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ABSTRACT

Since their establishment in the 1960s, Universities of Technology in South Africa have been taking pride in providing career-focused qualifications that match the intermediate needs of the economy. In order to provide these career-focused qualifications, these institutions have been focusing on enacting a curriculum framework that emphasizes replication of industrial processes which tended to accentuate routinized, conventional problem-solving. The shift in economic paradigm in the 21st Century and the general dissatisfaction with graduate readiness in the workplace as evident in both local and international literature, framed as employability skills or generic skills, suggest a new impetus being placed on creativity, especially in engineering education. This study attempted to develop final-year undergraduates’ creativity through making visible the key features of a pedagogic practice, by analyzing the existing engineering undergraduate pedagogic practices, and reconceptualizing and testing a pedagogy that could potentially develop undergraduates’ creativity. The reconceptualized pedagogy, enacted as “learnshops”, accentuated teamwork, collaborative inquiry, guided creative problem-solving and the use of case studies to encourage students to seek the higher designs of water, paper and energy technologies within their institution. Design-Based Research (DBR) frames the methodology and methods of data collection and analysis.

The research results show that existing engineering undergraduate pedagogic practices remain trapped in the skills training discourse that emphasizes conventional problem-solving in curriculum enactment. Students' meanings of creativity remain generally eclectic prior and post involvement in the learnshops, although students’ creativity conceptions become more focused on imagination and resourcefulness post-learnshops. The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) scores show that students’ creativity increased as a result of exposure to learnshops. Students working in teams of intermediate size to creatively solve given open-ended tasks related to sustainable development were able to achieve cooperation and generate useful ideas with the help of pedagogic interventions implemented during the learnshops. Itinerant membership as an aspect of team formation has little effect on teams’ generation of ideas.

**Keywords:** Creativity, curriculum, pedagogy, learnshops, teamwork, DBR
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Six days a week, at the exact same time, the locomotive slices through the stillness of the landscape. Neither the trees nor the hills take note; only the cow watches the train go by. From his cab, the engineer waves a hand in greeting and the animal responds by swishing her tail back and forth, which also serves to fan her udders. They’ve been repeating this ritual for years, but the engineer knows that today is the last time. He’s retiring tomorrow. He’ll have time to tend the tiny patch of grass by the door of the house he’s finally paid off. He’ll be able to take vacations during low season, at discounted prices. He’ll no longer have to try to motivate himself every morning by repeating that work is a source of dignity, or to endure the presence of his assistant, a sullen, stingy man. The engineer pulls out of the station, his head filled with endless plans – most of which are actually feasible. He pays no attention to the winding tunnels leading to a series of rundown suburbs or the buildings lining the tracks, crowned with neon-lit advertising. He isn’t taking pleasure in his final moments, or thinking that he’ll never again be in charge of the locomotive’s throttle. His mind wandering through a nap filled future, he drives past the urban sprawl and towards a landscape where various shades of green and the intermittent smell of manure prevail. When he sees the cow in the distance, he instinctively reduces his speed, noting his assistant’s look of disapproval. As he nears the cow it occurs to him that simply waving is not enough. So he slows down, his eye on the speedometer’s needle until it comes to rest at zero. Slowly – trying not to jam his spine and set off his chronic back pain – he climbs down onto the tracks. With the faltering steps of a man unaccustomed to seeing his feet when he walks, he crosses the field toward the cow. The animal, having sensed the train halting, stops swishing her tail. She turns her head to get a better look at the engineer, who gingerly – as if rather than a cow she were a lion – reaches out a hand to pet the animal. The ruminant lets out a moo that scares off the swarm of flies normally clustered around her eyes. She glances at the train. Despite the distance she can make out the thin spiral of smoke trailing up from the sullen assistant’s cigarette. At the windows, passengers shout, demanding that the engineer get back immediately. They have no time to waste, they say. This is unacceptable. A more patient minority, however, looks on as a man who – judging by his uniform – must be an engineer hugs a cow for what seems quite some time and then, having finished, returns to the train with the satisfaction of one who has done his duty.
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