

Some conditions for creative partnerships in education

RICHARD G. BAGNALL

Hong Kong Institute of Education

Abstract

This paper focuses on the use of partnerships in education as a means of facilitating the development of creativity in and through education. Educational partnerships may be understood as varying in their relationship to the learners involved, forming a hierarchical progression from partnerships that are directed towards learning, through partnerships for learning, to partnerships in learning. These types of relationship suggest a range of minimal requirements through which a partnership of a given type might successfully operate over four dimensions: teleological, functional, ethical, and political. In satisfying those minimal requirements, the development and maintenance of successful partnerships at higher levels may be seen as more resource-intensive than of partnerships at lower levels. There is also suggested a broad progression of partnership realities from lower to higher levels. At the lower levels, the minimal requirements imply a degree of precision, formality and rigidity in the partnership arrangements – suggesting the utility of straightforwardly formal contracts to ensure clarity and simplicity of the partnership parameters. At higher levels, the minimal requirements imply much more dynamic, organic, tentative, open, informal and flexible partnership parameters – suggesting the need for minimally constraining partnership agreements.

The likelihood of achieving (more) creative responses to educational situations through partnerships may be expected to be greater according to the extent to which the minimal conditions are realised or exceeded in each type of partnership. They may also be expected to be greater across the hierarchy of partnership types (towards, for and in learning) – although the achievement of other intended outcomes of the activity clearly may not follow that sequence.

Introduction

Partnerships in education suggest themselves as a straightforwardly sensible means of facilitating the development of creativity in and through education. At the very least, the combining of different perspectives, modus operandi and expertise through a partnership may be expected to enhance the likelihood of the educational engagement or its outcomes being creative in nature. There may also be expected to be generated some interactive effects of those combinations – effects exceeding in nature or magnitude the merely aggregative combination of realities and expertise introduced by different partners. Correspondingly, partnerships are not uncommonly advocated or entered into as a means of enhancing the creativity of the outcomes. The partnership reported, for example, by Aiello and Watson (2007) was directed to developing a learning culture in the one of the partner organisations (a secondary school). Similarly, the partnership reported by Kiggins and Cambourne (2007) sought to create what they termed a ‘knowledge building community’. More generally, many partnerships between schools and universities are directed to the development of more creative educational programs in the school partner, for example, those described by Campoy (2002), Trubowitz and Longo (1997), and Wood (1996). The contemporary popularity of university-industry partnerships for the generation and commercialisation of new knowledge – a fundamentally creative activity – is also illustrative (e.g., Florida, 2005, pp. 144-150).

The literature on partnerships in education suggests a diversity of arrangements under the title and a mixed bag of successes and failures under different criteria. Accepting here, for the sake of analysis, the hypothesis proffered above that partnerships do, in fact, enhance, the likelihood of the educational engagement or its outcomes being creative in nature, this paper is an attempt to throw some speculative light

on that diversity of successes and failures through focusing analytical attention, sequentially, on: (1) the nature of partnerships in education and their different relationships to learning; (2) the minimal conditions governing those partnerships that are successful; and (3) the nature of creativity in and through education and the relationships between the likelihood of successful creative partnerships in education and the conditions governing the partnerships.

The Nature of Educational Partnerships

Educational partnerships may be understood as partnerships, variously, between (two) or among (three or more) educational or resource providers, or learners, who may variously be individuals, organisations, or collectivities. The partnership, for example, reported by Aiello and Watson (2007) involved two organisational partners (a university and a secondary school). That reported by Kiggins and Cambourne (2007) involved three organisational partners (a university, a state department, and a teachers' organisation). The partnership studied by Miller (2001) involved multiple organisational partners, but in just two functional categories: higher education providers of teacher education on the one hand, and schools on the other. The partnerships advocated in the work by Thousand, Villa and Nevin (1994) were those between teachers and learners.

Partnership activities commonly include resourcing, communicative exchange, and shared engagements. The Aiello and Watson (2007) partnership, for example, involved the mutual generation of new cultural realities. Most commonly there is an interdependency between or among the partners, with each contributing something different to the partnership and commonly each also benefiting somewhat differently from it. In partnerships, for example, between a university provider of teacher education and a school or cluster of schools (such as those described by Su, 2002 and Campoy, 2000), the schools provide placements for teaching practice, gaining such things as access to new research and development knowledge and the opportunity for assessing the suitability of the student teachers as future employees. The university, on the other hand, contributes the student teachers, research and development knowledge, professional development for school teachers, and such like. It gains, not only the school placements for its student teachers, but also commonly opportunities for collaborative research and development. Partnerships between organisations often involve the creation of a partnership *centre*, in and through which the functions of the partnership are conducted. Many school-university partnerships, for example, are of this sort, including those described by Christopher (2007) and by Wood (1996). Among other benefits of such an arrangement is a clear locus of partnership management that the centre provides and the flexibility that it can provide in allowing changes to the composition of the membership of the partnership without radically reconstituting it. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) in education are a much promoted approach to harnessing private funding, management expertise and other involvement from business or industry partners in support of public education through contracting out operations and facilities (ref., e.g., Davies & Hentschke, 2005; Tachioka & Campbell, 2006).

Intended and actual outcomes of partnerships in education may be those of learning, the satisfaction of institutional purposes, knowledge-generation, learning from each other, cultural change, sharing of educational resources, or other instrumental attainments. The Aiello and Watson (2007) partnership, for example, was directed to achieving cultural change, in its goal of creating a learning culture in the school. That reported by Miller (2001) involved learning (on the part of the school partners) and teacher placement (on the part of the higher education institutions). That described by Christopher (2007) was directed particularly to sharing educational resources, such as science laboratories. Domenech (2006) advocated partnerships between urban and rural schools as a way of their sharing their respective experiences and strengths, and pooling their limited resources.

Reading through some of the voluminous published material on partnerships in education, one gets the sense that there may be some useful distinctions to be drawn on the relationship of the partnership itself to the learning engagements that are (or are intended to be) part of the partnership, since such distinctions may

have some relationship to conditions influencing the success of the partnership in achieving its educational aims. The set of such distinctions that comes most strongly to my mind from my examination of published accounts is that which arises from a consideration of the extent to which the partnership is a partnership of the learners in, or intended of, the partnership. What I have in mind here is, at one extreme, the situation where the learners, or the intended learners, are entirely outside the actual partnership – as its objects. At the other extreme is the situation where all the learners are integral to the partnership itself and the partnership is essentially a partnership between or among the learners – where they are the (exclusive) subjects in the partnership. In between these extremes there is clearly continuous variability in the extent to which both all of the learners (or the intended learners) are a part of the partnership itself and that to which the partnership is purely a partnership of learners (or in which other functional types of partners are involved). For analytical purposes, though, it may be useful to recognise here one broad intermediate category between the two polar extremes – where the partnership involves at least some of the learners or intended learners as one or more of the partners and where one or more of the other partners is not a designated learner in the partnership. These three categories of educational partnerships may be designated, then, as partnerships directed *towards* learning, partnerships *for* learning, and partnerships *in* learning.

In partnerships *towards* learning, neither (or none) of the partners is involved as a designated learner of the partnership. The learners or intended learners of the partnership are its objects. They are exogenous to it. These are partnerships of educators, educational bodies or educational resourcing bodies and, in some cases, also target or consuming organisations in which learning on the part of the partner organisations themselves is not a goal of the partnership. They may alternatively be partnerships of educational providers – pooling resources in some way (e.g., Christopher, 2007). They may also be partnerships of one or more educational providers and educational funding or regulatory bodies (e.g., Austin, 2000). Partnerships of this type are found also between educational providers and special interest groups, for example, the partnership described by Ponchilla, Armbruster and Wiebold (2005) between a voluntary association of blind athletes and an educational provider, directed to enhancing access to physical education opportunities by sight-impaired youth. ‘Cross-sectoral alliances’ (Wohlstetter et al., 2004) – which focus on inter-organisational partnerships across the public, for-profit and non-profit (or not-for-profit) economic sectors – and which include public-private partnerships (Cuddy, 2005; Ginsberg, Davies & Quick, 2004), are another good example of partnerships *towards* learning.

In partnerships *for* learning, at least one of the partners is involved as a designated learner of the partnership and at least one other as not so designated. They are partnerships involving both educator or educational provider or resourcer and learner partners. They are ‘mixed’ partnerships in this sense. Teacher-student relationships are typically partnerships of this sort, where the teacher works to promote desirable learning on the part of his or her students. Most of the partnerships described in the book edited by Thousand, Villa and Nevin (1994) are of this type, because of the authoritative role of the teacher, who stands beyond or outside the circle of learners – even though the educational approaches evidenced in that work are intended to encourage collaborative learning among the pupils. The extensive educational literature on cooperative learning and its multiplicity of formulaic approaches to managing such engagements is based on the external authority of the teacher manipulating the learners to work in partnerships between or among themselves. The partnership described by Thaman (2007) exemplifies this type in its involving “a partnership of donor agencies ...and a network of Pacific Island educational researchers and educators ...with a view towards encouraging culturally appropriate analyses of Pacific education systems and assisting educators to re-focus their planning on Pacific values and knowledge system” (Thaman, 2007, p. 61). An interesting situation here is where (at least) one of the partners is an organisation, in which learning is one of the partnership goals. This is not uncommonly the case, for example, in contemporary innovative partnerships between teacher education providers and schools. The partnership described by Su (2002), for example, had as a goal the reform of the partner school culture – involving major organisational learning. Similarly, the partnerships described by Aiello and Watson (2007) and Kiggins and Cambourne (2007) sought to create a

learning community in the participating schools partners. The so-called ‘professional development schools’ (PDSs) are intended to be school-university partnerships of this sort (Darling-Hammond, 2005).

In partnerships *in* learning, both (if there are only two) or all of the partners are involved as designated learners. They are partnerships between or among learners, where the partners are each collaborating voluntarily in promoting each other’s learning through the partnership. The learners are thus endogenous to the partnership. Moreland and Henry (2007), for example, present an analysis and advocacy of appropriate partnerships *in* learning involving adult learners and higher education academics. The collaborative research projects involving student teachers and teachers and embedded in the inter-institutional partnership described by Cohn and Kirkpatrick (2001) are another example. ‘Participatory research’ as an ideal is essentially an approach to research using partnerships in learning (Merriam & Simpson, 1995).

It must be reiterated here that these three categories are artificial, formally (but not ethically) defining ideal approximate zones of otherwise continuous cultural variability, rather than naturally distinct categories. They thus form a progressive, or a hierarchical sequence, from partnerships of educators, through mixed partnerships, to partnerships of learners.

They are also, though, not uncommonly nested, with partnerships here identified as being of a lower level including (or intended to include) partnerships of higher levels. In particular, partnerships *towards* learning are likely to be envisaged as including partnerships *for* or *in* learning. Thus, for example, the school-university partnership *towards* learning described by Cohn and Kirkpatrick (2001) included action research partnerships *in* learning involving teachers and student teachers. That described by Valadez and Snyder (2006) included a range of partnerships *for* learning in the school partners – directed to developing learning support for disadvantaged students.

The ubiquitous examples of partnerships between schools and universities involved in teacher education are essentially partnerships *towards* learning, in which each of the partners uses the partnership to enhance its core educational activity in teaching others – the universities benefiting through, particularly, practice teaching placements for its student teachers, the schools benefiting through professional development opportunities for its staff and, for secondary schools at least, preferential access to university places for its students (e.g., Miller, 2001). These partnerships, though, commonly strive to become, or at least to encompass, partnerships *for* learning – usually with schools being constructed as the learning organization in the partnership (e.g., Wood, 1996) – and occasionally also (in conception at least) as partnerships *in* learning, when the teacher education institution is also constructed as a learning organization in the partnership (e.g., Cohn & Kirkpatrick, 2001).

Minimal Conditions Governing Successful Partnerships

The structural realities of any given partnership will be particular to it. However, a speculative interpretation of the literature on partnerships suggests some general relationships between the foregoing three types of educational partnership and the minimal requirements through which a partnership of any given type might successfully operate. In other words, the literature on educational partnerships may be interpreted as suggesting that the success of partnerships at these three different levels may be dependent on – among other things – the partnerships meeting certain minimal requirements on key dimensions of their operation. The notion of a minimal requirement here is that of a state of affairs which, to the extent that it is not met in the operation of the partnership, collaboration in learning among the partners will be limited, and the impact, effectiveness and success of the partnership reduced correspondingly. While there are indisputably and obviously other such dimensions of minimal requirements (such as those of practicability and commitment), those that have struck me in the published accounts as most interesting are what I am calling the ‘teleological’, ‘functional’, ‘ethical’, and ‘political’ dimensions and requirements.

Firstly, I focus here on the minimum *teleological* requirement – on the extent to which the goals of the respective partners in the relationship must be common or shared. In partnerships *towards* learning, it may be argued that the minimal teleological requirement is just for *compatibility* between the goals that the respective partners bring to the partnership, in the sense that those goals are such that they may be effectively pursued in the partnership without disabling or seriously dysfunctional conflicts being raised by their pursuit. In partnerships towards learning, each partner may therein be pursuing potentially quite diverse sets of educational goals, some or all of which may even be seen as dubious by fellow partners. The partnership is not necessarily more than merely a mutually convenient vehicle for the pursuit of each partner's particular set of educational goals. In the partnership, for example, between nursing educators and a hospital, described by Hill and Walker (2004), the partners have taken existing organisational goals to the partnership.

However, in partnerships *for* learning, a higher degree of goal commonality is required. It may be argued that, in such partnerships, the minimum teleological requirement is for the *acceptance* by each partner of the goals of the other partners – an acknowledgement that those goals are appropriate to the partnership and, particularly, appropriate to the educational goals of the learner partner. If this requirement is not met, attainment of the educational goals in relation to the learners is unlikely, with resistance, subversion, displacement activity, or deliberate withdrawal from active learning engagement within the educational goals being likely consequences.

In partnerships *in* learning, it may be argued that an even higher degree of goal commonality is required – that of *commonality* in the educational goals of the different partners, so that each of the partners is consciously working towards the same educational goals. The requirement here is for a commitment, not only to the educational goals that each partner takes to the partnership, but a shared commitment to each other's goals, wherein each partner works towards both his or her own educational goals and those of the other partners.

Secondly, I focus on the minimum *functional* requirement – on the extent to which the roles of the respective partners in the relationship are more differentiated or more integrated. In partnerships *towards* learning, it may be argued that the minimal functional requirement is just for a mutual *acceptance* of the different roles that the respective partners adopt in the partnership, in the sense that each partner accepts the roles of the other partners as at least not counterproductive to the partnership's attainment of the goals that the subject is taking to it. In partnerships towards learning, each partner may therein take on roles that are different or similar to varying degrees and that are working towards the same or different goals to varying degrees. The roles of the respective partners must certainly contribute to the attainment of their own goals, and not work against the attainment of their partner's goals, but they need not be more integrated than that.

In partnerships *for* learning, a similar minimal functional requirement of mutually accepted role differentiation would seem to be required. The Kiggins and Cambourne (2007, p. 374) partnership, for example, is reported as aggregating partner roles and developing “collaborative relationships between the schools and the university”.

However, in partnerships *in* learning, it may be argued that a higher degree of role integration is required – that of *negotiated* – and hence necessarily agreed – roles, so that there is integrated approach to the achieving the shared goals. Each partner must be confident that the actions of the others in the partnership will contribute to the attainment of those goals. This confidence suggests agreement through negotiation of their respective roles.

Thirdly, I focus on the minimum *ethical* requirement – on the extent to which the pertinent ethical commitments of the respective partners in the relationship are again, more differentiated or more integrated. In partnerships *towards* learning, the minimal ethical requirement is just for a *mutual tolerance* of the ethical commitments that each is taking to the partnership. In partnerships towards learning, each partner may therein take to the partnership quite different and even incompatible ethical commitments. All that is required is an acceptance of those commitments as being owned by the partner and as being not

inappropriate to the attainment of the subject's partnership goals – regardless of their adjudged impact on attainment of the partner's goals.

However, in partnerships *for* learning, a somewhat more integrated set of ethical commitments is required – that of *mutual respect* for each other's goals. In this case, there is not just a mutual, potentially negative acceptance of other partners' commitments as not limiting the attainment of one's own goals, but an understanding of the partner's goals as good for them and their contribution to the partnership, and as valuable in themselves (and hence as worth defending and preserving). The Aiello and Watson (2007) partnership, for example, involved mutual respect between the partners. Kiggins and Cambourne (2007) similarly noted the importance of trust and friendship – qualities of mutual respect – as being important for the success of the partnership. Valadez and Snyder (2006, p. 29) conclude – of a partnership *towards* learning with nested partnerships *for* learning – that “partnership formation depends on the development of mutual respect”.

In partnerships *in* learning, an even more integrated set of ethical commitments is required – one that is effectively *situational* in nature (Bagnall, 2004). The requirement here is for ethical commitments in the partnership to be developed through negotiation in response to the situation presented by the partnership and the respective life-worlds that its different partners are bringing to it. The negotiation, of course, may be more or less explicit in nature, but the success of the partnership may be expected to be dependent upon the extent to which there is such an ethic in the partnership. This, of course, is not to say that the partners' ethical commitments outside the partnership are necessarily changed, but that the ethical dimensions of their work within the partnership should be of this order.

Fourthly and finally, I focus on the minimum *political* requirement – on the degree of effective autonomy needed by each of the partners in the partnership – ranging from lower to higher levels of autonomy. Partnerships that are directed *towards* learning indicate a minimal requirement of a relatively low level of partner autonomy – only the (*negative*) *freedom* from restraints to engagement in and disengagement from the partnership. Here, all that is required is a lack of restraint to each partner's involvement in the partnership or disengagement from it (Berlin, 2000). This presents an interesting challenge for partnerships involving compulsory engagement – through schooling, or organisational professional development programs, for example – where the degree of voluntariness on the part of the learners is limited. It suggests, of course, that such partnerships are unlikely to be successful for those learners for whom a lack of negative freedom to disengage from the partnership is an issue – a point that is well known from educational research and experience.

Partnerships *for* learning, however, indicate a higher minimal requirement of partner autonomy – that of the (*positive*) *freedom* derived from the capacity to engage with the curriculum or the learning tasks involved (Paterson, 1979). The notion of positive freedom here includes having the knowledge and skills to participate actively in the learning partnership – especially on the part of the learner. The Aiello and Watson (2007) partnership, for example, involved a strong degree of positive freedom, at least on the part of the university partner. Kiggins and Cambourne (2007) similarly noted the importance of informed responsibility – qualities of positive freedom – as being important for the success of the partnership.

Finally, here, partnerships *in* learning indicate an even higher level of autonomy on the part of the (learner) partners – that of *autonomous equality*. Here, a degree of functional autonomy within the partnership is required on the part of each partner, without any strongly hierarchical power differential between or among them (Benn, 1986). There may be expected, though, a potentially high degree of mutual interdependence – with each partner contributing differently to the partnership and hence creating a dependency of others on herself or himself in relation to that contribution.

Table One draws these suggested relationships together. Acknowledging that the minimal conditions for each type of participation are themselves a matter of degree, the extent to which they are not satisfied may be seen as indicative of the likelihood of the partnership not achieving its purposes, including that of providing

a creative educational outcome. As a general rule, then, we may suggest that higher levels of partnerships (from partnerships *towards*, to those *for*, and then those *in*), have progressively higher minimal requirements, linked to their increasing involvement of the learners in the partnership.

Table One: Minimum conditions for successful partnerships in each type of educational partnership.

Type of partnership	Minimum Teleological Requirement		Minimum Functional Requirement		Minimum Ethical Requirement		Minimum Political Requirement	
	Requirement	Progression	Requirement	Progression	Requirement	Progression	Requirement	Progression
In Learning	Goal Commonality	Greater Commonality	Negotiated Roles	More Integrated	Situational Ethic	More Integrated	Autonomous Equality	Higher Autonomy
For Learning	Goal Acceptance		Accepted Role Differentiation		Mutual Respect		Positive Freedom	
Towards Learning	Goal Compatibility	Less Commonality	Accepted Role Differentiation	More Differentiated	Mutual Tolerance	More Differentiated	Negative Freedom	Lower Autonomy

Looking across the suggested minimal requirements over the four dimensions, there is suggested a broad progression, from lower to higher levels, of partnership realities. At the lower level, the minimal requirements imply a degree of precision, formality and rigidity in the partnership arrangements – suggesting the utility of straightforwardly formal contracts to ensure clarity and simplicity of the partnership parameters. At higher levels, the minimal requirements imply much more dynamic, organic, tentative, open, informal and flexible partnership parameters – suggesting the need for minimally constraining partnership agreements. Getting the wrong type of agreement for the type of partnership involved may well be as disabling to the partnership as any other potential error and, insofar as information is available, some partnership failures may be understood in this way.

The development and maintenance of successful partnerships at higher levels may also be seen as more resource-intensive, more costly, than at partnerships at lower levels. The commitment of partner time, in particular, to developing and maintaining a partnership *in* learning is considerable, compared with that required to develop and maintain one *towards* learning. This suggests an important consideration in the early planning of partnerships.

An important feature of nested partnerships in this regard is that the relative success or failure of the over-arching (lower level) partnership is likely to be dependent upon the relative success or failure of the encompassed (higher level) partnerships. Since the over-arching partnership will normally be at a lower level of learner integration – commonly a partnership *towards* learning – than the encompassed partnerships on which it depends, the success of the over-arching partnership will effectively have higher minimal requirements for goal commonality, role and ethical integration, and partner autonomy than would be expected from its categorical nature. It is also likely to be more demanding of resources than would otherwise be indicated.

Creativity in and through Educational Partnerships

From an educational perspective, creativity in and through education may be considered instrumentally in two broad categories: (1) *learning* through education to be creative, or learning creativity as a skill; and (2) creative *responses* to educational situations. Educational research and development in creativity has traditionally focused on *learning* to be creative, its measurement, attributes, facilitation, the traits of identifiably creative individuals, and such like. In other words, it has focused on the educational *psychology*

of creativity in individuals and individual learners – an individualistic focus on the nature and enhancement of creativity, in which the role of collaboration is entirely ignored. The research and development, for example, reported in works such as Baer (1993), Cropley (2001), and Shaw and Runco (1994) constructs creativity entirely in the way.

Contrastively, and increasingly contemporarily, there is a focus on creative *responses* to educational situations – a concern at how creativity can be used to address challenging educational and more broadly social and environmental issues. Such a perspective may be understood as taking a *social* view of creativity, since it tends to focus on how creativity may be generated, enhanced and manipulated through social change to enhance educational effectiveness (as well as other measures of cultural effectiveness, such as economic and general well-being). The contemporary theorization, research and development in creative enterprises, creative communities and the role of creativity in enhancing social and economic well-being is essentially of this type. It is linked to the construction of contemporary advanced societies as *knowledge* societies, in which survival and success in the face of challenging environmental, informational and epistemological issues are dependent upon creative responses to those issues (ref., e.g., Bron & Schemmann, 2003; Sörlin & Vessuri, 2007). It is captured well in Richard Florida's theorisation of creative work in contemporary society and his suggestion that "Globally, a third of the workers in advanced industrial nations are employed in the creative sectors (Florida, 2005, p. 3).

It is in this second perspective of creativity – of creativity as a social phenomenon – that educational partnerships become an important focus, since partnerships present themselves straightforwardly as an approach to bringing together different perspectives and expertise to the end of generating creative responses to challenging situations. Advocacy of partnerships to enhance educational creativity is essentially from this perspective of creativity. It represents an historical shift in attention and awareness, away from the historically dominant focus on individual creativity to a focus on creativity as a social phenomenon.

In assessing the creativity of responses to challenging situations, the focus is appropriately on the creative properties of the *responses* to the challenging situations – on the actions or activities involved in the (educational) interventions to those situations or the outcomes of those actions or activities. Those properties may be understood as *conditions* of an action, activity or outcome that point to it being creative. These are features of an action, activity or its outcomes to which it must conform in some way and to a certain extent at least if we are to judge it as creative, or as evidence of creativity on the part of its authors. Without here fully reviewing such conditions, it should be noted for the purposes of this analysis that the main such conditions that I would argue must each be satisfied to at least a minimal extent in order for the action, activity or outcome to be generally accepted as a creative one are that it be: (1) *novel*, in being an unexpected, new, different or divergent, not a normal, response to the situation (the novelty condition); (2) *contextualised*, in being judged on the basis of the norms, expectations, traditions and goals of its context (the contextualised condition); (3) *intelligent*, in being recognisably an informed response to the demands and nature of the situation (the intelligence condition); (4) *valued*, in being a response that is or produces something of value, of whatever sort (aesthetic, ethical, instrumental, etc.) (the valued condition); and (5) *intentional*, in being intended as a response to the situation, not merely an accidental occurrence or outcome (the intentional condition). As a general rule, if those conditions are met, the greater the novelty of the action, activity or response, the more creative it will be judged to be, although higher levels of satisfaction of the intelligence, valued and contextualised conditions may also have some influence on the level of adjudged creativity.

These conditions are picked up variously in the literature on creativity, although the nature of that literature necessarily constrains a focus on the psychological attributes of creativity, rather than its more inclusive cultural dimensions that are of concern here, and it appears to assume, rather than to articulate, the intentional condition. Arthur Cropley (2001), for example, identifies what he calls 'three key aspects' of creativity: novelty, effectiveness and ethicality. While his novelty aspect clearly captures my novelty condition, his effectiveness and ethicality aspects are merely excessively constraining and culture-specific

aspects of the valued condition – utility and ethical value are clearly only two criteria of value, among others (such as aesthetic value). John Baer (1993), focuses on the importance of ‘divergent thinking’ in creativity – picking up my novelty condition – and also of forming new associations that are useful (my intelligence and valued conditions) and context-specific (my contextualised condition). Swede (1993) again identifies my novelty condition, in what he terms ‘multicontextual thought’, while also acknowledging the intentional condition. Halford and Wilson (2002) identify these same two conditions and also the valued condition – the last in their ‘effective’ requirement. Finally, here, Weiner’s (2000) conception of creativity as ‘appropriate novelty’ picks up both my novelty and valued conditions.

Shifting attention now to the sorts of actions that may be taken, or the sorts of conditions that might be generated, to *enhance* creativity in and through education, we note again, a divergence in research and development. While the conditions for learning to be a creative individual may be drawn from appropriate learning theory, the conditions for generating creative responses to educationally challenging situations call for an entirely different knowledge base – one that may be characterised loosely as the sociology of creativity. It is in this field that the foregoing analysis of partnerships in education may be located. It suggests that conditions for generating creative responses to educationally challenging situations may be drawn from these types of, and minimal conditions for, educational partnerships. Each of the general conditions of creativity and creative outcomes – but especially perhaps the intelligence condition – is likely to be more fully satisfied by greater goal commonality, more integrated roles and ethical realities, and higher partner autonomy. Accordingly, the likelihood of achieving (more) creative responses to educational situations may be expected to be greater according to the extent to which the minimal conditions are realised or exceeded in each type of partnership. They may also be expected to be greater across the sequence of partnership types (toward, for and in learning) – although the achievement of other intended outcomes of the activity clearly may not follow that sequence.

Discussion

These relationships may point to reasons why some educational partnerships are more productive of creative outcomes and the learning of creativity than are others. They may also be used in the planning and management of particular creative partnerships in education, to ensure that the minimal teleological, functional, ethical and political requirements of the partnership, if it is to be successful, are satisfied.

References

- Aiello, M. & Watson, K. (2007) An Alternative Approach to CPD, in T. Townsend & R. Bates (eds.), *Handbook of Teacher Education* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 457-464.
- Austin, J.E. (2000) *The collaboration Challenge* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).
- Baer, J. (1993) *Creativity and Divergent Thinking* (Hillside, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum).
- Bagnall, R.G. (2004) *Cautionary Tales in the Ethics of Lifelong Learning Policy and Management* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).
- Benn, S.I. (1986) *A theory of Freedom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Berlin, I. (2000) *Liberty* (Henry Hardy, ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Bron, A. & Schemmann, M. (2003) Adult Education in the Knowledge and Information Society, in A. Bron & M. Schemmann (eds.), *Knowledge Society, Information Society and Adult Education* (London: Transaction) pp. 7-19.
- Campoy, R. (2002) Paradoxes of Professional Development Schools, in S. Mitchell (ed.), *Effective Educational Partnerships* (Westport, CT, Praeger) pp. 5-22.
- Campoy, R.W. (2000) *A Professional Development School Partnership* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey).
- Christopher, G. (2007) The Value of Partnerships, *American School Board Journal*, 194:1, pp. 42-43.

- Cohn, M.M. & Kirkpatrick, S. (2001) Negotiating Two Worlds, in J. Zeni (ed.), *Ethical Issues in Practitioner Research* (New York: Teachers College Press) pp. 136-148.
- Cropley, A.J. (2001) *Creativity in Education and Learning* (London: Kogan Page).
- Cuddy, J. (2005) Partnership for Schools, *Policy and Practice of Public Human Services*, 64:4, p. 5.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (ed.) (2005) *Professional Development Schools* (New York: Teachers College Press).
- Davies, B. & Hentschke, G. (2005) Public/Private Partnerships in Education, *Management in Education*, 19:1, pp. 6-7.
- Domenech, D.A. (2006) City-country Partnerships, *American School Board Journal*, 193:8, pp. 28-29.
- Florida, R.L. (2005) *Cities and the Creative Class* (New York: Routledge).
- Ginsberg, R., Davies, T.G. & Quick, D. (2004). A North American Public-private higher education partnership, in S. Mitchell, P. Klinck & J. Burger (eds.), *Worldwide Partnerships for Schools, Foundations, Universities, Companies, and Community Schools* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon) pp. 3-32.
- Halford, G. & Wilson, W.H. (2002) Creativity, Relational Knowledge, and Capacity, in T. Dartnall (ed.), *Creativity, Cognition, and Knowledge* (Westport, CT: Prager) pp. 153-180.
- Hill, K.S. & Walker, L. (2004) Partnerships Pack Recruitment Power, *Nursing Management*, 35:12, p. 14.
- Kiggins, J. & Cambourne, B. (2007) The Knowledge Building Community Program, in T. Townsend & R. Bates (eds.), *Handbook of Teacher Education* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 365-380.
- Merriam, S.B. & Simpson, E.L. (1995) *A Guide to Research for Educators and Trainers of Adults* (2nd ed.) (Malabar, FL, Krieger).
- Miller, L. (2001) School-university Partnership as a Venue for Professional Development, in A. Lieberman & L. Miller (eds.), *Teachers Caught in the Action* (New York: Teachers College Press) pp. 102-117.
- Moreland, R. & Henry, P. (2007) Learning from Life, paper presented at the 37th Annual SCUTREA Conference, Belfast, Queens University.
- Paterson, R.W.K. (1979) *Values, Education and the Adult* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Ponchilla, P.E., Armbruster, J. & Wiebold, J. (2005) The National Sports Education Project, *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 99:11, pp. 685-695.
- Shaw, M.P. & Runco, M.O. (eds.) (1994) *Creativity and Affect* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex).
- Sörlin, S. & Vessuri, H. (eds.) (2007) *Knowledge Society vs. Knowledge Economy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Su, Z. (2002) Collaborating for Urban School and Teacher Education Renewal, in I.N. Guadarrama, J. Ramsey & J.L. Nath (eds.), *Forging Alliances in Community and Thought* (Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing) pp. 331-375.
- Swede G. (1993) *Creativity* (Toronto: Wall & Emerson).
- Tachioka, H. & Campbell, J.R. (2006) A New Education Scheme for Japan, *Management in Education*, 20:4, pp. 18-24.
- Thaman, K.H. (2007) Partnerships for Progressing Cultural Democracy in Teacher Education in Pacific Island Countries, in T. Townsend & R. Bates (eds.), *Handbook of Teacher Education* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 53-65.
- Thousand, J.S., Villa, R.A. & Nevin, A.I. (eds.) (1994) *Creativity and Collaborative Learning* (Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes).
- Trubowitz, S. & Longo, P. (1997) *How it Works* (New York: Teachers College Press).
- Valadez, J.R. & Snyder, J. (2006) Social, Cultural and Political Influences on the Development of an Educational Partnership, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 5:1, pp. 29-47.
- Weiner, R.P. (2000) *Creativity and Beyond* (New York: State University of New York Press).
- Wohlstetter, P., Molloy, C.L., Hentschke, G.C. & Smith, J. (2004) Improving Service Delivery in Education through Collaboration, *Social Science Quarterly*, 85:5, pp. 1078-1096.
- Wood, D.B. (1996) *School-university Partnerships* (Virginia: The College of William & Mary, EdD Dissertation).