

Renzulli, J. S. (2021). A theory of blended knowledge and a technology-based approach for the development of creative productive giftedness. In A. Hui & C. Wagner (Eds.), *Creative and collaborative learning through immersion: Interdisciplinary and international perspectives* (pp. 183–200). Springer Publishers.

A Theory of Blended Knowledge and a Technology-Based Approach for the Development of Creative Productive Giftedness

Joseph S. Renzulli¹

Introduction

Our history and culture can be charted to a large extent by the creative contributions of the world's most gifted and talented individuals. What causes some people to use their intellectual, motivational, and creative assets in such a way that it leads to outstanding manifestations of creative productivity, while others with similar or perhaps even greater assets fail to achieve at expected levels of accomplishment? The concept of creative productive giftedness was devised by this writer to distinguish it from traditional views of giftedness, which focus only on high academic performance and achievement test scores. Creative productive giftedness simply means that innovative ideas can only have an impact on targeted audiences when originators act upon the idea through the development of some kind(s) of product, performance, presentation, or other ways that *apply* the creative idea to esthetic, theoretical, or practical purposes. This application is essentially why and how we have recognized the work of “famous” people in all walks of life. The sheer amount of folk wisdom, portrayals in popular media, and biographical and anecdotal accounts about creativity and giftedness are nothing short of mind-boggling. Some clarity, however, can be found by carefully examining the creativity literature.

In recent years, the interest and research on learning related to knowledge acquisition, motivation, thinking skills, and, creativity have increased dramatically. This increase is no doubt a reflection of worldwide interest in promoting economic development, as well as promoting changes in cultural and social conditions that impact the lives of people.

The publication of the “Kew Bloom’s Taxonomy” (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), along with the Partnership for 21st Century Learning (<https://www.battelleforkids.org/networks/p21>), brought renewed attention to higher level thinking skills in education. Several international research teams have defined and created frameworks for learning so-called “21st Century Skills” (Binkley et al., 2012) as countries around the world have attempted to reform their school systems and address the increased attention on developing students’ skills beyond basic literacy and arithmetic (Care et al., 2017). As stated by Binkley et al. (2012), “The crux of 21st century skills is the need to integrate, synthesize, and creatively apply content knowledge in novel situations.” Research on project-based learning, a method of instruction which emphasizes similar processes and goals as those described earlier (albeit teacher-directed rather than individualized), suggests that investigative learning processes may promote the development of

¹ University of Connecticut. Mansfield, CT. USA
e-mail: joseph.renzulli@uconn.edu

students' twenty-first century skills in addition to increasing enjoyment and engagement in learning (Bell, 2010).

Several researchers and theorists have put forward ideas expressing various points of view; however, creativity researchers, for instance, tend to agree that creativity is the combination of originality and task appropriateness as defined in a particular context (Plucker et al., 2004). Moreover, researchers have differentiated among different levels of creativity, ranging from the more subjective (mini-c) to the everyday (little-c) experiences of creativity to professional (Pro-c) and, finally, eminent (Big-C) levels of creativity (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009). Along these same lines, creativity researchers have also argued that although creativity can be experienced across multiple domains at lower levels of performance, high levels of creative production tend to be domain specific (Kaufman et al., 2010).

Even with these insights from creativity research, we are still unable to answer the fundamental question of how and why some individuals develop their talents and perform at superior levels in analytic, investigative, and creative ways. While it would be tempting to present a yet another “combination-of-ingredients theory” (based on the characteristics of giftedness) to explain why some people achieve at high levels, the theory described in detail in this chapter addresses how three interrelated levels of knowledge fit into the structure and quality of one's formal learning experiences. These levels are received knowledge, analyzed knowledge, and applied and created knowledge. The theory is based on the role that knowledge plays in developing an investigative mindset and creative productivity, and how the integrated use of three levels of knowledge contribute to a major goal of gifted education, which is to increase the world's reservoir of creative and productive individuals. This work is purposefully different from theories about the characteristics of giftedness because it deals with the organization and structure of knowledge and it has implications for both curriculum development and teaching strategies that can be implemented in programs for gifted and talented students. These services represent a central focus of the literature in our field and what we actually do in programs that serve gifted students.

The field of gifted education is replete with systems and models for identification, curriculum development, program development, and program evaluation (Dai & Chen, 2014; Hunsaker, 2012; Renzulli et al., 2009; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2007), but little attention has been given to an underlying theory that focuses on the role of knowledge in the development of characteristics that bring high-potential students to our attention. Just as flour, water, salt, and yeast are the main ingredients for making bread, so also are knowledge and the creative construction and application of knowledge the main “ingredients” for developing highly creative and productive bright young minds.

Epistemology

Theories of knowledge are the focus of the study of epistemology, the branch of philosophy that investigates the origin, nature, methods, construction, and diffusion of human knowledge. In the Western World, epistemology had its origin in the work of Plato and Aristotle, as explained in this elegant quotation.

For Plato, sense data were at best a distraction from knowledge, which was the province of unaided reason. For Aristotle, knowledge consisted of generalizations, but these were derived in the first instance from information gathered from the outside world. These two models of human thinking, termed rationalism and empiricism, respectively, formed the major intellectual legacy of the West down to Descartes and Bacon, who represented, in the seventeenth century, the twin poles of epistemology (Berman, 1981, p. 46).

Bacon's approach to knowledge and learning became the standard for the development of the scientific method and for all subsequent taxonomic systems for organizing knowledge such as *Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Book I: Cognitive Domain* (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom, 1956). Bacon's taxonomic scheme set forth the paradigm for what has become the major guide for the pursuit of intellectual knowledge.

Bacon's theory states that knowledge comes primarily from sensory experience and evidence, especially through experimentation guided by six steps: (1) state the problem, (2) gather information/research, (3) formulate a hypothesis, (4) do the experiment, (5) analyze results, and (6) draw conclusions (Machlup, 1980). Thus, Bacon's ideas on what has now become universally recognized as the scientific method have had serious implications for the basic ingredients of what we should be examining as an epistemological framework for developing giftedness in young people.

An interesting historical footnote about the theory discussed here is that the Ancient Greeks mentioned earlier never believed that certain types of knowledge were more useful than others! Rather, they argued that the advancement of understanding occurred when different types of knowledge worked together to enhance learning and wisdom. The advent of formal curriculum that emerged over the centuries resulted in content and process being treated as separate pedagogical entities by subsequent education theorists. And when testing for content acquisition became the major criterion for measuring school success, we moved away from the original concept of blended knowledge embodied in the Aristotelian and Platonic concepts of knowledge (Fitch, 1981). In a certain sense, the theory presented in this chapter serves as "connective tissue" between the ways in which the ancients viewed knowledge and the changes that have taken place in formal education. These changes have resulted in a clear dichotomy that has forced a distinction in learning theories among the three levels of knowledge around which the theory is structured. Modern day theorists in cognition and instruction (e.g., Bereiter, 2002) have pointed to the changes that have taken place in learning theory as a result of the advent of the "knowledge age;" and this is the reason that a brief consideration of the sources of knowledge as well as the levels of knowledge have been integrated into account in the rationale of this theory.

The theory presented here simply intends to portray the ways that different kinds of knowledge interact with one another to produce the "blended knowledge" at the center of Figure 1. Learners receive information, but as they begin to analyze this information, they may find it necessary to "go back" and gather more material to carry out an analysis. Similarly, when they reach the applied and creative stage, they may also need to return to the received and applied levels; and "return trips" to these levels are usually based on just-in-time rather than presented information. And in those cases when new knowledge, innovative contributions to a field, or

even new ways of analyzing data (Big-C contributions) are made at the applied and creative levels, the innovative person may be contributing content that becomes part of received knowledge. Although this process is the natural way that learning takes place, an overly standardized test-prep curriculum may severely emphasize received knowledge and in a certain sense “discriminate” against both the analyzed and applied/creative levels or learning. It is for this reason that the theory has relevance to the pedagogy advocated in special programs and the ways in which we train teachers to work with gifted students. The reason that gifted education advocates were among the educators who early on latched on to Bloom’s theory of cognitive development was that it called attention to the higher mental processes important to high levels of development.

Blending Three *Levels* of Knowledge To Promote Thinking Skills and Creative Productivity




Figure 1. Theory of knowledge for promoting creative productivity.

Bloom’s work, however, has usually been interpreted as a lineal sequence to the pursuit of higher levels of thinking (not necessarily his intention). The theory of blended knowledge presented in this chapter views knowledge acquisition and usage as an interactive and cyclical process and thus is presented in the form of a Venn diagram in an effort to portray this interaction (see Figure 1).

Before describing the theory of blended knowledge that is the focus of this chapter, it is important first to discuss two related issues that are part of the rationale underlying this theory. These issues are important because the production and diffusion of knowledge are central to the advancement of our civilization and an important part of the rationale for establishing and supporting programs for young people with exceptionally high potential.

The Purpose of Gifted Education

The first issue is the justification for providing special services to the targeted group of young people served in special programs for the gifted. “Why” many people have asked, “should a school, state, or nation provide supplementary funds, specially trained teachers and teacher training programs, conferences, professional journals, and other resources for a group of students that are already endowed with superior potentials?” Although we often respond to this question by talking about the “needs” of these students that are sometimes met but more often not addressed, it seems apparent to state that all students in our schools have needs that should be respected and accommodated. Or we run down a list of our usual maxims (e.g., the need for creative thinking, critical thinking, problem solving, decision making, etc.), but leaders of a recent report entitled *21st Century Skills, Education & Competitiveness: A Resource and Policy Guide* (2008) have argued emphatically that:

Public education has traditionally thought of higher level thinking as the purview of talented and gifted programs, while the teaching of basic skills was geared toward those on a trade track in high schools. Now, the focus must be on making sure all students have a broad array of these skills in addition to strong grounding in core subjects (p. 27).

When asked the question addressed earlier about why we need special services for gifted and talented students, I have always stated unequivocally that the purpose of providing supplementary resources for the development of giftedness is to increase the world’s reservoir of highly creative and productive individuals. Simply explained, we need more scientist, artists, writers, statesmen, political leaders, entrepreneurs, and designers in all fields of human endeavor who will address the problems of our modern society, improve the health, economy, quality of life, human freedoms, aesthetics, arts, and preservation of the Earth’s resources. While this response may sound abstract and idealistic, it bears a direct relationship to the kinds of contributions that we admire in such gifted individuals as Jonas Salk, Ludwig Beethoven, Margaret Sanger, Pablo Picasso, Martin Luther King, Rachel Carson, Steve Jobs, Marion Anderson, and others who have left their stamp on making the world a better place.

Sources of Information and Knowledge

The second issue related to this theory has to do with the *sources* of information and knowledge for learners of all ages. Who and what are the providers of information and knowledge in formal learning situations? When it comes to schooling, there are essentially two major sources of knowledge. I define the first source as to-be-presented (T-B-P) knowledge, the type usually transmitted to students through lectures, textbooks, and other forms of print, visual, or auditory media. Committees that develop curricular standards and textbook writers almost universally determine what T-B-P knowledge is used in today’s schools, and it is also highly influenced by

persons who develop standardized tests. Most traditional learning is based on this source of knowledge.

I call the second source of knowledge just-in-time (J-I-T) knowledge. This type of knowledge is described as the one that people only “go and get” because it is necessary to address a particular problem or to learn more about something assigned or that is of personal interest to the individual. The advent of technology and the Internet has now made access to J-I-T knowledge ubiquitous to most teachers and students. Technology has also provided us with software that can personalize learning in a way never before available; and it can personalize learning beyond merely modifying the amount and level of content provided to students. Programs such as Study Island (<https://www.edmentum.com/products/study-island>), Compass Learning (<https://compass-learning.com>), and Naviance (<https://www.naviance.com>), and a program called Renzulli Learning (<https://renzullilearning.com>) developed at the University of Connecticut (Field, 2009; Renzulli & Reis, 2007). The Renzulli Learning System creates an individual profile for each student based on his or her interests, learning styles, and preferred modes of expressions; and a unique search engine matches each profile to high engagement resources according to the ways students have responded to the questionnaire that generates the profile. Teachers can also use this software to review, select, and infuse high engagement/enrichment activities into selected curricular topics or units of study being pursued by individuals, small groups, or entire classrooms. True personalization of learning is now possible through the use of today’s technology; and teachers now have at their disposal the tools that allow them to blend together the three types of knowledge described next.

Adults in most practical, work-related, and problem-solving situations use J-I-T knowledge routinely and the advent of easy-to-use digital age technology has now made J-I-T knowledge readily assessable to most school-age learners. For example, a middle school student investigating the reasons for the collapse of a large building used National Weather Bureau data to obtain the snow accumulations and temperature records for his region of the country over a 50-year period. He also obtained building code regulations and hypothesized that weight-bearing regulations written decades earlier were insufficient to accommodate present day large roof building designs. Imagine how dreadfully boring and irrelevant it would be if all students were required to learn or even memorize 50 years of weather data? The student conducting this study, however, needed the information and therefore it became instantaneously relevant.

Today’s students are growing up in a world where their access to and familiarity with mobile devices provide them with instant entrée to the wider world of knowledge. The Center for Applied Special Technology (1996) has gathered compelling research and evaluation findings about the influences that technology is having on achievement, higher order thinking skills, and workforce preparation and the CEO Forum (2001) has argued that technology has had a significant impact on all areas of the curriculum. The warp-speed technological changes taking place in schools today have become one of the most pervasive occurrences having a significant impact on the education system, so much that technology is actually influencing learning theory itself. Consequently, technology has provided the necessary impetus to reassess more traditional methods and techniques that we use to bring knowledge into the classroom and guide students in its use.

The Content and Methodology of a Discipline

Received knowledge (content) and analyzed knowledge (process) form the basis of all disciplines and their role and interaction have been widely discussed by learning and curriculum theorists. Phenix (1964) recommends that a focus on representative concepts and ideas is the best way to capture the essence of a discipline. Representative ideas or concepts consist of themes, patterns, main features, sequences, organizing principles and structures, and the logic that defines a discipline and distinguish it from other disciplines. Representative ideas and concepts can also be used as the bases for interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary studies. When we select content, the level of advancement or complexity of material we must first and foremost take into consideration the age and ability, maturity, previous study, and experiential background of the students. Beyond these considerations, three principles of content selection are recommended. (1) Curricular material should escalate along a hierarchy of the following dimensions of knowledge: facts, conventions, trends and sequences, classifications and categories, criteria, principles and generalizations, and theories and structures. (2) Movement toward the highest level, theories and structures, should involve continuous recycling to lower levels so that facts, trends and sequences, and so on can be understood in relation to a more integrated whole rather than isolated bits of irrelevant information. (3) The cluster of diverse procedures that surround the acquisition of knowledge—that dimension of learning commonly referred to as “process” or thinking skills—should themselves be viewed as a form of content. It is these more enduring skills that form the cognitive structures and problem-solving strategies that have the greatest transfer value (Bransford et al., 2000). When we view process as content, we avoid the artificial dichotomy and the endless arguments about whether content or process should be the primary goal of learning. Combining content and process leads to a goal that is larger than the sum of the respective parts. Simply stated, this goal is the acquisition of a scheme for acquiring, managing, and producing information in an organized and systematic fashion. A focus on methodology is the most direct way to prepare young people for their roles as contributors in future fields of professional involvement. A focus on methodology also mean, more than just teaching students about methods of inquiry. Rather, it is designed to promote an understanding of and appreciation for the *application* of both content and methods to the kinds of problems that are the essence of particular fields of knowledge. The goal of a focus on methodology is, therefore, to cast the young person in the role of a firsthand inquirer rather than mere learners of lessons, and to create a mindset that prepares young students for confrontations with knowledge that are the starting point of their own applied and created knowledge.

A Theory of Blended Knowledge

Although philosophers and epistemologists have written for centuries about the general nature of knowledge, the theory presented here is restricted to the acquisition, application, and creation of knowledge in formal (schoolhouse) learning. Thus, the main “ingredients” for developing young minds mentioned earlier (information, knowledge, and the creative application of knowledge) can be categorized into three general levels of knowledge depicted in Figure 1. Before describing each of these three levels, it should be emphasized that while they are hierarchical in level of complexity so far as the powers of mind are concerned (cf. Bloom’s hierarchy), it is the *interaction* between and among all three levels that creates the blended knowledge which is represented in the center of the three concentric circles in Figure 1.

Received Knowledge

The first level of knowledge is received knowledge, and this is the type of material most often associated with what traditional schooling is all about. At this level, information and knowledge are frequently used synonymously; however, leading knowledge scholars define small differences (Machlup, 1980). Information captures data at a single point and refers to material that has been given some meaning by way of a relational connection (e.g., Boston & Atlanta are state capital cities). This type of knowledge is the concise and appropriate collection of information, but has value only when it is made useful in situations that are relevant to the learner. It refers to a deterministic process where patterns within a given set of information are ascertained (e.g., capital cities are seats of government); what Whitehead (1929) called “inert knowledge” and described it as “... knowledge that students can exhibit when it is specifically called for (on an examination for instance), but that otherwise plays no roles in their lives” (Bereiter, 2002, p. 309).

Received knowledge such as facts, data, vocabulary, numeracy, names, dates, and other types of information are typically conveyed to students through lectures, textbooks, worksheets, and various types of digital media. It is the type of information that is usually assessed through standardized achievement tests or “right answer” tests constructed by teachers. Received knowledge is the foundation for all learning and thus an essential component of the blended knowledge concept that makes up the center of Figure 1. The left side of this figure represents the major inputs to the learning process and the right side represents the outputs or what we “take away” from a learning process that blends together three levels of knowledge. Although memorization, note taking skills, and recall are the main mental processes developed for the acquisition of received knowledge, teachers have used attractive materials, the media, and a variety of classroom organization and management techniques to convert “raw” information into meaningful knowledge; and creative teachers have devised ways to make this level of knowledge more interesting and useful to students.

Analyzed Knowledge

The second level of knowledge and the type that has frequently been associated with programs for the gifted is analyzed knowledge. This level of knowledge has grown in popularity in recent years due to the focus on twenty-first century thinking skills, the process standards included in the Common Core State Standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010), and the *Next Generation Science Standards* developed by The National Research Council, the National Science Teachers Association, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (NGSS, 2013). Kaplan (2009) discussed how this level of knowledge contributes to the depth and complexity that should be a hallmark of curriculum for gifted students. Analyzed knowledge develops thinking skills such as interpreting, extrapolating, recognizing attributes, discriminating between same and different, comparing and contrasting, categorizing, classifying, determining criteria, ranking, prioritizing and sequencing, seeing relationship, determining cause and effect, pattern finding, and making analogies. These skills are typically associated with Bloom’s higher level thinking categories of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom, 1956).

Classroom practices that promote analyzed knowledge are much more advanced than merely receiving, storing, and retrieving information. Discussions, debates, simulations, role playing, critiquing, and questioning that focus on attitudes, values, conclusions, and why, how, and cause and effect are typically the ways in which analysis skills are developed. Analyzed knowledge obviously draws upon received knowledge, but it also interacts with received knowledge in a cyclical manner. When students are working at tile analysis level they may find the need to acquire (“go back”) and obtain additional factual information to further examine or scrutinize an argument, point of view, or interpretation of a problem they are addressing. If received knowledge is “grist for the mill of mind,” then analyzed knowledge is the “relentless grinding” of information that uses received knowledge to develop more complex levels of thinking and understanding.

Applied and Created Knowledge

These first two levels of knowledge arc both priorities for all of our students. The ability to solve problems evolves from retrieving facts, data, and information and manipulating this material in ways that create meaning for the individual and improve the powers of mind. More advanced levels of problem solving and the construction of knowledge, however, require curiosity, creativity, and the task commitment (Renzulli, 1982) to pursue problems that go beyond acquisition, prescribed problems, and even teacher assigned problem-based learning activities. These traits that should be the focus of programs for developing giftedness and they should constitute the mission of gifted education mentioned earlier—increasing the world’s reservoir of highly creative and productive individuals. It is this broader set of skills that develops the investigative, creative, and entrepreneurial mindsets that are exactly the characteristics that we most admire in people who have made important contributions to their respective fields of endeavor—indeed, the creative and productive people that the larger world ultimately refers to as “gifted.”

The best way to promote the use of applied and created knowledge is to ensure that special programs place a major focus on providing opportunities to pursue real problems in investigative and creative ways (Delcourt, 1994; Hebert, 1993; Renzulli, 1982; Westberg, 2010). Real problems differ from other types of assigned problem solving activities in four basic ways. First, students select the specific problem they want to pursue. This selection may be restricted to an assigned topic or course (e.g., the Civil War in a history course), but within any general or specific topic area opportunities for personalization of interest creates internal motivation because students have choices based on their own interests. For example, within the general topic area of the Civil War, students might choose to study the music, uniforms or women’s clothing fashions, fiction, photography, weaponry, human rights, the biographies of famous individuals or persons from their towns, sea battles, the Underground Railroad, the role of women, or any other issue that holds a particular fascination for the individual or group. A series of general exploratory experiences such as a speaker or virtual field trips to Civil Wat sites or battlefields can be used to give students ideas about the choice of a problem in which they might develop a sustained interest (see, for example, Type I Enrichment in the *Enrichment Triad Model*, Renzulli, 1977).

Second, students are guided in procedures for formulating a hypothesis or research question and the use of authentic investigative methodology such as how practicing historians go about investigating a particular area of study. Developing a hypotheses or research question, selecting a topic for creative writing, or designing an artistic or community service project ensures that students extend beyond just “looking stuff up” and reporting it! It is at this point that teachers need to be able to assist students in track down How-To books and web resources that guide them in finding and focusing on investigable problems. For example, in a book entitled *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method*, the Gottschalk (1969) writes briefly about how practicing historians choose subjects and find information about them:

The beginner, with or without aid, can easily discover a subject that interests him or her and that will be worthy of investigation—at least at an introductory level. They need only to ask four sets of questions:

1. The first set of questions is geographical. They center around the interrogative: “Where?” What area of the world do I wish to investigate? The Far East? Brazil? My country? My city? My neighborhood?
2. The second set of questions is biographical. They center around the interrogative: “Who?” What persons am I interested in? The Chinese? The Greeks? My ancestors? My neighbors? A famous individual?
3. The third set of questions is chronological. They center around the interrogative: “When” What period of the past do I wish to study? From the beginnings till now? The fifth century B.C.? The Middle ages? The 1780s? Last year?
4. The fourth set of questions is functional or occupational. They center around the interrogative: “What?” What spheres of human interest concern me most? What kinds of human activity? Economics? Literature? Athletics? Sex? Politics? (pp. 62–63)

The third guideline for investigating a real problem is that there is no single predetermined or “correct answer” or prescribed way for conducting a study. There may be some general procedural standards that apply to research in general, but the creativity literature clearly shows us that people who have taken the road less traveled are often the ones who make innovative breakthroughs in their fields of study (Barron et al., 1997; Kaufman & Sternberg, 2006; Sternberg, 1988, 2007).² The problems that students pursue should also be “fuzzy” ones or open-ended ones, and they should be structured in such a way that it has the potential to change actions, attitudes, or beliefs. Teacher flexibility and a willingness to entertain and respect learning style differences are important conditions at this stage for promoting creativity and the self-efficacy that Bandura (1977) argued are important contributors to independent growth. The teacher or mentor must truly serve as “the-guide-on-the-side” by giving feedback, making suggestions, recommending and helping students secure resources, and providing general support and encouragement. The skills mentioned earlier for facilitating analyzed knowledge activities can be applied here as well. In many ways, the teacher’s role at this stage is similar to a college professor’s role when guiding a student through a master’s or doctoral thesis. This guidance may refer back to both analysis skills and the need to carry our further searches of the received knowledge level described earlier.

² John Gurdon, the 2013 winner for the Nobel Prize in medicine, was criticized and given low marks by a high school teacher because: “... he will not listen and will insist in doing his work in his own way.”

The *raison d'être* of the creative/productive person in all societies is to have an impact and create change for one or more intended audiences. That is the reason why writers write, artists paint, builders build, and scientists and engineers produce new products to improve existing work and to make it more effective, efficient, and/or aesthetic. *The main goal of creative producers is to make a difference.*

The final guideline for helping students at the applied and creative knowledge levels is to assist young people in exploring potential outlets and audiences for their work. This exploration should begin early in the investigative and creative process because it provides motivation to complete and disseminate students' best work. An exploration of outlets and audiences allow students to become familiar with the formats and genres of the areas and disciplines in which they are working. These opportunities enable students to submit work for publication or display, both in and especially outside the school, to make presentations and performances to special interest groups, to enter their work into the almost unlimited number of special talent, and academic contests and competitions that exist in practically all areas of knowledge. These highly motivating opportunities to publish, present, and perform create and real world experiences to teach students about self-regulation, time management, meeting deadlines, and other executive function skills. One need only examine the legendary success of programs such as future and community problem solving, National History Day Competition, International Science and Engineering Fair, Invention Convention, and a host of other competitions to understand the role that outlets and audiences play in the creative and productive process.

The Renzulli Learning System

The major vehicle we have developed to implement this theory of blended knowledge is a technology tool entitled The Renzulli Learning System (RLS). The Renzulli Learning System is an interactive online teaching tool that provides personalized learning for students. RLS is based on more than 40 years of research and development conducted at the University of Connecticut and field tested across the country in all types of schools. Renzulli Learning applies gifted and talented teaching strategies and enrichment resources to total school improvement. The RLS enables educators to easily personalize learning and differentiate instruction by using technology to quickly identify student academic strength areas, interests, learning styles, and preferred modes of expression.

The Renzulli Learning System includes four key components:

- *The Renzulli Profiler:* Each student registers and then completes an online profile that gives teachers a comprehensive learning assessment of their academic strengths, interests, and learning and expression styles. Depending on the student's age and reading level, completion of the profiler takes between 45 and 60 min.
- *The Differentiation Search Engine:* The differentiation search engine matches thousands of online and some offline resources to each student's profile. Students and teachers are also able to explore the entire database of over 50,000 carefully selected age-appropriate websites and resources, including enrichment activities, simulations, e-books, and projects. Teachers can use the system to identify, select, and infuse enrichment activities into any and all aspects of the curriculum.

- *Lesson Planning and Differentiation Tool:* The lesson planning and differentiation tool enables teachers and students to work collaboratively on topics, assignments, and projects. Teachers can differentiate and disseminate a lesson in as little as 15 min. They can create and differentiate their own lessons or use the Renzulli readymade assignments and projects with linked-in resources. RLS enables students to understand “the why” of using the Internet by helping them make the best use of web resources. It also helps students focus their interests as they pursue advanced level work. The tool also enables students to complete a differentiated project in a systematic manner to achieve their goal.
- *The Total Talent Portfolio:* RLS has online portfolios to store student’s work. It is accessible anytime, anywhere, and can transport student information from grade to grade or school to school. The portfolio records enrichment sites visited, students’ assessment of the online Renzulli resources, and favorite sites, as well as any projects and assignments students have completed. Teachers and parents can review this portfolio at any time.

How Does RLS Work?

Once schools subscribe to Renzulli Learning (<https://renzullilearning.com>), teachers and students immediately have access to the enrichment activities anywhere they have a computer or handheld device and Internet service. Teachers and students sign on to the system with a user ID and password. Our professional development team and online training programs can train teachers to implement RLS, create differentiated lessons, and use RLS to challenge and engage all students. Research findings (Field, 2009) point to enjoyment and engagement as the critical factors in increasing achievement, decreasing boredom, and making learning more relevant and meaningful. Renzulli Learning was developed to save teachers time and promote the three E’s of highly successful schools—enjoyment, engagement, and enthusiasm for learning on the parts of *both* students and teachers. The essence of blended learning is dependent on easy access to relevant material and students’ ability to manage their own learning. The RLS was purposefully designed to place more responsibility for learning in students’ own hands and to use technology as a tool for facilitating self-directed learning.

Summary

This theory of blended knowledge and the Renzulli Learning System have the most critical relevance for what and how we teach high-potential young people, as it focuses on opportunities for creative productivity within standard curriculum practices, and on how we train teachers of gifted and highly creative students. If one of the goals of gifted education is to increase the world’s reservoir of highly creative and productive individuals, we must devote as much attention to analyzed and applied and created knowledge as we do to requiring students to simply acquire larger and huger amounts of information. One student described her advanced placement courses as “... test-prep on steroids,” and said that she learned more about creativity, joyful learning, and “thinking hard” through working on the school year-book, participating in the debating club., and preparing for a National History Day competition. *Using and blending* knowledge, both T-B-P and J-I-T, create a different brand of learning, and this brand should be the focus of work with high-potential young people.

This theory simply portrays the ways that different kinds of knowledge interact with one another to produce “blended knowledge” as depicted at the center of Figure 1. Learners receive information, but when they begin to analyze this information, they may find it need to “go back” and gather additional material for a more advanced analysis. Similarly, when they reach the applied and creative stage, it is often necessary for them to return to the received and applied levels, and “return trips” to these levels are usually based on just-in-time rather than presented information. And in cases when new knowledge, innovative contributions to a field, or even new ways of analyzing data (e.g., Big-C contributions such as Rubin’s Causal Model in statistics) are made at the applied and creative levels, the innovative person will then have added content that will become part of received knowledge in other learning venues. Although this process is a natural way that learning takes place, an overly standardized test-prep curriculum that severely emphasizes received knowledge can and will “discriminate” against both the analyzed and applied/creative levels of learning. Although this theory ideally can be applied to learning situations for all students, the inclusion of the applied and creative levels of knowledge is most associated with the goals that should be allied with programs for gifted and talented students. It is for this reason that the theory presented here has special relevance to the pedagogy advocated in talent development programs. The ways in which we develop curriculum, instructional techniques, and train teachers to work with gifted students strives to build an identity that is qualitatively different from general educational theories.

Like any other conceptual formulation, this theory is designed, first and foremost, to generate research testable hypotheses. Are accelerated courses that only provide advanced coverage of received knowledge producing desired results? Does adding analyzed knowledge result in different outcomes? What happens when we add all three levels to produce truly blended knowledge? These questions strike at the heart of the age-old dichotomy in our field between acceleration and enrichment. The theory of blended knowledge described in this chapter can and should be tested as it asserts that *both* acceleration and enrichment should be important components of gifted and talented programs.

The right-hand side of Figure 1 represents the outputs of a blended knowledge approach to learning and creative productivity. Increased academic achievement in the traditional sense is mentioned first because, whether we like it or not, any theory that does not include advanced content and the benefits of acceleration is logically flawed and will be rejected out of hand by policy makers and administrators. But a focus on twenty-first century skills has caused some reform-minded policy makers to embrace the importance of including analyzed knowledge in the goals of general education. It may also be reasonable to assume that these persons will see the value of considering the importance of blending all three levels of knowledge discussed here to further enhance creative productivity in our high-potential students. Finally, it may even be reasonable to hope that they may see some logic in giving students at all levels opportunities to engage in some of the activities that promote applied and created knowledge as well as received and analyzed knowledge. The enjoyment, engagement, and enthusiasm for learning that results from blending all three levels of knowledge in the learning process could reduce the achievement gap and reduce the boredom factor that continue to plague so many students in our schools, especially in schools serving low-income students. This challenge may be one of the first research questions that this theory could promote. A blended knowledge theory is particularly relevant to our highest achieving students (regardless of income level) because it represents the

modus operandi of gifted contributors in the larger world of knowledge construction, usage, and dissemination.

The theory of blended knowledge draws upon the wisdom of intellectual founders in the field of epistemology, it takes into account the over-standardization of formal schooling that has taken place over the past several decades, and it recognizes the dramatic changes in learning that are now possible through the use of technology. The theory also has special relevance to gifted education because knowledge creation, utilization, and diffusion are what creative and productive people do. The type of learning advocated by this theory is the way that the pursuit of knowledge naturally occurs in “real world” places. Scientists in research laboratories, writers working on a book or play, and social scientists gathering data to analyze various human behaviors do exactly what this theory specifies. If we want our most able young people to think, feel, and do like practicing professionals, we must include in their overall school experiences these kinds of opportunities to pursue and act on existing knowledge as it is done outside of formal schooling. Although learning in this “natural way” should occur for all students and at all grade levels, mass education and the text book/testing industrial complex have kidnapped the process by over prescription, a test-prep driven curriculum, and a linear/sequential interpretation of learning hierarchies.

The current focus on deductive, didactic, and prescriptive approaches to “canned curriculum” has resulted in limited opportunities for inductive, investigative, and inquiry approaches to learning. This emphasis has been especially detrimental to our most able students by turning them into efficient lesson learners and consumers of knowledge, but limiting their opportunities for developing high levels creative productivity and an *investigative learning* mindset. The young people who have the potential to make significant contributions to the arts, sciences, and all other areas that result in economic, social, and culture growth cannot change the world if educators do not integrate applied and created knowledge with advanced content. Like any other theory, I hope this blended knowledge theory will generate research on the parts of interested scholars, and will serve a practical purpose of causing us to reexamine our mission, goals, practices, and especially the ways in which we train teachers who will work with gifted students. An important part of the research that this theory might generate should focus on longitudinal studies of highly creative and productive adults whose work has made a difference in their chosen fields of endeavor and even changed the world. If we want special programs and services for high-potential young people to gain the recognition and support we advocate, the best “data” we can put forward are testimony that demonstrates their gifted programs made a difference beyond merely enabling them to earn good grades, high test scores, and advanced degrees. It must demonstrate that these programs have, indeed, contributed to expanding the reservoir of the world’s highly creative and productive individuals.

References

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Barron, F., Montuori, A., & Barron, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Creators on creating: Awakening and cultivating the imaginative mind*. New York: Putman.
- Beghetto, R. A., & Kaufman, J. C. (2007). Toward a broader conception of creativity: A case for mini-c creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 1(2), 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1931-3896.1.2.73>
- Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. *The Clearing House*, 83(2), pp. 39–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650903505415>
- Bereiter, C. (2002). *Education and mind in the knowledge age*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berman, M. (1981). *The reenchantment of the world*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M. & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw, & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills* (pp. 17–66). Berlin, Germany: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2324-5_2
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longman.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Care, E., Kim, H., Anderson, K., & Gustafsson-Wright, E. (2017). *Skills for a changing world: National perspectives and the global movement*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED583031.pdf>
- Center for Applied Special Technology. (1995). *The role of online communications in schools: A national study*. Peabody, MA: CAST. <https://www.cast.org/udl/roleofonlinecommunicationsinschools.cfm>
- CEO Forum. (2001). *Year 4 Star Report*. <http://www.electronicsschool.com/>
- Dai, D. Y., & Chen, F. (2014). *Paradigms of gifted education*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (1994). Characteristics of high level creative productivity: A longitudinal study of students identified by Renzulli's Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness. In R. F. Subotnik & K. D. Arnold (Eds.), *Beyond Terman* (pp. 401–436). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Field, G. B. (2009). The effects of the use of Renzulli Learning on student achievement in reading comprehension, reading fluency, social studies, and science. *International Journal of Emerging Technology*, 4(1), 29–39. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v4i1.629>
- Fitch, R. E. (1981). *The knowledge cycle*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gottschalk, L. R. (1969). *Understanding history: A primer of historical method* (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hébert, T. P. (1993). Reflections at graduation: The long-term impact of elementary school experiences in creative productivity. *Roeper Review*, 16(1), 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199309553529>
- Hunsaker, S. L. (Ed.). (2012). *Identification: The theory and practice of identifying students for gifted and talented education services*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

- Kaplan, S. N. (2009). The Grid: A model to construct differentiated curriculum for the gifted. In J. S. Renzulli, E. J. Gubbins, K. S. McMillen, R. D. Eckert, & C. A. Little (Eds.), *Systems & models for developing programs for the gifted & talented* (2nd ed., pp. 235–251). Creative Learning Press.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The Four C Model of Creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, *13*(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688>
- Kaufman, J. C., Beghetto, R. A., Baer, J. & Ivcevic, Z. (2010). Creative polymathy: What Benjamin Franklin can teach your kindergartener. *Learning & Individual Difference*, *20*(4), 380–387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2009.10.001>
- Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.) (2006). *International handbook of creativity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Machlup, F. (1980). *Knowledge: Its creation, distribution, and economic significance (Vol. 1: Knowledge and knowledge production)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. <https://learning.ccsso.org/common-core-state-standards-initiative>
- Next Generation Science Standards. (2013). *Next Generation Science Standards: For states, by states*. Retrieved from <http://www.nextgenscience.org/get-know-standards>
- Phenix, P. H. (1964). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Plucker, J. A., Beghetto, R. A., & Dow, G. T. (2004). Why isn't creativity more important to educational psychologists? Potential, pitfalls, and future directions in creativity research. *Educational Psychologist*, *39*(2), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3902_1
- Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The Enrichment Triad Model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1982). What makes a problem real: Stalking the illusive meaning of qualitative differences in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *26*(4), 147–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698628202600401>
- Renzulli, J. S., Gubbins, E. J., McMillen, K. S., Eckert, R. D., & Little, C. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Systems & models for developing programs for the gifted & talented* (2nd ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (2007). A technology based program that matches enrichment resources with student strengths. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *2*(3), 1–12.
- Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). (1988). *The nature of creativity—Contemporary psychological perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2007). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. F. (2007). Toward best practice: An analysis of the efficacy of curriculum models in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *51*(4), 342–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986207306323>
- Westberg, K. L. (2010). Young creative producers: Twenty-five years later. *Gifted Education International*, *26*(2–3), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02614294100260031>
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: Macmillan.

Joseph S. Renzulli, Ed.D., is the Raymond and Lynn Neag Professor of Gifted Education and Talent Development and also the Director of The Renzulli Center for Creativity, Gifted Education, and Talent Development at the University of Connecticut. He is a leader and pioneer in gifted education and applying the pedagogy of gifted education teaching strategies to all students. The American Psychological Association named him among the 25 most influential psychologists in the world. He received the Harold W. McGraw, Jr. Award for Innovation in Education, considered by many to be “the Nobel” for educators, and was a consultant to the White House Task Force on Education of the Gifted and Talented. His most recent work is an online personalized learning program that provides profiles of each student’s academic strengths, interests, learning styles, and preferred modes of expression. This unique program also has a search engine that matches multiple coded resources with student profiles. Teachers also use the program to select and infuse high engagement/enrichment activities into any and all standardized curriculum topics.