochure with preliminary results, the median or middle value across EU countries has been used as a proxy for the European average.
Fig. 10  Number of respondents by country

- Italy: 1707
- Greece: 1493
- Spain: 1133
- Poland: 866
- Bulgaria: 418
- Finland: 382
- Estonia: 362
- Hungary: 337
- Sweden: 303
- Lithuania: 276
- France: 267
- Czech Republic: 223
- Slovakia: 217
- Portugal: 216
- Latvia: 193
- Germany: 185
- Belgium: 172
- Romania: 168
- Slovenia: 119
- United Kingdom: 114
- Cyprus: 99
- Malta: 62
- Denmark: 46
- Ireland: 37
- Netherlands: 32
- Austria: 26
- Luxembourg: 7
Respondents were asked to specify the qualification(s) they hold; several answers were possible out of a defined list of proposals, i.e. Bachelor degree in education and/or in a subject other than education, Initial Teacher Training Certificate/Post Graduate Certificate in Education, Masters in education and/or in a subject other than education, MPhil in education and/or in a subject other than education, PhD in education and/or in a subject other than education. The results are displayed in Figure 12.

The following results are based on the highest qualification level declared by each respondent.

There is a balanced representation of teachers holding a Bachelor Degree as their highest qualification and teachers holding a Masters Degree, i.e. 45% in each case.
Fig. 11: Subjects taught by respondents

- Foreign languages: 26.9%
- Primary school subjects: 20.8%
- ICT - Informatics: 13.2%
- National language/literature: 13.1%
- History: 11.3%
- Mathematics / Geometry: 11.2%
- Other subjects: 10.1%
- Geography: 8.1%
- Cross-curricular subjects: 7.2%
- Special needs education: 6.7%
- Environmental education: 6.5%
- Pre-school subjects: 6.0%
- Physics: 5.5%
- Visual arts: 5.3%
- Citizenship: 5.2%
- Biology: 5.0%
- Chemistry: 4.7%
- Music: 4.6%
- Design and Technology: 3.9%
- Health studies: 3.8%
- Physical education: 3.7%
- Social studies / Sociology: 3.5%
- Economics: 3.2%
- Latin or Greek (classic): 3.2%
- Sciences (all): 3.1%
- Religion / Theology: 2.9%
- History of art: 2.9%
- Ethics: 2.5%
- Drama / Theatre studies: 2.5%
- Media education: 2.4%
- Psychology: 2.1%
- Philosophy / Logic: 2.1%
- European studies: 1.4%
- Geology: 1.4%
- Law: 1.1%
- Politics: 1.1%
- Home economics: 1.0%
Respondents were asked to specify the subject(s) they teach; several answers were possible out of a defined list of subjects. The results are displayed in Figure 11.

Around a quarter of the respondents (26.9%) teach foreign languages (possibly in addition to other subjects). Foreign language teachers’ participation in European projects has repeatedly been observed, and is also noted for example in eTwinning. There is no over-representation of teachers teaching subjects generally thought to be more creative, such as the arts or music.

Around a fifth of the respondents teach a subject at primary level. The next most highly rated subjects are ICT/informatics, national language/literature, history and mathematics/geometry.
Fig. 12 Distribution of qualification levels
Gender, age distribution and number of years of teaching

Respondents were asked to specify their gender and age. The results are displayed in Figure 13.

Female teachers are largely predominant in all age groups, as they are in the teaching workforce as a whole.

Around a third of the respondents have been teaching for 10 to 20 years (see Figure 14), and a little bit more than a third for more than 20 years. Only a minority of respondents started teaching quite recently. As the sample is composed predominantly of rather experienced teachers, it is even more striking that a vast majority of them believe in the benefits of technologies for enhancing creativity.

In the final detailed analysis these results will be correlated with statistics about teacher population in the countries covered. It can nevertheless already be noted at this stage that the sample characteristics roughly mirror the general profile of the teacher population throughout Europe.
Fig. 13  Gender and age distribution of respondents

Fig. 14  Number of years teachers have been teaching
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