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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 the partners, 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 benefitting through, particularly, practice teaching placements for its student teachers, the schools benefitting 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 an 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of partnership</th>
<th>Minimum Teleological Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Functional Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Ethical Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Political Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Learning</td>
<td>Goal Commonality</td>
<td>Greater Commonality</td>
<td>Negotiated Roles</td>
<td>More Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situational Ethic</td>
<td>More Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomous Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Learning</td>
<td>Goal Acceptance</td>
<td>Accepted Role Differentiation</td>
<td>Mutual Respect</td>
<td>Positive Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Learning</td>
<td>Goal Compatibility</td>
<td>Less Commonality</td>
<td>Accepted Role Differentiation</td>
<td>More Differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More Differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 effectives, 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 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.
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