FOSTERING CREATIVITY WITH WISDOM

Anna Craft
The Open University, UK

Abstract: Over the past five years, creativity has become a focus of attention for policy makers in education. However, the increased interest in creativity has occurred as if without reference to any value framework. This article suggests that in fact an invisible underpinning value framework has been provided by Western individualism, in turn both supporting and driven by the globalized capitalist marketplace.

What could this mean for nurturing creativity with wisdom in schools? Working from the stance that wisdom involves making thoughtful, well-informed and appropriate judgments leading to sound courses of action with regard to the consequences, this paper discusses some significant objections to a market-driven model of creativity in education, discusses a possible framework for understanding creativity in a way which emphasizes responsibility as well as rights to expression and proposes wisdom as a necessary element of pedagogy.
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INTRODUCTION

The years since the late 1990s have seen an increased call for creativity in education by policy makers in many parts of the world. This is the latest in a number of waves of policy-makers’ interest in creativity, as documented elsewhere (Bentley, 1998, Craft, 2002, 2005a, Jeffrey and Craft, 2001).
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In England, this has led to a burgeoning of activity designed to nurture the creativity of children and young adults in both formal and informal learning contexts. Some of this has been characterized by ‘creative partnerships’ between expert professionals beyond the learning setting, and those professionals engaged in supporting learning within the setting. Some attention has also been paid to how adults can be better nourished in enabling such creativity, with the commitment of some resources in this direction also (for example through several funded projects, such as the Creative Partnerships initiative). In general the increased emphasis on creativity within society has been greeted by educators and ‘creative partners’ as a positive move.

The political call for creativity is one which often couches creativity as a universal attribute, suggesting a need for greater creativity in order to both survive as well as thrive in the 21st Century (Craft, 2002, Seltzer and Bentley, 1999). This case is made explicitly in policy documents in some parts of the world. In England, the 1997 White Paper, *Excellence in Schools* (DFEE, 1997), focused on preparing young people ‘successfully for the twenty-first century’, by recognising the different talents of all people. This position was extended by the work of the National Advisory Committee for Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE, 1999) which talked of the need to provide young people with skills and approaches required by employers. The report acknowledged that alongside high standards of academic achievement, employers now required ‘people who can adapt, see connections, innovate, communicate and work with others’ (NACCCE, 1999, p.13).

Interestingly, the NACCCE Report brought together educational and cultural policy-making in the context of learning and indeed brought together two government departments: the Department for Education and Skills, and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Whilst the two arenas are related, they clearly are subtly different in their purposes and their goals. Yet, proposals in the NACCCE Report provided a foundation for other, more recent, educational policy moves in England, such as:

- The funding of specialist schools from the mid 1990s as documented by both the Department for Education and Skills (2005) and the Specialist Schools’ Trust, itself established in 1987 (DFES, 2005, SST, 2005), and within the Specialist Schools Trust, the emergence of specific Creative Learning Projects, such as ‘CLASS’: Creative Learning and Specialist Subjects.
• The establishment of the generously-funded national programme, Creative Partnerships (Creative Partnerships, 2005a) and flowing out of this the Creative Action Research Awards (Creative Partnerships, 2005b).
• The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority Creativity Project (QCA 2005a, 2005b).
• Work at the National College for School Leadership from 2002 when it was established, through a series of Leading Edge Creativity seminars and projects still ongoing at the time of writing (November, 2005) exploring the nature of leadership for creativity in schools, and ongoing work (NCSL, 2005).
• The publishing by DfES of the book, Excellence and Enjoyment, for primary schools, in May 2003 (DfES, 2003), exhorting primary schools to take creative and innovative approaches to the curriculum and to place creativity high on their agendas, followed by materials (DfES, 2004) to encourage this.
• The introduction of Every Child Matters from 2003 (Every Child Matters, 2003, 2005)– a government initiative designed to ensure the well-being of children and young people from birth to age 19, by supporting them in being health, staying safe, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution and achieving economic well-being; an agenda which is, perhaps ALL about resilience, resourcefulness, and lifewide creativity (Craft, 2002, 2005a).

And, as of late 2005, in England, the attention to creativity in education by policy makers shows no sign of abating yet. In June mid-June 05, a further review of creativity in schools was announced by the new Creative Industries Minister James Purnell, as part of his major debate on how Britain can become the world’s creative hub (DCMS, 2005). This Review, led by Paul Roberts of the Improvement and Development Agency (IDEA), began in the Autumn of 2005 and will run until February 2006 when advice to Ministers is expected.

The picture is similar elsewhere in the world including Australia (Australia Council for the Arts, 2005), Canada (as discussed by Woods, 2002), Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong as discussed by Fryer (2003), Scotland (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2005, Scottish Executive, 2004) and moves are also being made in this direction in the United States in the form of a national enquiry exploring creativity, education and the economy, through Education Commission of the States (2005). Recent developments in creativity in education particularly in relation to the arts in many countries including Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Iceland, The Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland and the United States of America are summarised by the International Federation of Arts Council and Culture Agencies (2005).
The establishment of creativity has occurred, in many parts of the world, with direct reference to the value framework of Western individualism, driven by the capitalist globalized marketplace. For example, the Scottish Executive published on its website in April 2004 the following statement by Frank McAveety, MSP, Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport, regarding creativity: “The creativity of Scots - from the classroom to the boardroom - is the edge we need in a competitive world. Our duty as an Executive is to create the conditions that allow that creativity to flourish - whether in arts, sciences, commerce or industry. ….Creativity is as valuable in retail, education, health, government and business as in culture. The cultural sector should become the national dynamo of the creative impulse that can serve all these areas” (Scottish Executive, 2004). This was the precursor to the establishment of a Commission in June 2004 comprising of representatives from various sections of the cultural sector and chaired by James Boyle, to refine the cultural and creative strategy for Scotland.

Such arguments and perspectives have been in emergence since the early 1990s, as the following quotation from a Canadian Ministry of Education document on ‘Year 2000 Framework Learning’ demonstrates: ‘in view of the new social and economic realities, all students, regardless of their immediate plans following school, will need to develop a flexibility and a versatility undreamed of by previous generations [and to]. employ critical and creative thinking skills to solve problems and make decisions (Ministry of Education, 1991, p.2, quoted in Woods, 2002 p79).

The case is made, also, in the Far East. For example, Ng and Lin (2004) point out that in Singapore, one desired learning outcome for pupils at the end of their schooling (i.e. pre-higher education), set in the context of being able to think creatively and independently, is that they should ‘have an entrepreneurial … spirit’ (The Ministry of Education, 1998).

Implied, it seems, in such policy statements, is the notion that performance in the market place is itself seen an indicator of creativity. This is a position adopted by some analysts also. Florida (2002), for example, offering controversial comment on economic development, links the high value placed on creativity— with the suggestion that in North America, it is led by the growth of a ‘Creative Class’, i.e. engineers, architects, scientists, artists, educators and entertainers, whose economic function is to create new technology, new creative content and above all, new ideas. Florida’s thesis is that the group is growing in size and influence, with an already profound impact on work and lifestyle, in being both self-directed and high-achieving. He argues that urban economic development occurs through plural and diverse inner cities (with high populations of bohemians, ethnic minorities and gay people for example) because creative workers are drawn to live in such...
places. Although it has serious critics (for example, Malangi, 2004), Florida’s work has been influential in urban redesign and regeneration in the United States.

**OBJECTIONS TO A MARKET DRIVEN APPROACH TO CREATIVITY IN EDUCATION**

In some countries, such as England, the introduction of a focus on creativity can be seen as representing a significant shift in emphasis from a highly ‘performative’ education focus introduced in the last decade of the 20th century, characterized by a compulsory school curriculum, very strong guidance for some aspects of pedagogy, and a testing and inspection regime which seemed to some to reduce the profession of teaching to that of a technicist role (Ball, 2003, Craft, 2003, Jeffrey and Craft, 2001, Jeffrey and Woods, 1998, Woods and Jeffrey, 2002). To the extent that recent calls for creativity in education are seen as countering this performative culture, many teachers and schools have welcomed it with open arms (Jeffrey and Woods, 2003, Woods and O'Shannessy, 2002).

However, it could be argued that there are some fundamental problems with the market driven context to the focus on creativity, which elsewhere I have called ‘blind spots’ (Craft, 2005b); here referred to as problems. Both problems stem from the market-driven foundation on which the call for creativity in education is based.

The first problem is the question of culture. Policy statements calling for increased creativity in some universalised form are made with no reference to macro- or sub-cultural values—a ‘universalization’ of creativity (Jeffrey and Craft, 2001). The lack of reference to values has been described as ‘culture blind’ (Ng, 2003). It is suggested, then, that creativity is called for in the context of liberal individualism tied to a market economy (Craft, 2005a, 2005b, Ng, 2003). The discourse around creativity is one in which high value is placed on individuality, thinking generatively outside of social and other norms, and which also values highly innovative engagement with the economy as both producer and consumer (Jeffrey and Craft, 2001).

The second problem concerns the consequences of emphasising the role of creativity in selling ideas and products. One of the effects of promoting a culture which encourages and rewards continual innovation in the context of a market place, is that the drive to innovate further becomes an end in itself. The re-furbishment, further development and re-use of old artefacts and ideas seem subservient to the shiny mantra of making profit; where new and fashionable is better than make do and mend. Designing products and services not only to be out of fashion within a short time but also to cease
working, so they have to be thrown away rather than repaired or restored, is seen as unproblematic. I want to ask the question, then, how desirable is the norm of innovation demanded by this global economy? To what extent is it WISE for educators to play any role in further developing and sustaining the ‘throw-away’ culture?

These problems were raised, among others, in an earlier paper (Craft, 2003) in which I sought to open a debate about the extent to which educators should accept the re-emphasis on creativity in the curriculum as unproblematic. In that paper I named a variety of limits to creativity in education which included social, environmental and ethical problems, and also looked at some practical challenges that these pose for teachers. For further development of these points, see Craft (2005b).

In this paper, however, I seek to explore some of the issues that face teachers and schools in nurturing their students’ creativity. And in order to address some of these questions of value from classroom perspectives, I connect the question of ‘wisdom’ with the job of nurturing creativity.

WISDOM AND CREATIVITY

As Ardelt (2005) notes in her introduction to Sternberg and Jordan’s Handbook of Wisdom (Sternberg and Jordan, 2005), after twenty-five years of research on the topic of wisdom, a uniform definition still does not exist. In part this is because accounts are located in multiple domains and perspectives, including the socio-cultural (Takahashi and Overton, 2005), the philosophical (Osbeck and Robinson, 2005), the psychological (Kunzmann and Baltes, 2005) as well as the implicit (Bluck and Gluck, 2005). Clearly, too, definitions of wisdom are bounded by time and by space (Birren and Svensson, 2005).

This article draws on the psychological literature, in which the existence of several current dominant Schools of thought in the study of wisdom, has been noted by Bassett (2006). The first, and perhaps the most influential in terms of what wisdom could mean for learning, is the approach which explores wisdom as intellectual functioning and expertise—encompassing the Berlin School with the Berlin Wisdom Paradigm (Baltes and Staudinger, 2000) and also Sternberg’s team formerly at Yale with the balance theory (Sternberg, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2004). Both the Berlin School and Sternberg’s work, emphasise the metacognitive skill elements of wisdom concerning the practicalities and pramatics of lived life.

Another school of thought, by contrast, emphasizes varied personal attributes of wisdom; exploring for example the role of age, gender, educational attainment and occupation (for example, Ardelt, 2000, 2003,
Denney et al. 1995, Webster 2003, Wink and Helson, 1997). These are a diverse set of studies, from which little can be generalized, and this school perhaps offers less insight in terms of learning, as the first school.

Finally a third approach sees wisdom in relation to Piagetian stage-theory of development, as an aspect of post-formal development, framing wisdom as exceptional self-development, enabled through a decentering of the ego and the capacity to think dialectically recognizing alternative truths and inherent contradictions (for example, Kitchener and Brenner, 1990, Cook-Greuter, 2000). This approach offers, then, a developmental trajectory given its location within a developmental theory.

How wisdom may relate to creativity in the context of learning in classrooms, is perhaps best informed by the first school of thought, which sees wisdom as intellectual functioning and expertise. The potential contribution of the third school is also considered later in the paper.

**Wisdom as intellectual functioning and expertise**

The notion of wisdom is described by leading researchers at the Max-Planck Institute, Berlin and the International University, Bremen (collectively referred to here as the Berlin School), as bringing together characteristics of knowledge, mental capacities and virtue (Baltes and Kunzmann, 2004, Baltes and Staudinger, 2000). This research group defines wisdom as ‘an expert knowledge system about fundamental problems related to the meaning and conduct of life’ (Baltes and Stange, 2005, p.196)—such that appropriate courses of action are then determined, which take account of multiple perspectives. This is not dissimilar to the definition cited by Sternberg (2003) from the Webster’s New World College Dictionary, which emphasizes appropriate and sound action informed by a mix of knowledge, understanding and experience as follows: ‘power of judging rightly and following the soundest course of action, based on knowledge, experience, understanding, etc.’ (Webster’s New World College Dictionary, 1997, p.1533, cited in Sternberg, 2003, p.147).

Taking a laboratory approach to the exploration of wisdom, the Berlin School identifies five criteria for labeling any action ‘wise’ (Baltes and Staudinger, 2000). Two they describe as basic criteria:

- rich factual knowledge of human nature and human life course
- rich procedural knowledge of possibilities for engaging with life problems

The remaining three are seen as ‘meta-criteria’ and are considered by the group to be ‘unique to wisdom’ (Baltes and Stange, 2005):
• lifespan contextualism (i.e. understanding of multiple contexts of life and their inter-relationships in concurrent temporality as well as over the life span)
• value tolerance and relativism (i.e. understanding of differences between individuals, group and wider social/cultural values and priorities)
• knowledge about handling uncertainty (including limits in knowledge: both one’s own and collective, regarding the world at large). (Baltes and Stange, 2005)

From their studies of wisdom-related knowledge, the activation of this and the emotional, motivational and social dynamics of wisdom related knowledge, the research group suggests that whilst wisdom can be associated with aging, it is not an automatic outcome of growing older. Their work contradicts the position advanced by the third school theorists highlighted by Bassett (2005, in press) and discussed above, who view wisdom in terms of postformal-operational thinking as proposed by Piaget (1932).

By contrast, the Berlin School propose the need for a range of supportive processes and conditions relating to personality, cognitive capacities, environment and life history, which nurture a person’s capacity to orientate toward a ‘common-good’ perspective as opposed to adopting a more ‘self-centred’ orientation.

In a world which could be seen as increasingly driven by liberal individualist ideologies which provide the incubator for the development of children and young people, this need for supportive processes and conditions may provide a particular set of challenges for educators. Indeed, studies by the research group at Harvard University known as the GoodWork Project, working in conjunction with researchers at Claremont and Stanford Universities, suggest a decreasing tendency to prioritise the ‘common-good’ perspective among ambitious young people seeking to excel, in three professions studied (journalism, science and acting) (Fischman et al, 2004). The research team, whose early conceptualizations of their project sited within a wisdom-related framework, calling their initial work ‘humane creativity’, note that common threads across all three professions was the propensity to cut corners and bend rules, to see oneself as operating alone rather than part of a community in which peers and others including respected elders provide a set of reference points which inform their actions. A salient theme in their findings is that “younger workers are faced with conflicts for which they have little guidance… in struggling with these conflicts they are loath to pass judgment on others; and they believe, in turn, that they ought to be given latitude to do what they feel is right.” (Fischman et al, p.142).
It seems, then, that the studies of both the Berlin School and the GoodWork project at Harvard, suggest that whilst not age-related, the development of wisdom (i.e. appropriate action taking account of multiple forms of understanding and knowledge, and taking account of the multiple needs and perspectives), is increasingly difficult to achieve in today’s world. It could be argued that the predominance of the capitalist marketplace has served to erode the notion of service, of responsibility to others and, even, possibly, as Margaret Thatcher famously commented, some twenty-five years ago, in an interview in Woman’s Own Magazine, the very existence of ‘society’.

Educators do, it seems, face an interesting dilemma. For with the impetus to nurture creativity comes a set of assumptions which imply individual engagement and success, which may run counter to ‘wise action’. For, as Sternberg (2003) argues, ‘wisdom is not just about maximizing one’s own or someone else’s self-interest, but about balancing various self-interests (intrapersonal) with the interests of others (interpersonal) and of other aspects of the context in which one lives (extrapersonal), such as one’s city or country or environment or even God. Wisdom also involves creativity, in that the wise solution to a problem may be far from obvious’. (p.152). Sternberg’s ‘balance theory’ of wisdom thus proposes wisdom in terms of successfully balancing interests. It also recognizes that ‘wise solutions are often creative ones’ (p.158) and proposes that wisdom is related to ‘creatively insightful thinking’ (p.158).

Sternberg (2003) makes the point, however, that ‘although wise thinking must be, to some extent, creative, creative thinking … need not be wise’ (p.158). Earlier in the paper it was argued that, since the policy perspective on the generation of creativity in classrooms by teachers and schools appears to be value neutral, and lacks any moral and ethical framework, thus the very encouragement of creativity in education raises some fundamental questions and dilemmas (such as cultural blindness and over-marketisation). It could certainly be argued that creativity, developed without wisdom, may not serve children, their families and communities, and the wider social and cultural groupings to which they belong—and thus may be seen as a questionable endeavour.

How might such studies of wisdom inform learning and teaching in classrooms?
Chapter

WISDOM IN THE CLASSROOM?

As discussed earlier, the work of the Berlin School suggests that the development of wisdom is not necessarily correlated with age, implying that it may be developed in the classroom.

Claxton (2005) raises interesting questions around how wise action may be developed in classrooms, suggesting it may be helpful to “leave open the question of the extent to which wise action or wise judgment has to draw upon deliberate, systematic, conscious and even intellectual forms of thought” (ibid, p.1)… he goes on to argue, “Wise action may manifest in a highly intuitive and spontaneous way, just as much as—or perhaps even more than—it requires explicit rationality. Wise action, at least as I use the term, often has a light and contingent quality that ponderous rationality—the methodical weighing up of pros and cons, and so on—often lacks.” (ibid, p.1). Claxton also notes that acting wisely involves “the inclination to look for wise solutions, and not just the cognitive ability to do so.” (ibid, p.9).

So—if ‘wisdom’ were involved in the job of nurturing creativity, and if wisdom were to be a core objective in both learner creativity and the kinds of pedagogies that might support this, what could this mean for learning and teaching in classrooms? We could see this as playing out on the levels of both pedagogy and learning.

Whether we are considering pedagogy or learning, Sternberg’s ‘balance’ theory (2003) appears to offer a framework for the task of developing creativity with wisdom in the classroom, for it emphasizes the multiplicity of perspectives that need to be brought to bear. Wise action according to Sternberg involves actively balancing intrapersonal, interpersonal and extrapersonal interests. Although Sternberg suggests that creativity may not necessarily involve wisdom, I would suggest that if we bring Wisdom to the fore in nurturing creativity in the classroom, then effectively we encourage both teachers and their pupils to consider the impact of their ideas not only on themselves but on others, and with their wider environment. We are then, encouraging the development of creativity with responsibility, paying attention to the impact of our ideas in multiple ways. Doing this requires, as Baltes and Staudinger (2000) note, knowledge of human nature and knowledge of how to engage with problems which life brings with it. This suggests a need for experience alongside the capacity to understand and to balance perspectives.

As Baltes and Stange (2005) point out, being able to take on multiple perspectives, also means being able to understand multiple contexts and interrelationships between these, being able to accept value relativism, and being comfortable with handling uncertainty.
Thus, the teacher who exercises creative pedagogy with wisdom, considers the potential impact of her ideas not only on herself in terms of her own personal satisfaction, but on others (pupils, colleagues and perhaps the wider community) and also the wider context (for example the local area). And pupils for whom wisdom is a component of their creativity as it is nurtured, consider how their ideas will affect others and the wider context as well as themselves. Classrooms and schools which nurture these capacities, might, then, help adults and children to understand uncertainty, relativism, interrelationship and human nature in the context of these. In schools where a ‘creative partnership’ has been formed such that teachers and creative practitioners collaborate on supporting children’s learning, perhaps there is a particular kind of opportunity to broaden out perspectives in this way.

But how might this be done in practice? Noting the essentially moral ingredient to wise action, Claxton (2005) argues the need for ‘a degree of disinterestedness on the part of the actor which enables them to ‘stand back from the fray’ and see the predicament more objectively, and in more of its all-round complexity’ (Claxton, 2005, p.5). He suggests this goes hand in hand with a degree of responsibility rather than laissez-faire, and also ‘the ability of the wise actor not only to ‘get out of the way’, but also to empathise’ (Claxton, 2005, p9). Claxton proposes some possible components and precursors, to developing wisdom in the classroom. One of these is nurturing ‘the disposition towards empathy’ (Claxton, 2005, p9). He uses the term disposition in order to emphasise the inclination toward such behaviour; as he puts it, ‘To act wisely, one must deploy one’s empathy (for example) spontaneously and appropriately. (Claxton, 2005, p.9)—and cites practice in which the cultivation of empathy in primary classrooms has been successful (Claxton 1999, 2002). He proposes the notion of proto-sagacity in recognition of the role played by experience in making wise judgements in any context, let alone the context of nurturing creativity.

The development of empathy may be particularly served by the engagement within the classroom of a mix of experience and expertise, such that young people meet a mix of perspectives as a matter of course. In this way, creative partnerships, sometimes established in the service of nurturing creativity, may also serve to develop some of the precursors for developing creativity with wisdom. It has been suggested that the formation of creative partnerships in nurturing learning in classrooms offer opportunities for re-conceptualising the role of the classroom teacher in nurturing creativity, in ways which address ethical, social and environmental responsibility in fostering creative engagement through creative partnership between teachers and artists or other creative practitioners (Craft, 2005). The framing and development of partnership is explored by (Griffiths and Woolf, 2004) but as partnership work continues to evolve, to include the early years (Churchill
Dower, 2004) through to post-compulsory and higher education (Jeffery et al, 2005), investigation into how such relationships are set up, nurtured and sustained, how they relate to notions of ‘teacher’ and ‘artist’, and their contribution to nurturing the creativity with wisdom of all involved, could form part of a future development and research agenda.

Other strategies which may facilitate the development of creativity with wisdom both in pedagogy and learning include fostering a classroom environment in which ideas are subject to exploration and critical scrutiny, such that it is not the case that when it comes to creative endeavours, ‘anything goes’ but far from it. Introducing protocols within the classroom can provide frameworks in which the evaluation of ideas and products produced by children can occur in an unthreatening and supportive manner, as work at Harvard’s Project Zero has demonstrated (Blythe, 1999 and Blythe et al 1998).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article the apparently value-free nature of creativity as portrayed through policy development, has been highlighted, and the case made for a need to develop creativity with wisdom, such that cultural blindness and environmental disregard do not ultimately permeate the nurturing of creativity in schools. Possible ways of achieving this in both pedagogy and learning, have been explored.

However, implied within the notion of developing creativity with wisdom, as the notion of ‘progo-sagacity’ suggests, is the development of the capacity for moral judgement. Whilst the Berlin School cited earlier in the article may reject age- and stage- based approaches to thinking about the developmental of wisdom, those in search of explanatory models of moral development may be drawn to the third school of thought. This school includes work on the notion of ‘emergent wisdom’ (Bassett, 2005), as part of a system of engagement which produces special, higher-level thinking or intelligence that shifts thinking from egocentric to a deep recognition of interdependence.

There are significant challenges in age- and stage- based theories such as this, as highlighted by the developmental work of Kohlberg (1981, 1984), whose age- and stage- based model of moral development was based on the Piagetian model of logical-mathematical development (Piaget, 1932, Piaget and Inhelder, 1969). It provides a useful reminder that the fostering of creativity with wisdom may be integrally related to the nurturing of moral development and there is therefore potential for teachers to highlight the ethical and moral issues that arise from creativity. At the least this may
mean recognizing that, during the 20th Century in particular creativity was resourced, developed and applied in what might be seen as undesirable and unethical ways.

It could certainly be argued that the development of creativity with wisdom is no less located in a view of western individualism than the notion of creativity itself. What this paper argues for is the need to surface a moral and ethical framework—and with this the recognition of multiple perspectives—into the fostering of creativity in classrooms. It has suggested that fundamentally we might seek in classrooms to ask ourselves as adults and encourage children to ask, what ends their (and our) creativity serves; and thus to foster creativity with wisdom. Writing Wisdom into the framing of creative teaching and learning (and, perhaps, the researching of it) will naturally involve the recognition and exploration of multiple approaches to wisdom itself.
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i This is a large-scale, empirical project, spread over ten years, based at Harvard University’s Project Zero and working in collaboration with research groups at Stanford University and The University of Chicago. Co-directed by Professors Howard Gardner, Mihaly Csikszentmihaly and William Damon, it explores how professionals in the United States succeed or fail in carrying out work that is excellent, ethical and engaging in the face of powerful market conditions, and rapid changes in society. It has worked with 12000 subjects in nine domains and the results of the study have been written up in half a dozen books and dozens of articles. More information about the GoodWork Project can be found on the website: http://www.goodworkproject.org/

ii A term developed by Jonathan Rowson in his doctoral work at Bristol University.

iii Clearly another dimension of this would include how researchers can investigate creativity with wisdom.