Kansas State University Libraries

New Prairie Press

Adult Education Research Conference

2007 Conference Proceedings (Halifax, NS, Canada)

To Go or Not to Go: Does Linking Intelligence and Wisdom Provide a More Powerful Theoretical Lens for Understanding Learning in Adulthood?

Rosemary S. Caffarella
Cornell University, USA

Follow this and additional works at: https://newprairiepress.org/aerc

Part of the Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons

Recommended Citation

To Go or Not to Go: Does Linking Intelligence and Wisdom Provide a More Powerful Theoretical Lens for Understanding Learning in Adulthood?

Rosemary S. Caffarella
Cornell University, USA

Abstract: I first argue that being intelligent, no matter how defined, is not enough to address the complexity of problems and challenges we face in the 21st century. I then explore whether linking selected concepts of intelligence and wisdom might provide a more robust way for educators to view the power of thinking that adult learners possess.

The concepts of intelligence and wisdom have long been viewed as different. Intelligence is regarded by some as genetic, others as a psychological construct that can be measured, or more recently something more tangible, that can be better viewed in the activities of everyday life. Whatever perspective is chosen, the study of the links between intelligence and wisdom are few. Why is this connection important for educators of adults? I argue in this paper that being intelligent, however defined, is not enough to address the complexity of the issues and problems adults face in the 21st century, whether they are in our backyard or on the battle scared lands of Darfur, Iraq, and Chechnya. Discussed first in this paper is the work of Sternberg, one of the few researchers who for many years thought deeply about the connections between intelligence and wisdom. Explored next are how two specific approaches of framing intelligence and the writing on wisdom might be linked in ways that could illuminate a more holistic paradigm of how we think about and act on the intractable problems adults encounter as they move through life. The paper concludes with observations for research.

Sternberg on Intelligence and Wisdom

Sternberg's study of wisdom has spanned many years. In an earlier study he sought to discover people's conceptions of implicit theories of wisdom by exploring "the nature and inter-relationships of intelligence, wisdom and creativity" (Sternberg, 1986). Through a series of studies with both laypersons and specialists, he found that people not only have implicit theories about intelligence, wisdom and creativity, but that they use them to evaluate others. He concluded from these studies that we must pay as much attention to wisdom and creativity as we do to intelligence, which was and still is not the standard practice. In his continuing quest to delineate the nature of wisdom, he most often linked this research, which is both theoretical and empirical, to his study of intelligence, and more specifically, to his triarchic, successful, and practical theories of intelligence (Sternberg, 2000; Sternberg et al., 2000; Sternberg & Lubart, 2001). In this work, he concluded that "successful intelligence and creativity [are] the basis for wisdom" (Sternberg, 2003). "Termed the balance theory of wisdom, Sternberg contends that wisdom is mediated by the values that underlie the common good. . . .Wisdom also involves creativity, in that the wise solution to a problem may be far from the obvious" (Sternberg, 2003, p. 152). In a recent handbook on wisdom, Sternberg (2005) looks at wisdom through the concept of foolishness. Foolishness comes from many avenues such

as a lack of practical intelligence or common sense, knowledge acquisition going awry, and defective problem-solving measures. His message is very clear—"the costs of foolishness can be very high" (p. 349), especially from the actions of people who possess incredible power and wealth. Their foolishness has led us into wars, polarizations among those who could make a difference, and inconceivable hardships for people worldwide. Rather, what is critical in taking action, which is the center piece of most theories on wisdom, is that in wisdom, one seeks a common good, realizing this common good may be better for some than for others" (p. 345).

The Individual Differences Approach

I address next the possible links between intelligence and wisdom through the discipline of psychology and more specifically the individual differences approach, which is the mainstay of research and theory building on intelligence from the psychological perspective. The majority of these studies focus only on the study of wisdom, although I am aware of a few researchers, in addition to Sternberg, who completed either empirical or theoretical work about how these two concepts are connected (e.g. Baltes & Staudiner, 2000). Grounded in the psychometric tradition, this approach assumes that intelligence is a measurable construct (Horn, 1989). I chose this body of research as it has a long and often contentious history; however this approach continues to be the dominant paradigm in the study of adult intelligence. What I find intriguing about this research and theory building is a contradiction between what most studies from this approach demonstrate and the more conventional concept of wisdom. Throughout the ages wisdom has been viewed as coming from our many experiences in life and is primarily a prerogative of older adults. Most researchers that frame their work in the individual differences approach hold tightly to their conclusions that intellectual functioning declines with age. There are also those who study intelligence from this same approach that do not agree with this finding. The two camps appear to be split more by methodological issues and what constitutes intelligence, than philosophical and epistemological differences. Researchers who assert that intelligence declines with age primarily use cross-sectional studies, and measurements that have little or nothing to do with the practical life of adults (Schaie & Hofer, 2001). On the other hand, researchers who maintain that overall intelligence remains the same and even may increase until very late in life have studied this phenomenon through longitudinal methods (Schaie, 2005). Here in lies the contradiction.

From this large group of studies produced by scholars who align themselves with the individual differences approach, the majority of these voices, I argue, assume that being wise would most likely characterize middle-aged adults, and a few might even venture to say young adulthood as well, if intelligence and wisdom are indeed connected. Therefore, wisdom might be most common during the time that intelligence levels, from their perspective, remain relatively stable. The Berlin Wisdom Paradigm group, lead by Paul Baltes, who frame their work from the individual differences approach, has one of the longest and richest histories of the study of the wisdom (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000; Kunzmann & Baltes, 2003, 2005). For example Baltes and Staudinger 2000, based on a number of empirical studies on wisdom, assert that their data "suggest there may be an age limit to the level of wisdom-related performance in old age" (p.128), and that wisdom comes with all ages in adulthood. These data have led them "to predict the 'world record'

for wisdom may be someone in her 60's" (p.128), when taking into account both intellectual functioning and what they term wisdom-related concepts.

From their many years of empirical research, Baltes and his colleagues have recently proposed a theoretical model of wisdom that centers on the development, structure, and functions of wisdom According to Kunzmann and Baltes (2005) development of wisdom "is acquired over an intensive process of learning and practice . . . involves an integration of intellect and character . . . [and includes] most likely several paths that lead to wisdom" (p.118). Three factors are significant in this development of "wisdom-related knowledge, namely, *facilitative contexts* as determined for example by a person's gender, social context, or culture; *expertise-specific factors* such as life experience, professional practice, or receiving and providing mentorship; and *person-related factors* such as certain intellectual capacities, personality traits, or emotional dispositions" (emphasis in original p. 119). These factors are all bi-directional, accumulate over time, and determine the way people plan, manage, and make meaning of their lives. The current focus of the Berlin Wisdom Paradigm research group is a more in-depth study of the emotional-motivational side to wisdom and also to further develop alternative ways that wisdom can be measured by moving beyond the standard personality questionnaires. In addition, as Baltes and Kunzmann (2004) reflect on their own work they believe strongly that investigating further the relationships between wisdom and other forms of pragmatic intelligence is critical, such as those proposed by Sternberg and his colleagues, Gardner (1999), and Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000). As they observe: "acquiring and refining the kind of knowledge about the fundamental pragmatics of life that we argue is the core of wisdom [is foundational to the study of wisdom]. Here is the productive interface of wisdom as theory and wisdom as praxis" (p. 293).

For those few researchers that claim intelligence does not decline with age, I believe their assumption would be that indeed intelligence and wisdom could be connected, and although most often thought of as a characteristic of older adults, might also be found in younger age groups. Ardelt (2000, 2003, 2005) has presented some unique assertions related to wisdom. She argues that in educating older adults it may be more important to assist them in becoming wise than helping them maintain their intellectual functioning. Her reasoning for this claim is that although intelligence allows older adults to stay involved in a rapidly changing world, that being wise is more important in helping this population prepare "for the physical and social decline of old age and ultimately their own death" (Ardelt, 2000, p. 771). Ardelt describes wisdom as the rediscovery of the *significance* of old truths, mastery of one's inner self, spiritual, concrete, timeless and universal, while intellectual knowledge is an accumulation of knowledge and information, scientific, abstract, detached, impersonal, time-bound, and domain-specific. Ardelt (2003) also believes that although "wisdom is thought to be a strong predictor for many attributes of aging well" (p. 275), wisdom is not important for just older adults. Rather wisdom is developed much earlier in our lives. Ardelt (2003, 2005) has moved further with her research in developing and testing a three-dimensional wisdom scale (3-D-WS). More specifically, she has defined and operationalized cognitive, reflective, and affective dimensions that mirror her model of wisdom. The task of the cognitive dimension is to gain "a deep and clear understanding of life and the desire to know the deeper meaning of life" (Ardelt, 2005, p.8), while the reflective

dimension allows one to perceive reality as it really is, and the affective dimension is characterized by "an increase in sympathetic and compassionate love for others" (p. 8).

The Contextual Approach

Explored next is the second possible link between intelligence and wisdom through lens of the contextual approach to intelligence. Within this approach, there are two major threads. The first thread is that our intellectual ability lies at the intersection of the mind and everyday life. In essence this thread captures the adaptive functions of intelligence, that of being able to act intelligently in a number of different situations (Berg, 2000). This definition of the contextual dimension of intelligence very closely mirrors Sternberg's models of successful and practical intelligence. In addition, the work of the Berlin Wisdom Paradigm group and Ardelt's model of wisdom also include ideas of this thread of the contextual approach to intelligence, such as stressing expertise in the pragmatics of life, emotional competence, and the cognitive and affective dimensions of being wise. Another model on wisdom, The Emergent Wisdom Model, best illustrates fully this thread of the contextual approach (Bassett, 2005a). Through voices of twenty-five thoughtful and insightful adults of public distinction, Bassett (2005a) was able to capture "a model that describes the various components [dimensions] of wisdom, how they interrelate, and how people can learn to become wise(r)" (p. 6). She describes each of the dimensions, including their chief characteristic, the proficiency needed to carry out that component, what the manifestations would be for each dimension, and "learning prompts" that facilitators could use to assist a person to work their way through the model. Two of the most intriguing dimensions of the model are those of *engaging* and *transforming*. Often being wise does not equate with action, but according to Bassett (2005a), "I don't think you will find someone who is wise leads a passive life. Wisdom comes from going as far as you can and making changes, doing things you are afraid of doing. Wisdom is strength"(p.9). This dimension of *engaging* actually precedes the last dimension of the model, that of *transforming*. In her view transforming is a reflective act, "one that allows the whole process of becoming wiser to cycle again, but on a deeper level—a transformation. This map of wisdom is really a spiral, circling ever wider and deeper into greater understanding of fundamental patterns and relationships, expanded spheres of consideration, and actions that are committed to the common good" (p. 10). Bassett ponders on why we do not go crazy with all of this constant doing, changing, and moving in different patterns. Her response is intriguing: "The self is not understood as a unit seeking stability, but rather as a process where the sub-parts constantly shift, adjust, and change. . . . From this vantage point a person is able more and more to 'empty the subjective side and take the world's perspective on things' (P. Kagan, pers. com., October 24, 2003 in Bassett, 2005a, p. 11)". Bassett (2005b) did change the display of her model from one presented in a traditional table format, which she viewed as too static and linear, to a form that reflects movement between and among the different parts of the model. In doing so the Emergent Wisdom Model, although the same in content, is now illustrated not as one single "simple construction, but rather a complex, ever-changing combination of elements" (p. 4).

The second thread in the contextual approach is based on the assumption that intelligence often has a different meaning to different gender, social, ethnic, and cultural groups. As Davidson and Downing (2000) state: "What is considered to be intelligent

behavior in one culture is sometimes thought to be rather idiotic in other cultures" (p. 40). Examples of classical studies of intelligence from this thread include Luttrell's (1989) research on the self-perceptions of intelligence of working class Black and White women, and Sternberg's (2000) descriptions of intelligence by adults in Africa and Asia. The Berlin Wisdom Paradigm does take into account the contextual factors of culture and race as part of their context-related factors, and also their concept of lifespan contextualism, but it appears to be rare in basic research on models of wisdom, at least those derived from the Western perspective. So, too, are there rich descriptive materials and empirical studies that describe this thread of differences related to areas such as gender, culture, race, and war and peace (e.g. Takahashi & Overton, 2005; Thorpe, 2005). For example, there have been many depictions of the wise old women. One such portrayal is the "Tracking of the Archetype of the Wise Woman/Crone" (Becvar, 2005). Becvar describes the historical roots of the Crone back to when the focus of worship was the Triple Goddess. "The three faces of the Goddess corresponded to the basic stages of development in women—the Maiden, the Mother, and the Crone" (p.20). The original Crones of the matriarchal community were viewed as a 'grand' mother image, meaning their main roles were to assist others in dying and welcoming new souls into their communities. The Crone also served as a teacher, settled disputes, and took on the challenge of distilling what she had learned into wisdom that could be shared. Needless to say this construction of the Crone as the carrier of wisdom over the centuries went from a person of honor to one that was reviled as hags or witches. Nevertheless, women today are beginning to again embrace the traditional meaning of the Crone, that of the wise old woman, and "older age is being celebrated [by women] in croning ceremonies that are created by and unique to the participants" (Becvar, 2005, p.21). In participating in such rites, women are welcoming the final phase of their lives through acknowledging connectedness, meaning "behaving with others in a way that honors and respects our interdependence" (p. 22); suspending judgments of others without careful observation and reflection and a passing of time; trusting the universe and the many ways messages are given in our world (e.g., intuition, dreams, guidance from oracles); creating realities that recognize women's abilities to influence and affect their lives that in some ways are truly astounding; and walking a path with heart, knowing that each women must walk her own path.

Closing Observations

From this initial exploration of whether linking the theories and concepts of intelligence to wisdom might provide a more powerful lens for understanding learning in adulthood, my response would be an unequivocal yes, but with reservations. The major promise I believe is working primarily within the contextual approach to both intelligence and wisdom, which acknowledges the importance of the intersection of the pragmatics of life with both being wise and intelligence. In addition, this approach recognizes that differences among people and situations, such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity, culture, race, class, and war and peace affect how we define both intelligence and wisdom. Focusing on this approach does not mean just letting go of studies guided by the individual differences approach, but to use these as only a part of the data that are useful, versus that data being *the only data* that are considered valid. My suggestion is that scholars form multi-disciplinary teams to look more in-depth at how what we know and

can learn about intelligence and wisdom might add a more holistic and rich picture of learning in adulthood, accepting that data come in many forms from traditional empirical work to storytelling and yes even from having crones share the wisdom they have gained. We also need to let go of the easy populations to study, that is undergraduate students, and move into the real world of adulthood at all ages, places, and ways of knowing and being. In addition, we need to enter into longitudinal studies in their many variations versus relying primarily on cross-sectional studies which we know confound our conclusions, as well as open our minds and hearts to alternative sources of knowledge, even forms that may still be unknown to us.

References

Ardelt, M. (2000). Intellectual versus wisdom-related knowledge: The case for a different kind of learning in the later years of life. *Educational Gerontology, 26*, 771-789.

Ardert, M. (2003). Empirical assessment of a three-dimensional wisdom scale. *Research on Aging, 25*, 275-324.

Ardert, M. (2005). How wise people cope with crises and obstacles in life. *ReVision, 28*(1), 7-19.

Baltes, P.B., & Kunzmann, U. (2004). The two faces of wisdom: Wisdom as a general theory of knowledge and judgment about excellence in mind and virtue vs. wisdom as everyday realization in people and products. *Human Development, 47*, 290-299.

Baltes, P.B., & Staudiner, U.M. (2000). Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 122-136.

Bassett, C. (2005a). Emergent wisdom: Living a life in widening circles. *ReVision*, *27*(4), 3-11. Bassett, C. (2005b). Introduction. *ReVision*, *28*(1), 3-4.

Berg, C.A. (2000). Intellectual development in adulthood. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence.* (pp. 117-137). New York: Cambridge University.

Becvar, D.S. (2005). Tracking the archetype of the wise woman/crone. *ReVision, 28*(1), 20-23. Davidson, J.E., & Downing, C.L. (2000). Contemporary models of intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of* intelligence (pp. 34-49). New York: Cambridge University.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21stcentury.* New York: Basic Books.

Horn, J.L. (1989). Cognitive diversity: A framework of learning. In P.L. Ackerman, R.J. Sternberg, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Learning and individual differences* (pp. 61-116). New York: Freeman.

Kunzmann, U., & Baltes, P.B. (2003). Wisdom-related knowledge: Affective, motivational, and interpersonal correlates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1104-1119.

Kunzmann, U.& Baltes, P.B.(2005). The psychology of wisdom. Theoretical and empirical Challenges. In R.J. Sternberg & J.Jordan, *A handbook of wisdom. Psychological perspectives* pp.110-135. Cambridge,UK: University of Cambridge.

Lutrell, W. (1989). Working-class women's ways of knowing: Effects of gender, race and class. *Sociology of Education, 62*(1), 33-46.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396-420). New York: Cambridge University.

Schaie, K.W. (2005). *Developmental influences on adult intelligence: The Seattle longitudinal study.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Schaie, K.W., & Hofer, C. (2001). Longitudinal studies in aging research. In J.E. Birren & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (5th ed., pp. 53-77). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Sternberg (1986). Intelligence, wisdom, and creativity: Three is better than one. *Educational Psychologist,* 21(3), 175-190.

Sternberg, R.J. (2000). Intelligence and wisdom. In R.J. Sternberg, J. Jautrey, & T.I. Lubart (Eds.), *Models of intelligence: International perspective* (pp.55-77). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sternberg R.H. (2003). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Sternberg, R.J., Forsythe, G.B., Hedlund, J., Horvath, J.A., Wagner, R.K., Williams, W.M., et al. (2000). *Practical intelligence in everyday life.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J., & Lubart, T.I. (2001). Wisdom and creativity. In J.E. Biren & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (pp.500-522). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Takahashi, M., & Overton, W. (2005). Cultural foundations of wisdom. An integrated developmental approach. In Sternberg, R.J., & Jordan, J.A. (Eds.), *A handbook of wisdom: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 32-60). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Thorpe, M.O. (2005). Wisdom in war: Ordinary people in extraordinary times. *ReVision,* 27(4), 34-43.