

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

JAMES C. KAUFMAN 101: TWO PATHS TO CREATIVITY

DOWON CHOI & MARIA AVITIA

ABSTRACT James C. Kaufman's contributions to the field of creativity are numerous and diverse; so, it is challenging to distill them to a specific area. If the creativity field could be broken into multiple divisions, he might fit into the divisions of "general creativity" or "diversity in creativity." Paradoxically, however, he is one of the scholars who moved forward the concept of domain-specific creativity, emphasizing the importance of developmental processes of creativity. Kaufman is abstract enough to theorize creativity models, guiding our understanding of the construct. Yet, he is a master communicator, able to translate these abstract concepts for lay people in a humorous and accessible way. Additionally, Kaufman focuses his research on everyday creativity. His recognition of this facet empowers creative people from diverse backgrounds and increases fairness in education. However, there is a lot more to James Kaufman than just creativity research; he is also a producer of creative works. Originally starting college as a creative writing major, he has written many plays that have been produced around the world, including a musical that was produced off-Broadway. Furthermore, Kaufman is a master collaborator, bringing different groups of people together to produce over 40 books. But most of all, he is a welcoming friend and advisor, opening the world of creativity research to those who want to be a part of it. In this chapter, Kaufman's incremental contributions to the field of creativity research, along with the path that led him there, and who he is as a person, are summarized.

Keywords: Four C model, Sylvia Plath effect, creativity 101, social justice

James Kaufman 101: Two Paths to Creativity

James Kaufman is an influential American psychologist in the field of creativity. He is an expert researcher, prolific author, theorist, creator of assessments, mentor, commentator, creative writer, and colleague. His balance of expertise and humility has allowed him to move the field of creativity forward both by his own contributions and by supporting and inspiring the work of many other researchers. In this chapter, we will take a look at his journey and discuss some of his many contributions to the field.

Two Paths to Creativity

James Kaufman was born in 1974 as the youngest of three children. His parents, Alan and Nadeen Kaufman, are internationally renowned psychologists who have created numerous popular and widely utilized intelligence and achievement tests (e.g., the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, and the Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test). James Kaufman mentioned several times that his father taught him numbers and statistical analysis through baseball, and his mother nurtured his creative writing with detailed written feedback after reading every single story he wrote (e.g., Kaufman, 2017c).

Kaufman entered college at the young age of 16, skipping his senior year of high school as part of a program offered by the University of Southern California (USC), majoring in Creative Writing (N. Kaufman, personal communication, May 21, 2021). According to J. C. Kaufman (personal communication, May 14, 2021), there were two people at USC that he had heard of and wanted to meet; one was a novelist, Tom Boyle, and the other was a psychologist, John Horn. Kaufman took fate into his own hands and searched out both professors, meeting Horn the first week of school and Boyle within the first month. John Horn quickly took him under his wing. (Although, for the first year and a half, Horn's mentorship was not related to psychology.) Similarly, shortly after meeting Tom Boyle, Kaufman became his research assistant for the next four years.

Like his parents, these two men contributed to two different parts of Kaufman's development. His education and experience diverged between the arts and sciences and yet converged into one topic, creativity.

His Path to Psychology and Creativity Research

Kaufman became a researcher long before he went to college. Unintentionally, as a child, he even started contributing to the field of psychometrics by solving new IQ test items that his parents created to develop their assessments (A. Kaufman & N. Kaufman, personal communication, July 17, 2017). He was only an adolescent when he and his father Alan Kaufman started researching and publishing articles—not in psychology, as one might presume, but rather in Baseball. Alan Kaufman (personal communication, May 25, 2021) shares a story of James Kaufman's first steps into the world of research:

As a 12- or 13-year-old, Jamie and I began to be a research team studying Major League Baseball. (James has always been Jamie to me, still is.) First, we wrote research articles and started getting articles accepted by Baseball Digest, Baseball Research Journal (yes, there really is a BRJ!), and a half dozen other magazines. We even published one in Playboy—not an easy feat—and Jamie had to sneak that issue into school to show his friends. We actually published a few articles in psychology journals, using multiple regression to predict award winners or Hall of Fame candidates (I taught Jamie lots of statistical procedures using baseball stats). We presented pa-

pers at local and national Society of American Baseball Research (SABR) conferences. But mostly we collaborated on a book called *The Worst Baseball Pitchers of All Time*, first a 1993 edition published by McFarland, then a 1995 Revised Reprint for Citadel Press. Jamie was able to find the addresses of about 80 pitchers who qualified for our book (guys like “perfect game” Don Larsen who once had a season where he won 3 games and lost 21). Jamie insisted we write to them and ask them to fill out a questionnaire. He also wanted to ask for their phone numbers and have telephone interviews. I said that it was a fool’s errand, that no one would do that. But he convinced me. . . . And he was right! We got many completed questionnaires with great quotes. More than a dozen agreed to phone interviews. I called, got rapport, and teenage Jamie conducted hour-long interviews. . . . We had a great time first writing, then revising, the book. Jamie’s creativity was in full bloom.

As mentioned in the introduction, John Horn became Kaufman’s undergraduate mentor. Horn is one of the contributors to the Cattell-Horn-Carroll model of intelligence. To Kaufman (personal communication, May 14, 2021), “he was one of the more amazing and brilliant mentors [he] ever met.” During an interview conducted on May 14th in 2021, Kaufman shared detailed stories about the roots of his career related to creativity. Kaufman began doing research on crime with Horn late in his sophomore year. Kaufman said if he was ever going to pursue psychology, it would be in forensics. After considering English Literature and Law, Kaufman double majored in psychology in his junior year, largely attributed to the influence of Horn and his parents. However, when he had access to a large dataset under Horn, he was not sure what topics to explore in the data. He went on PsycINFO and searched for intriguing topics. Many of them were related to mental health, and Kaufman soon began to volunteer at mental health hospitals. As he found this new direction interesting, he applied to clinical programs. He also applied to some programs in social psychology, cognitive psychology, developmental psychology, and experimental psychology. Although he did not get into any of the clinical programs, he was accepted into the other areas at Yale, Harvard, Penn State, and the University of Virginia.

Kaufman’s strong life connection with cognitive psychology finally led him to pursue his Ph.D. degree under Robert Sternberg at Yale University in 1995. An internationally renowned cognitive psychologist, Sternberg (1996, 2010, 2020) has developed theories and applications to recognize more diverse and global human abilities and skills (e.g., creativity, wisdom, and street smartness), going beyond routinely measured analytical thinking skills often measured on high-stakes standardized tests. For the first two years, however, Kaufman floundered. Although he worked on two papers with Sternberg on human ability and intelligence, (one of which is still on his top 10 most cited works), he had not yet found an area he was passionate about and enjoyed. He was not yet good at getting his own ideas. For his first master’s at Yale, which had to culminate in an experiment, he picked one of the ideas that Sternberg suggested. James said that he “did a terrible job and hat-

ed it." It was boring to him. He was used to at least being decent at things, but he was not on this. He was close to dropping out.

Near the end of his second year, the idea of researching creativity emerged. Although it was perhaps obvious in retrospect, since Sternberg studied creativity, Kaufman had not considered it. Sternberg printed out his *Handbook of Creativity*, which at the time had not yet been published, and recommended Teresa Amabile's *Creativity in Context*, Finke, Smith, and Ward's *Creative Cognition*, Dean Simonton's *Greatness*, and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's *Creativity*. Kaufman spent that summer reading. It was a life-changing summer. He said about this new topic, "It was the first academic stuff that I ever liked, that never sucked, that ever actually interested me. Those five books were and remain a very big influence on me." During his second master's, this time writing a literature review, he decided to focus on creative writing. This was before the full text was available on PsychINFO. However, Sternberg had the entire run of creativity research journals and let him borrow them a year at a time. Going through every article, Kaufman read everything on creative writing. This thesis not only became his first solo-authored accepted paper, but also this line of research ended up becoming the Silvia Plath effect.

Kaufman started applying for professor jobs during his last year of graduate school. However, creativity was, and as he says, "still is", a weird thing to study. Creativity as a research topic did not yet have its place at the university. After not being able to find a suitable teaching job at a university, he accepted a job with Educational Testing Service (ETS) as an associate research scientist in 2000. Although it was not his dream job, it paid well. While at ETS, Kaufman worked at the Center for New Constructs which consisted of examining learner characteristics that were not yet being measured by the existing tests. More specifically, he focused on finding ways to incorporate certain constructs into current tests (e.g., creativity). During his two years there, two major things happened. Firstly, he and a colleague received a grant to analyze writing. The project brought in John Baer as a consultant, who continues to be one of his closest colleagues. Secondly, he realized that working at ETS was not what he wanted and began applying to other jobs.

With more experience, Kaufman had more success. He applied for a professorship in cognitive psychology at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB). However, given his previous experience, he was encouraged to apply to be the director of the Adult Learning Institute, later renamed the Learning Research Institute. Though he was hesitant, he took on the challenge. This allowed him to have a lower teaching load, access to resources, the opportunity to do larger-scale research projects, and publish many articles. Ultimately, this position helped him figure out who he wanted to be as a scholar. Although Kaufman was not bringing in many grants, he was publishing, distributing new knowledge, and gaining media attention for the university. He stayed at CSUSB for 11 years. However, he wanted to mentor Ph.D. students as well, which CSUSB could not offer him. In 2013, he moved back to New England to the University of Connecticut as a tenured professor of Educational Psychology in the Neag School of Education, joining creativity colleagues Jonathan Plucker and Ronald Beghetto. Kaufman currently remains in this position.

Since starting at the University of Connecticut, four of his advisees have completed their Ph.D. degrees. Three more students are in the process of completion, and two students will be starting in the fall of 2021. Additionally, he has received several distinguished awards: the *Choice Outstanding Academic Title*, from the American Library Association (2015, and twice in 2018); the *Neag Distinguished Scholar*, from the University of Connecticut in 2018; the *Florence L. Denmark Award for Significant Contributions to Psychology*, from Pace University, New York in 2018; and the *Rudolf Arnheim Award for Outstanding Achievement in Psychology and the Arts*, from the American Psychological Association, Division 10 (Society for Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts) in 2017.

Scholarly Contributions

Kaufman's scholarly work can be conceptualized in many directions due to, in part, his prolific and diverse contributions in the field. However, his scholarly work can be distilled into three descriptors: inclusive, developmental, and balanced for social justice and educational fairness. Kaufman and his colleagues rekindled unrecognized but meaningful personal levels of creativity in their frameworks (e.g., mini-c) and assessments (e.g., Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale's everyday creativity) to foster hidden creativity. Not only did he include individuals' creativity, but also multi-levels of social aspects of creativity, ranging from interpersonal levels to a bigger cultural context (Kaufman & Glăveanu, 2020). His theoretical perspectives on creativity were reflected in his assessments. Supported by his empirical research, Kaufman (2010, 2018) argues that assessing students' creativity can increase educational fairness, going beyond a traditional construct of general intelligence. This summary of scholarly work is divided into four areas: theories, assessments, educational applications, and mental health.

Theories to Understand Creativity: Between Mini and Big

The CASE model, developed by Kaufman and Glăveanu (2020), sheds light on some previously-shaded areas of creativity by suggesting some conditions of fully crystalized creativity for all. For example, even if one's idea is new and useful, the person's creativity can be overlooked. CASE represents the four conditions of recognizable creativity: capital, awareness, spark, and exceptionality. This model amalgamates an individual's awareness of creative potential, the role of audiences, and sociocultural context to understand why certain creativity stays undiscovered and how important is an individual's belief on the creative potential for society. Hopefully, the CASE model can play a role in reducing our habitual thought patterns towards certain groups' creative expressions and prototypes that can create a vicious cycle for ethnic minorities and women, as the creators mentioned below.

Finally, although there are no differences by gender or ethnicity if creative products are anonymously evaluated (Kaufman, Baer, & Gentile, 2004), creative work that is thought to be by Caucasians (Kaufman, Baer, Agars, & Loomis, 2010) or men (Proudfoot, Kay,

& Koval, 2015) is assigned higher ratings – regardless of the gender or ethnicity of the actual creator. (p. 32)

The Four C model, a developmental conceptual framework, was completed by Kaufman and Beghetto (2009) based on Beghetto and Kaufman's (2007) previous work. The model's name, *Four C* (mini-c, little-c, Pro-c, and Big-C), appears witty due to similarities with one of the classic creativity research models, the *Four P* model (person, product, process, and press; Rhodes, 1961). Also, the similar names between Four P and Four C may imply their incremental contributions to the creativity field. Previously, creativity research was divided into two broad levels. Big-C originated from a long history of studies about creative geniuses to learn about the nature of creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996 & Simonton, 1994). Richards (2007) and Runco (1996), on the other hand, were more interested in everyday creativity, or little-c. In between these two dichotomous concepts, Kaufman and Beghetto debuted mini-c (i.e., creative potential or developmentally meaningful individual creativity) and Pro-c (i.e., professionally successful creativity) in their model. Thanks to the duo, researchers, educators, and parents can recognize our personal and professional creativities. Mini-c and Pro-c levels of creativity can be important since they are distinctive steppingstones to be developed for a higher level of creativity. The following is their own words about how the model moved the field forward:

We recognize that adding two additional distinctions (mini-c and Pro-c) to traditional conceptions of creativity adds a level of complexity to the field of creativity studies. At the same time, we argue that the additional complexity that comes with the Four C Model is necessary for continued maturation of the field of creativity studies. (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 8)

The Amusement Park Theory (APT) of creativity was developed by Baer and Kaufman (2005) to logically organize and combine the somewhat incompatible concepts of domain-general creativity and domain-specific creativity. Historically and traditionally, creativity was researched as a general cognitive ability (e.g., measuring divergent thinking as creativity), similar to general intelligence. Thanks to the APT of creativity, creativity was better understood in more specific skills. In Kaufman's book *Creativity 101*, he asks a humorous, thought-provoking question to help readers understand the perspective of domain-specific creativity: was Anton Chekhov, an eminent Russian playwright and story writer (Big-C), a creative physician?

Their model's structure can be similar to the hierarchical Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) intelligence model since it incorporates general intelligence alongside a broad spectrum of cognitive abilities in a hierarchical manner. However, compared to the CHC model, the APT model seems easier to understand due to Baer and Kaufman's poetic sense to use the metaphor of an exciting amusement park. Suppose creativity can be viewed as (1) domain-general creativity (e.g., basic intelligence, motivation, and learning opportunities), (2) domain-specific creativity (e.g., undergraduate psychology major), and (3) micro domain-specific (e.g., graduate psychology major). In their amusement park metaphor, they are analogous to, respectively (1) a type of

park (e.g., zoo), (2) a specific park (e.g., San Diego Zoo), and (3) a specific attraction within a particular park (e.g., Animal encounters activity at San Diego Zoo). The following is their explanations for the APT's purposes and applications:

If the objective is to help nurture students' creativity in a wide variety of domains—that is, if the program is not specialized to one domain or one thematic area—then activities should draw on diverse domains in different thematic areas. The APT model can help program developers avoid the all-too-common mistake of focusing on one area to the exclusion of others. (p. 159)

The Propulsion Model of Creative Contributions originated from Sternberg (1999) who divided seven types of creative contributions across domains based on interactions between creative products or ideas and their fields. Sternberg, Kaufman, and Pretz expanded the original model to creative leadership (2004) and the arts and letters (2001). Numerous and colorful examples in those articles depict gradations of leaders, painters, and writers' creative work to help understand creativity in context. Later, Kaufman and Skidmore (2010) updated this model with more examples from the domains of media and technology.

Creativity Assessment: Between Specific and General for Fairness and Equity

Essentials of Creativity Assessment (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008) is a monumental book to help creativity researchers understand historical and contemporary creativity assessments comprehensively. This book was translated into Korean as well (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008/2011).

K-DOCS (Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale) was created by James Kaufman (2012). This 50-item self-reported questionnaire covers five domains of creativity: Self/Everyday, Scholarly, Performance (including writing and music), Mechanical/Scientific, and Artistic. This measurement's reliability and validity were supported in the United States, some European countries (Mckay, Karwowski, & Kaufman, 2017; Kaufman, 2012; Mckay, Karwowski, & Kaufman, 2017; Şahin, 2016; Silvia, Wigert, Reiter-palmon, & Kaufman, 2012), and Asian countries (Susanto et al., 2018; Tan, Tan, Cheng, Hashim, & Ong, 2021). Regarding applications of this domain-specific measurement, a Czech Republic study (Dostál, Plhánková, & Zášková, 2017) found that Self/Everyday creativity was significantly correlated with empathy and Mechanical/Scientific creativity was related to systemizing skills. Another study (Şahin, Özer, & Deniz, 2016) with identified gifted students in Turkey found a similar result that Self/Everyday creativity was linked with emotional intelligence. These findings support Kaufman's effort to illuminate hidden and unrecognized-yet-important small creativity at the community or society levels. Recently, K-DOCS was successfully normed in the United States (Kapoor, Reither-Palmon, & Kaufman, 2021).

CAT (Consensual Assessment Technique) is an evaluation method in which experts judge creative work, reflecting particularly on the context of the creative products (Amabile, 1983). After Kaufman's own research on the

CAT, the technique would become one of his preferred creativity measurements due to its relatively accurate, domain-specific, contextual, and fair qualities. He empirically tested this technique in many different populations and for various purposes: to determine the reliability of the CAT (Kaufman, Lee, Baer, & Lee, 2007), to investigate undergraduate students' potential bias on creative writings (Kaufman et al., 2010), to discover commonalities/differences between expert and non-expert raters (Kaufman, Baer, Cole, & Sexton, 2008), to examine the accuracy of gifted students' ratings on others' writings (Kaufman, Gentile, & Baer, 2005), and to explore gender and ethnic differences on different types of writing (Kaufman, Baer, & Gentile, 2004). We can take a glimpse of Kaufman's weighted value on fairness over efficiency since he tried to figure out how to compensate for the weaknesses of the CAT (e.g., inefficiency), suggesting that quasi-experts (e.g., MFA candidate in Art, experienced writing teachers, and Rotten Tomatoes reviewers for movies) may be one solution (see Kaufman & Baer, 2012).

Creativity in Education: Between Cognition and Social Interaction for Growth

Creative Metacognition was created by Kaufman and Beghetto (2013). Creative metacognition has two broad components: (1) self-knowledge about one's own creative strengths and weaknesses and (2) contextual knowledge about appropriateness depending on a specific situation. In other words, these creative skills are similar to a wise decision based on the evaluation of one's own creativity and the specific situation. This useful construct has three major benefits. Firstly, teachers and educators may be able to realize their potential implicit biases toward their students' creative expressions in class. Secondly, we can understand why certain creative expressions in school settings can be discouraged and even smothered unwittingly. Finally, students can develop their creative metacognition to fulfill their creative potential.

Kaufman and Beghetto explained this complex concept with the metaphors of Superman and Clark Kent. They argue that students can learn to utilize their creative metacognition to judge when (and where) to fly and when not to fly (e.g., making judgments on the optimal time and place to exert certain levels of creativity).

This construct was tested with certain groups of people's performance related to domain-specific creativity tasks (Kaufman, Beghetto, & Watson, 2016), intelligence (Karwowski, Czerwonka, & Kaufman, 2020), self-efficacy (Anderson & Haney, 2020), self-concept (Beghetto & Karwowski, 2017), emotions (Puente-Diaz & Cavazos-Arroyo, 2020), and so forth.

Between the Dark Side and the Positive Power of Creativity

The Sylvia Plath Effect describes the historical phenomenon that eminent female poets were significantly more likely to present symptoms of mental disorders, compared to other types of eminent writers and individuals in other careers (Kaufman, 2001). His findings in this area have gained much attention in the media, such as *The New York Times* and CNN (Kaufman, 2017a). Indeed, the link between general creativity (including scientific domains) and mental illness has been a hot topic for a century without the emergence of any

clear conclusions (DeYoung, Grazioplene, & Peterson, 2012; Greenwood, 2020; Webb et al., 2005; Witty & Lehman, 1930).

This association has not been clear because, in part, the levels of creativity (e.g., genius vs. successful professionals) and domains of creativity (e.g., art vs. science) were all mixed up in literature; for example, Terman's (1922) high-IQ children and Simonton's (1994) full-blown eminent geniuses are too different to compare. Regarding domains, Feist (1998) found that artistically creative and scientifically creative professionals may have different profiles of personality. Unfortunately, however, the Sylvia Plath effect was used to strengthen a negative stereotype about creative female poets. Kaufman expressed his regret and responsibility for the stereotype (2017a). This creativity myth (e.g., the image of the crazy female poet) could have motivated him to try to push the future directions of the field of creativity research toward more healthy and balanced positive outcomes. The following is from his book, *Creativity 101* (2009):

Does creativity have a dark side? Sure. Everything has a dark side. . . . there have been a tremendous amount of resources spent detailing those eminent geniuses who have also been mad. But I am not convinced by the highly inconsistent research literature that a strong and steady connection exists between creativity and mental illness. . . . It is important to re-emphasize that even if all of the "mad genius" literature is true (and I would hope that most readers will not assume this point), it is a further leap to think that the average person who is creative is more likely to be mentally ill. . . . Whether or not creative genius is connected to illness will likely have no impact on most people's lives. (pp. 138-139)

Indeed, Kaufman's (2014) edited book, *Creativity and Mental Illness* debunked many myths about the negative stereotypes of creative people and explained the possible origins empirically and historically.

Empowering Everyday Creativity for Social Justice is one of Kaufman's most meaningful contributions in the creativity field. In the special issue to celebrate the 50th anniversary of *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, Kaufman (2017b) wrote an article entitled "Looking forward: The potential of creativity for social justice and equity (and other exciting outcomes)." In the article, he highlighted the positive outcomes of creativity. Particularly meaningful to Kaufman, people can use their creative potential to overcome their life struggles, perform better, and achieve personal growth. For example, Kaufman (2018b) looked at meaning-making in life as an active creative process. Although the process may not be clearly observable, it can be important to one's psychological health and well-being. He also noted that not only top-down, genius creativity but also bottom-up, everyday creativity can transform society.

Meaningful at a societal level, he argued that creativity may reduce inequity issues related to gender and ethnic biases. Going beyond the dark side of creativity, Kaufman's (2018a; 2018b; 2018c) series of articles focus on the benefits of creativity by introducing empirical studies to support the connection between creativity and positive outcomes.

Other Contributions to the Field

Perhaps one of the reasons James Kaufman has been so successful in the field of creativity is because he knows how to get the word out about the research he does. Whether it is through written work, leadership positions, invited addresses, or media, he is able to convey the message to a wide audience. According to Google Scholar (n.d.), Kaufman was cited 2996 times in 2020 alone; he has received more than 2000 citations a year since 2015. The following sections will dive deeper into these contributions.

Written Work

Kaufman is a prolific writer, as evidenced by the over 200 articles, 33 encyclopedia entries, 19 chapters, 15 reviews, and 14 books he has written/co-authored (not including those currently in press). However, he is also a successful editor having edited/co-edited 32 books, including two series: the *Psych 101* series and the *Exploration in Creativity Research* series. His wife Allison Kaufman (personal communication, May 19, 2021) shared her perspective on why he is such a good editor:

James is a total introvert, but I think he's really talented at understanding people. He loves to mentor people because he sort of sees how they work and how to help them work their best - what motivates them and interests them or inspires them. How to fit the person to the project. It works that way with his projects too - the reason he edits so many books is that he loves putting them together - fitting the authors and topics together into the book so they create a story or demonstrate an idea. He sees how people and their ideas work in ways other people don't.

Kaufman indicated that one of the valuable lessons from Robert Sternberg was editing books. Working with Sternberg made him ready to become an expert editor. "You learn how to do it, you pick up the tips, you have a vision for it, and you reach out. It's fun" (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). During the interview, Kaufman was asked whether he likes writing books more or editing them. He stated:

They are just different beasts. Editing a book, the fun part is planning it. The actual editing is good, you can read some good stuff, but that can be a little more, 'more'. Writing, particularly like [*Creativity*] 101, was me writing it in my voice, I mean, on one hand, I love it. On the other hand, it's all-consuming. I am very much not a perfectionist, except for a very few couple of projects, and [*Creativity*] 101 is one of them. . . . Writing is a very personal act. It is something that you do on your own. Even in the books I have co-authored, it's me doing my stuff, and them doing theirs, and then we meet. Where editing by its nature is collaborative.

Leadership Positions

Kaufman has founded and co-founded, respectively, two peer-reviewed scholarly journals, *Psychology of Popular Media Culture* in 2011 and *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* in 2008. He has also served as

the editor of the *International Journal of Creativity and Problem Solving* from 2008 to 2019. Additionally, he has been an associate editor on four additional journals and served on 20 editorial/advisory boards for peer-reviewed journals. Kaufman commented that what he likes about editing journals is his ability to shape them and through that the field itself. “Being able to find interesting papers and help expand and diversify the field. It also keeps you on top of the latest literature” (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). He has also contributed to the field by being an ad-hoc reviewer for over 50 journals. Additionally, he has reviewed conferences, manuscripts, grants, and workshops.

In terms of professional services, Kaufman has sat on and or chaired committees for various divisions of professional organizations ranging from the American Educational Research Association’s (AERA), *Division D: Measurement & Research Methodologies*; to American Psychological Association’s (APA) *Divisions 10: Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, as well as *Division 46: Media Psychology and Technology*; and National Association of Gifted Children (NAGC) *Creativity Division*. Most notably, he served as President of APA’s *Divisions 10: Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* From 2012 to 2014.

Invited Addresses

Another way Kaufman continues to shape the field of creativity research is through invited addresses at conferences, schools, and universities. In addition to the different academic and research conferences, he has spoken at the 92nd Street Y, Boys and Girls Club of America National Conference, the P21 Summit, and even Comic-Con International in San Diego. Additionally, he has traveled the world going to over 12 different countries, including Brazil, Chile, France, Germany, Qatar, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, and Turkey. For someone who has said that he does not love to travel, he has been able to spread the word about creativity research worldwide. His international efforts to connect creativity researchers led him to steer some conferences: The Marconi Institute of Creativity (Italy) and the International Conference on Knowledge, Innovation, and Enterprise (Czech Republic). Additionally, he is a board member of the Webster Center for Creativity and Innovation (Switzerland) and the Institute for Creativity and Innovation, University of Applied Management (Germany).

Media

Kaufman has appeared on shows, documentaries, newscasts, videos, and has been quoted by magazines and news outlets. Most recently he narrated the documentary *Independents: A Guide for the Creative Spirit*. Additionally, he was an on-camera creativity expert for Season 1 Episode 2 of *Redesign My Brain*. He appeared on CNN as a creativity expert and tested Dr. Sanjay Gupta on camera. He co-wrote, co-produced, and appeared in *Creativity in the Classroom*, a documentary produced by the American Psychological Association, and has appeared in multiple *Brainwaves* videos. Off-camera he has been a guest on *National Public Radio* four times and on multiple podcasts including *This Past Weekend*, *The Psychology Podcast*, *Creativity in Crisis*, *Psych Crunch*, *Table to Stage*, *Tent Talks*, and *The Falconer*. Kaufman has

had multiple in-depth interviews and profiles written on him appear in the *Roeper Review*, *Tech Trends*, *APA Monitor*, and *Scientific American* just to name a few. Additionally, he has been quoted or had his research appear in *The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *Los Angeles Times*, *O!*, *Wall Street Journal*, and many more.

His Path to Creative Works

We have discussed James Kaufman's academic and research accomplishments at length. However, Kaufman is not just a creativity researcher, but he is also a producer of creative works. As mentioned above, he started college as a creative writing major. Kaufman (personal communication, May 14, 2021) expressed his passion as a young man for writing by saying, "I was always interested in writing: anything, stories, some poetry, essays. I got really into journalism in school and fell in love with theater."

To begin, Kaufman has been writing from a very young age. By the age of seven or eight, he was already writing copiously. When he was in fourth grade, he had a yellow binder full of stories and plays. His mother Nadeen Kaufman (personal communication, May 24, 2021) shared a story of the young writer:

When James was about seven years old, he read Anne Frank's diary and became a bit obsessed with her. He decided to write his own novel about her. . . . He wrote over seventy pages on lined paper with a pencil. He wrote many short stories throughout the years, but in Middle School, he began asking me for constructive feedback. For a few years, I read everything he wrote (which included poetry) and corrected spelling and grammar. Sometimes I was amazed at how fully developed a character would be; his observations of people, their problems and desires, were astute. In retrospect I know that I was hard on him, expecting adult products. I'm sorry about that. He wasn't as interested in spelling and grammar as I was; he wanted feedback on the story itself. And there I was, red marker in hand. Luckily, his creative drive was (and still is) powerful.

However, sometime around his junior year, Kaufman (personal communication, May 14, 2021) realized that he was "good at creative writing but wasn't good enough." When he thought of writers, two categories emerged: the great writers and the not-so-great writers; he realized that he was not quite on the promising trajectory. He indicated that, in some ways, this was the genesis of the Pro-c in the Four C model. After his realization, he wrote to two of his favorite writers for advice. They both essentially said the same thing: "If you want to be a writer then write. But right now, you are not in a good mindset" (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). He decided that he did not want to write fiction, but maybe he could write plays instead.

Nadeen Kaufman (personal communication, May 24, 2021) states that during this time, James Kaufman wrote the story and lyrics to the musical, *Discovering Magenta* which would later be performed off-Broadway. While at the University of Southern California, she was incredibly excited to be in the audience for a reading of the play, including the song lyrics, by an

array of undergraduates. Like a supportive mentor, John Horn was in the audience as well. Kaufman loved writing and though he felt that he was not great, he was still good, so he applied to various Master of Fine Art programs in creative writing. One sent back a little note that in essence said, “If you can do anything else, do that other thing” (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). So, he pursued psychology instead.

As mentioned in the previous sections, the first few years of graduate school were tough for Kaufman. He hated what he was doing, and he felt that he was not good at it. He was still writing plays, and some were being put on all over the world: the U.S., Canada, Australia, and the U.K. This was early in the internet era, and he was one of the first to start posting his content online. About 50-60 productions overall were performed by high schools, colleges, local theater groups, and theater festivals; he directed at least eight productions himself. The plays varied from 10–15 minute plays, to one-act plays, even a couple of full-length plays. Two were performed off-Broadway, *Discovering Magenta* and *My Very Elegant Mother*, the latter of which was also turned into an audiobook.

Soon after he discovered his niche in creativity research, he slowed his pace on his creative works, but he did not stop. He and his friend Michael Bitterman continued to submit the musical *Discovering Magenta* that they had continued to refine in graduate school. Finally, it was accepted in 2015 as part of a theater festival. Once it was accepted, they had to rewrite most of it, revising the plot and including new songs. Kaufman indicated that the re-working of the play was the first creative writing that he had done in over a decade. They co-produced the play, recruited a director, and hired actors. Kaufman (personal communication, May 14, 2021) shared:

Often when something special happens to you, you are not aware of it until later. But this was one of those. . . . I knew it was special and . . . You know it was a limited run, about three performances, but I enjoyed every second of it.

Although the musical is over, Kaufman finds ways to stay in touch with the world of theater. He is currently working on writing a book with Dana Row, one of his favorite musical theater composers. They are now working on a book about creativity for people in the world of theater. To Kaufman, this is some of the most fun that he has had on a writing project, and he loves to be able to talk theater with one of his favorite composers.

Another line of interest in writing for Kaufman is journalism. Not only did he work on his middle and high school newspapers, but he also worked as a stringer, writing freelance articles for two local newspapers covering sports. For the weekly newspaper, he would write articles about local teams and events. For the larger daily paper, he tended more often to confirm scores and obtain quotes for things that they had on the byline. As a high school journalist, he interviewed several well-known actors, cartoonists, and authors by mail. Although a part of him loved it, he realized that it was not the lifestyle that he wanted to live. Indeed, the best stories tended to be the upsetting ones. However, many of the things that appealed to him about journalism are things that he can still do as a psychologist: editing books and journals, getting quotes, and doing research.

James the Person

This section reflects the person behind the researcher, as such, we will do away with formalities and address James Kaufman by his first name. We will discuss what some of his friends and collaborators have to say about him along with some of his former students. Although this is by no means an exhaustive list (and we apologize to those whom we could not reach out), it provides an overview of who James is as a person.

Friend and Collaborator

Some of James's friends and well-known collaborators were asked for quotes or short stories to include in this chapter. To avoid reducing any of the thoughtful submissions, full quotes from his friends and collaborators will be included at the end of this chapter and the content will be summarized in this section.

As mentioned above, James has published a large amount of work on creativity across domains and has done research, published articles, and written books on many different topics, such as learning, engineering, sports, love, and neuroscience. John Baer (personal communication, May 20, 2021) states, "I can think of no one in the creativity research field who has worked in so many different areas." His ability to be flexible and find ways to include creativity in almost any topic may be one of the things that makes James so great as a creativity researcher and advisor. James (personal communication, May 14, 2021) states, "Most of these types of crossovers, if not all, it's someone who I think is cool and interesting and I think 'Oh I want to work with them.'"

James also connects other researchers with each other. Zorana Ivcevic Pringle (personal communication, May 20, 2021) shares:

When Alex McKay did a social network analysis of creativity researchers, there was a central node in the network. All the researchers in the room immediately looked at James. It was clearly him. James is a connector in the world of creativity research.

David Cropley (personal communication, May 25, 2021) agrees, "He has created around himself a network of colleagues, spread around the world, that he connects together. James is able to join the right people together, for the right projects."

James has also been able to bring new researchers into the field of creativity, whether they are early career researchers or were researchers from a different field. Zorana Ivcevic Pringle continues:

My graduate advisor was not a creativity researcher and James became a mentor who invited me to take part in an APA symposium he was organizing. . . . My career would not be the same without James. He opened the door to the field of creativity scholarship for me.

David Cropley also notes:

I first got to know James Kaufman when I received an email from him, . . . inviting me to submit a chapter for a book he was editing (Creativity Across Domains). . . . I was relatively new to the field of creativity research and replied to him asking if he had mistaken me

for the “other” Cropley (my father, Arthur Cropley, who really is a creativity researcher). However, James assured me that he meant me. His interest had been piqued by what was probably my only publication on creativity at that stage: a study of creativity in engineering students (I teach engineering). . . . My own career as a creativity researcher comes down to the influence, in equal measure, of my father, Arthur, and James. Without the collaboration and the connections to other researchers that James has facilitated, it’s unlikely that I would still be working in this field.

James’s colleagues also note how he can work well with students. Although that will be discussed in more detail in the next section, here are a few things that his friends have observed. David Cropley (personal communication, May 25, 2021) writes:

Wherever he has worked I have seen students gravitate to James. At California State University, San Bernardino, James created a loyal, dedicated, and highly competent cohort of Honours and Masters students. Many of these came from non-traditional (in a university sense) backgrounds. . . . However, it is not surprising to me that out of this cohort there are now half a dozen, or possibly more, PhD-qualified scholars spread around the United States.

His friend Jonathan Pluckers (personal communication, May 21, 2021) shares:

[James] is the most student-centered professor I have ever met. . . . He goes out of his way to provide opportunities to students. . . . This is most impressive to me because he doesn’t think of it as “going out of his way,” but rather as standard operating procedure. . . . He encourages students to believe in themselves as much as he believes in them, and the results are often amazing.

In terms of his work itself, his collaborators indicate that “Working with him is so effortless, or at least it seems that way. He makes the work more fun, and his portion of the work is always so good that it takes little effort to get something great done!” (R. Reiter-Palmon, personal communication, May 24, 2021). Additionally, David Cropley (personal communication, May 25, 2021) shares:

James is a prolific generator of new knowledge in the field of creativity. I think this comes down to the fact that he is not only deeply knowledgeable about the field, but he is also an excellent writer, a fluent statistician, and perhaps above all, a skilled integrator. . . . Of course, none of this would work as well as it does if James’s own research was not of the highest calibre.

Based on the quotes provided, it is difficult to separate the collaborator from the friend. Roni Reiter-Palmon also mentioned that “I consider James more than a colleague. He is a good friend and great collaborator.” John Baer (personal communication, May 20, 2021) shares:

The field would be so much less interesting were James not at the center of so much of it, both because of his brilliance and because he

is just such a great human being, someone everyone wants to hang out with and work with.

His kindness has been observed by many. Vlad Glăveanu (personal communication, May 18, 2021) states: “James is one of the main reasons why I tell all my academic friends that the creativity community is the nicest and most welcoming group I have ever been part of.” His honesty was also noted by David Cropley (personal communication, May 25, 2021):

Over the years I have also stayed with James, sometimes for several weeks, and he is an amusing, engaging, and loyal friend. He is also honest and forthright as a colleague: he’ll tell you if an idea is stupid or a waste of time, just as he will support good ideas. James is one of those people who is interesting to be around. In the end, the field of creativity research is immeasurably enhanced by having James Kaufman in it.

One of James’s oldest and closest friends in the field of creativity, Jonathan Plucker (personal communication, May 21, 2021) shared an essay about him. He starts with: “James and I met so long ago that I honestly don’t remember when or how. But we immediately struck up a friendship that has only become stronger over the past couple decades, and I am grateful for that.” He indicates that “You would be hard-pressed to find a warmer, more interesting person with whom to talk . . . he is endlessly curious about the interests of his friends. Having a boring chat with James is simply impossible! He is a fascinating, captivating thinker.” He shares that his loyalty is unconditional. “His colleagues and friends trust him implicitly – once James Kaufman is on your side, he stays there for life!” and “he is willing to help anyone at any time. If someone needs a professional favor, even a new acquaintance, James immediately steps up to provide assistance.”

Mentor

Some of James's friends and collaborators have mentioned James's ability to mentor students and how well he works with them. James was asked what he has learned in the process of mentoring students. He indicated that one of the biggest lessons to being a good mentor is being a human being. He first started mentoring students when he was at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). These students were a different type of student than those he had taught at Yale when he was a graduate student. At Yale, the students were absolutely brilliant, however, he was not important to them; no one in the room needed him. All the students were going to be fine. However, many people attended CSUSB because they lived nearby. Many were working, returning students, first-generation college students, or had kids. “The same students who were working and raising kids or helping a parent or whatever, were the same ones who were apologizing for missing an assignment because they were in the ER or something” (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). This shaped his philosophy greatly. He would rather trust a student than possibly make it worse for someone who was already having the worst moment of their life. That part has continued. No matter where you are,

all students face difficult personal and life challenges, and it is important to him to be sensitive to that.

For James, one of the things he likes the most about mentoring is finding the students who are the diamond in the rough, those who were incredibly smart, passionate, and dedicated, and who had not been given the same opportunities. One of his research topics is meaning. “What makes a life or a career so important? One pretty big one is feeling like you are helping people. That what you are doing matters” (J. C. Kaufman, personal communication, May 14, 2021). James has been privileged with great and brilliant parents, and great teachers and mentors. If he is in the position to help those who are interested in the thing he loves, creativity, he will. One of his current doctoral students, Sarah Luria (personal communication, May 28, 2021) summarized his mentorship succinctly, “James is a gifted advisor who always has his students' best interests in mind. He cares deeply for his students and nurtures their potential.” Below are words from some of his former students or “diamonds.”

I suppose James was the first "real" academic advisor I ever had. He was the guy who decided to give me, who was at the time when I started my Master's training a naive young man, a chance to get off the ground in terms of my scientific knowledge, which allowed me to become more prepared for what would become my scientific/academic career. I learned a lot from him. Furthermore, due to his autonomy-promoting 'hands-off' approach to advising, I was able to have the freedom to discover the area of study in which I pursued and achieved my doctoral degree: Cognitive-Motor Neuroscience. From that title it may sound like I've left creativity behind, but I still have a genuine interest in the field and may decide to pursue it once again in the future. In the meantime, I want to at least continue to share the knowledge James helped me acquire about creativity with the next generation of students. I just finished running a 'special topic' week in my introductory psychology class on the subject of creativity, which exposed students to James and some of the work he has done. Perhaps because of that, some of them will become inspired and look further into this fascinating area of study. (Kyle Jaquess, personal communication, May 6, 2021)

James was my advisor in the MA program and has continued to be my informal mentor ever since (for the past 12 years or so). He has been my greatest source of support in my academic career and has had a profoundly positive influence on my life in general. When I met James, I was a first-generation college student with an art degree and debilitating social anxiety trying to get an MA in psychology. I think it's unlikely that I would have gotten my Ph.D. without his support and guidance. Coming from a background where the vast majority of people you know never graduated from college, let alone with an advanced degree, can make the labyrinth of academia seem impossible to navigate at times. In addition to teaching me about research, James taught me about surviving in academia. He provided a lot of guidance about what would help me advance at different

stages of my career and lots of opportunities for professional development (beginning with things like co-reviewing journal articles or guest lecturing in his classes). He also made a point to introduce his students to a lot of important researchers in the field. He is still the first (and frequently only) person I go to for advice about my career. He is one of very few researchers I've worked with who actually gets excited about research ideas. Talking about creativity research with him is always enjoyable and I always walk away feeling inspired and motivated. (Christa Taylor, personal communication, May 10, 2021)

When I think of an adviser who truly cares for their students, who types/writes faster than a cheetah, and is dedicated to science, I think of Dr. James Kaufman. I want others to know that he is not only a leader in the field of creativity but also among his former students and trainees. He provided guidance, resources, and training to me in the areas of psychology research and outreach. One of my biggest regrets is never taking one of Dr. Kaufman's classes, especially his class on film at California State University, San Bernardino. Many of the students I knew had him as a professor, and they would tell me how his class fueled them to think and engage in psychology. Dr. Kaufman is a leader who has not only contributed to creativity research and literature but also to the many students who fondly just call him James. (Joseph J. Armendarez, personal communication, May 18, 2021)

James has provided a great source of mentoring to me when I was an undergraduate and a grad student. His ability to share and describe creative theory makes it easily understandable. Also, his ability to share personal experiences made it seem like I could be a person that could earn a Ph.D. and that it was not merely reserved for grizzled wizards or research. He had a very caring personality and was interested in fostering student's research goals. Additionally, his network of other creativity researchers was vast and was great at connecting students to work with others and collaborate on projects. He always lets people know about projects that would be beneficial for their academic development. It was a great experience to be mentored by him. (Ryan Holt, personal communication, May 19, 2021)

There is so much to say about Dr. Kaufman, but I will share a brief story. Prior to going to college, I had some negative experiences in education, even hearing my own high school counselor that I was not "college material". Although I did eventually go to college, I was not very sure of my abilities. Shortly after I met Dr. Kaufman, my outlook towards education began changing. Dr. Kaufman was a great mentor in the whole sense of the word, he not only saw me as a student, but also a person. I still remember the day I was in his office, and he told me that he saw my academic potential. Those sim-

ple words made such a difference in how I saw myself. A year after meeting him, I was leading my one research project, involved in research preparation programs such as McNair and thinking that maybe a Ph.D. was very much a possibility. In many ways, it was his mentorship that not only allowed me to believe in me, but he also inspired me to want to one day do the same for other students. I don't think I would be a university professor today if it wasn't for the genuine support Dr. Kaufman gave me. Thank you, Dr. Kaufman, for believing in me and allowing me to now do the same for other students. (Tatiana Pumacahua, personal communication, May 28, 2021)

As the second author of this chapter, what can I say that has not already been said? I remember meeting Dr. Kaufman in a class in which he guest lectured. I knew that I needed to find an advisor; I thought creativity was cool, and he seemed very approachable. After the class, I went up to talk to him. I cannot remember what I said, but we walked back to his office, and I left with a literature review to work on. We continued meeting; he advised me on my classes, and I took his class on creativity and intelligence. Two of the readings were his *Creativity 101* book and his father's Alan Kaufman's *IQ Testing 101*. I was so nervous when I went into his office one day to tell him that I was more interested in his father's work than his. He laughed, and the next time his parents were in town, he introduced me to Drs. Alan and Nadeen Kaufman, who have also become great mentors to me. Although James was my undergraduate advisor, he continues to be my mentor, even now that I have completed my Ph.D. He takes a personal interest in his students, invites them into his home, and essentially makes them a part of the family. He will fight for his students when they have been wronged and will write a letter of recommendation at the drop of a hat despite having so much to do. Like many others, I truly do not feel I would be here today without his influence and support.

The Roads Continues

As can be seen, Kaufman has already contributed so much to the field of creativity. Only time will tell what creative projects and research ideas he comes up with next. Although this chapter may have been somewhat unconventional in the amount of personal information provided, the authors felt that to understand James Kaufman's success in the field of creativity, the readers had to understand James himself, who he is, and where his passions came from. His love of writing has helped him produce countless publications. His love of creative writing and theater fueled his interest in the field of creativity. His ability to organize thoughts, and his ability to connect people together, has resulted in many collaborations and edited books. His caring nature and mentorship qualities have benefited not only his students and early career creativity researchers but also the field itself by helping it grow and diversify.

In conclusion, James Kaufman has helped many in the world to appreciate that creativity is everywhere and in every moment. It is impossible

to capture all of his creative work and contributions in the field of creativity. Similarly, we could not seize all the creative moments that people have had with James Kaufman. As Kaufman's graduate advisor Robert Sternberg (personal communication, May 18, 2021) so eloquently states, "He combines being the top scholar in the field of creativity today with being one of the nicest and kindest human beings I have ever met. Hard to top that!"

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(2), 357–376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.357>
- Anderson, R. C., & Haney, M. (2020). Reflection in the creative process of early adolescents: The mediating roles of creative metacognition, self-efficacy, and self-concept. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000324>
- Baer, J., & Kaufman, J. C. (2005). Bridging generality and specificity: The Amusement Park Theoretical (APT) model of creativity. *Roeper Review*, *27*(3), 158–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190509554310>
- Beghetto, R. A., & Karwowski, M. (2017). Toward untangling creative self-beliefs. In M. Karwowski & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *The creative self: Effect of beliefs, self-efficacy, mindset, and identity* (pp. 3–22). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809790-8.00001-7>
- 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>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. Harper/Collins.
- DeYoung, C. G., Grazioplene, R. G., & Peterson, J. B. (2012). From madness to genius: The Openness/Intellect trait domain as a paradoxical simplex. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.12.003>
- Dostál, D., Plhánková, A., & Zášková, T. (2017). Domain-specific creativity in relation to the level of empathy and systemizing. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *51*(3), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.103>
- Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *2*(4), 290–309. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0204_5
- Google Scholar (n.d.). *James C. Kaufman*. Retrieved May 25, 2021, from https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=OzW_dWUAAAAJ&hl=en
- Greenwood, T. A. (2020). Creativity and bipolar disorder: A shared genetic vulnerability. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *16*(1), 239–264. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095449>
- Kapoor, H., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Kaufman, J. C. (2021). Norming the muses: Establishing the psychometric properties of the Kaufman Domains of Cre-

ativity Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07342829211008334>

Karwowski, M., Czerwonka, M., & Kaufman, J. C. (2020). Does intelligence strengthen creative metacognition? *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *14*(3), 353–360. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000208>

Kaufman, J. C. (2001). The Sylvia Plath effect: Mental illness in eminent creative writers. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *35*(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2001.tb01220.x>

Kaufman, J. C. (2009). *Creativity 101* (1st ed.). Springer Publishing Company.

Kaufman, J. C. (2010). Using creativity to reduce ethnic bias in college admissions. *Review of General Psychology*, *14*(3), 189–203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020133>

Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Counting the muses: Development of the Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS). *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *6*(4), 298–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029751>

Kaufman, J. C. (Ed.). (2014). *Creativity and mental illness*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaufman, J. C. (2017a). From the Sylvia Plath effect to social justice: Moving forward with creativity. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *13*(2), 173–177. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v13i2.1413>

Kaufman, J. C. (2017b). Looking forward: The potential of creativity for social justice and equity (and other exciting outcomes). *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *51*(4), 305–307. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.195>

Kaufman, J. C. (2017c). Tracing the roots of a career in creativity. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*, *5*(1), 1–216.

Kaufman, J. C. (2018a). Creativity as a stepping stone toward a brighter future. *Journal of Intelligence*, *6*(2), 21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence6020021>

Kaufman, J. C. (2018b). Finding meaning with creativity in the past, present, and future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*(6), 734–749. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618771981>

Kaufman, J. C. (2018c). Uniquely creative: Developing a new outline for positive outcomes. *Creativity: Theories – Research – Applications*, *5*(2), 188–196. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ctra-2018-0018>

Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2012). Beyond new and appropriate: Who decides what is creative? *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.649237>

Kaufman, J. C., Baer, J., Agars, M. D., & Loomis, D. (2010). Creativity stereotypes and the consensual assessment technique. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(2), 200–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2010.481529>

Kaufman, J. C., Baer, J., Cole, J. C., & Sexton, J. D. (2008). A comparison of expert and nonexpert raters using the consensual assessment technique. *Creativity Research Journal*, 20(2), 171–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400410802059929>

Kaufman, J. C., Baer, J., & Gentile, C. A. (2004). Differences in gender and ethnicity as measured by ratings of three writing tasks. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 38(1), 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2004.tb01231.x>

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. (2013). In praise of Clark Kent: Creative metacognition and the importance of teaching kids when (not) to be creative. *Roepers Review*, 35(3), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2013.799413>

Kaufman, J. C., Beghetto, R. A., & Watson, C. (2016). Creative metacognition and self-ratings of creative performance: A 4-C perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 51, 394–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.05.004>

Kaufman, J. C., Gentile, C. A., & Baer, J. (2005). Do gifted student writers and creative writing experts rate creativity the same way? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(3), 260–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620504900307>

Kaufman, J. C., & Glăveanu, V. P. (2020). Making the CASE for shadow creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000313>

Kaufman, J. C., Lee, J., Baer, J., & Lee, S. (2007). Captions, consistency, creativity, and the consensual assessment technique: New evidence of reliability. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 2(2), 96–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2007.04.002>

Kaufman, J. C., Plucker, J. A., & Baer, J. (2008). *Essentials of creativity assessment*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Kaufman, J. C., Plucker, J. A., & Baer, J. (2011). *Chang-ui-seong-pyeong-ga [Essentials of creativity assessment]*. (S. Lee & H. Lee, Trans.). Hakjisa. (Original work published 2008)
- Kaufman, J. C., & Skidmore, L. E. (2010). Taking the propulsion model of creative contributions into the 21st century. *Psychologie Schweizerische Zeitschrift Für Psychologie Und Ihre Anwendungen*, *5*, 378–381. Retrieved from https://jck_articles.s3.amazonaws.com/KaufmanSkidmore.pdf
- Keenan-Lechel, S. F., Henriksen, D., & Mishra, P. (2018). Creativity as a sliding maze: An interview with Dr. James C. Kaufman. *TechTrends*, *62*(4), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0300-y>
- Mckay, A. S., Karwowski, M., & Kaufman, J. C. (2017). Measuring the muses: Validating the Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS). *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *11*, 216–230. <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.1037/aca0000074>
- Plucker, J. A., Beghetto, R. A., & Dow, G. T. (2004). Why isn't creativity more important to educational psychologists? Potentials, pitfalls, and future directions in creativity research. *Educational Psychologist*, *39*(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3902_1
- Proudfoot, D., Kay, A. C., & Koval, C. Z. (2015). A gender bias in the attribution of creativity: Archival and experimental evidence for the perceived association between masculinity and creative thinking. *Psychological Science*, *26*, 1751–1761. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615598739>
- Puente-Diaz, R., & Cavazos-Arroyo, J. (2020). Creative metacognitive feelings as a source of information for creative self-efficacy, creativity potential, intrapersonal idea selection, and task enjoyment. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *54*(3), 499–507. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.384>
- Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *42*(7), 305–310. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20342603>
- Richards, R. (2007). Everyday creativity: Our hidden potential. In R. Richards (Ed.), *Everyday creativity and new views of human nature: Psychological, social, and spiritual perspectives*. (pp. 25–53). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11595-001>
- Runco, M. A. (1996). Personal creativity: Definition and developmental issues. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *1996*(72), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219967203>
- Şahin, F. (2016). Adaptation of the Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale into Turkish and examination of its psychometric properties. *Elementary Education Online*, *15*(3), 855–867. <https://doi.org/10.17051/io.2016.70479>

Şahin, F., Özer, E., & Deniz, M. E. (2016). The predictive level of emotional intelligence for the domain-specific creativity: A study on gifted students. *Education and Science*, 41(183), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2016.4576>

Silvia, P. J., Wigert, B., Reiter-palmon, R., & Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Assessing creativity with self-report scales: A review and empirical evaluation. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 6(1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024071>

Simonton, D. K. (1994). *Greatness: Who makes history and why*. The Guilford Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1996). IQ counts, but what really counts is successful intelligence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(583), 18–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263659608058305>

Sternberg, R. J. (1999). A propulsion model of types of creative contributions. *Review of General Psychology*, 3(2), 83–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.3.2.83>

Sternberg, R. J. (2010). WICS: A new model for school psychology. *School Psychology International*, 31(6), 599–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034310386534>

Sternberg, R. J. (2020). Transformational giftedness: Rethinking our paradigm for gifted education. *Roeper Review*, 42(4), 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2020.1815266>

Sternberg, R. J., Kaufman, J. C., & Pretz, J. E. (2001). The propulsion model of creative contributions applied to the arts and letters. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 35(2), 75–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2001.tb01223.x>

Sternberg, R. J., Kaufman, J. C., & Pretz, J. E. (2004). A propulsion model of creative leadership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13, 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-1690.2004.00304.x>

Susanto, E., Novitasari, Y., Ahman, Nurhudaya, Rakhmat, C., Hidayat, A., & Wibowo, S. B. (2018). Rash model analysis of Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS) to Indonesian students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1114(1), 012027. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1114/1/012027>

Tan, C.-S., Tan, S.-A., Cheng, S.-M., Hashim, I. H. M., & Ong, A. W.-H. (2021). Development and preliminary validation of the 20-item Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale for use with Malaysian populations. *Current Psychology*, 40(4), 1946–1957. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-0124-8>

Terman, L. M. (1922). A new approach to the study of genius. *Psychological Review*, 29(4), 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0071072>

Webb, J. T., Amend, E. R., Webb, N., Goerss, J., Beljan, P., & Olenchak, F. R. (2005). *Misdiagnosis and dual diagnoses of gifted children and adults: ADHD, Bipolar, OCD, Asperger's, Depression, and other disorders*. Great Potential Press.

Witty, P. A., & Lehman, H. C. (1930). Nervous instability and genius: Some conflicting opinions. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 24(4), 486–497. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.uconn.edu/10.1037/h0074610>

Appendix

Full Notes from Friends/Collaborators and Family

Vlad Glăveanu, Ph.D. Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Psychology and Professional Counseling at Webster University Geneva

James is one of the main reasons why I tell all my academic friends that the creativity community is the nicest and most welcoming group I have ever been part of. I still remember meeting him, for the first time, at the APA congress in Washington, in 2014. We had some brief email exchanges before and, to be frank, I was rather intimidated by the idea of meeting 'the' James Kaufman, the person who had his name on the cover of every other book about creativity I had ever read. And there he was, surrounded by people, smiling, laughing, inviting me to join and wanting to talk privately, later on, if I had a moment. I was over the moon and, when we did talk, we immediately decided to collaborate on theory and many other projects, including to write a paper about the 4 C and 5 A models coming together (side note, that paper was published many, many years later, but we kept being busy with other exciting pieces of writing in the meantime). And we kept meeting. Pre-pandemic I visited James's house and family once, he came two times to Switzerland to speak at the Creativity Week. And, as you can imagine, these were great opportunities to eat chocolate, enjoy some good cheese, and develop more theory. And to drink milk! In fact, one of my fondest memories from my visit to Connecticut - beside drawing on and signing James's wall of 'key creativity visitors' to his house - was our trip to the nearest milk bar. While the correlation between writing efficiency and drinking lots of flavoured milk has not been tested yet, James and I could easily have provided some good pilot data. We sat there for hours, writing different pieces of text, exchanging it, re-reading, editing, and drinking milk. And I've been looking for opportunities to relive this experience ever since! (personal communication, May 18, 2021)

John Baer, Ph.D. Professor at Rider University

I have never met anyone with so many original ideas, and so much energy to pursue new ideas, whatever their origin, as James. I can think of no one in the creativity research field who has worked in so many different areas. Some of us in the field are sort of one-trick ponies—that's probably a fair description of my work—but James is just the opposite, a whole corral full of different and exciting ideas. The field would be so much less interesting were James not at the center of so much of it, both because of his brilliance and because he is just such a great human being, someone everyone wants to hang out with and work with. (personal communication, May 20, 2021)

Zorana Ivcevic Pringle, Ph.D. Senior Research Scientist at Yale School of Medicine

I submitted a study from my dissertation to a mainstream journal and got desk rejected. Off I was, sending the paper to a different journal, feeling rather insecure. What I can tell with distance, but was not aware of then, is that the

paper used person-centered analyses at a time when this was not common and mainstream personality journals were not very interested in creativity.

James was a blind reviewer for the article, but signed it and asked me to get in touch. I was thrilled about the positive review, but even more than that, looking forward to meeting James. My graduate advisor was not a creativity researcher and James became a mentor who invited me to take part in an APA symposium he was organizing and all those conference informal events where you meet people in the field.

Since, we became friends and collaborators. He invited me to contribute to edited volumes and we worked on research studies. When I was organizing a conference, I called him to join the fun of bringing a terrific group together to Spain.

My career would not be the same without James. He opened the door to the field of creativity scholarship for me. In the two decades since we first met, I have seen him pull in many graduate students and early career scholars.

When Alex McKay did a social network analysis of creativity researchers, there was a central node in the network. All the researchers in the room immediately looked at James. It was clearly him. James is a connector in the world of creativity research. Objectively. And I can attest to it personally. (personal communication, May 20, 2021)

Jonathan Plucker, Ph.D. Julian C. Stanley Professor of Talent Development at John Hopkins School of Education

James and I met so long ago that I honestly don't remember when or how. But we immediately struck up a friendship that has only become stronger over the past couple decades, and I am grateful for that. James's productivity and the tremendous impact of his work are discussed elsewhere in this chapter, so I will focus on some of the personal characteristics that make him both an extraordinary scholar and wonderful person.

First, and much like myself, James is a bit of an introvert. But once he becomes comfortable with you, you would be hard-pressed to find a warmer, more interesting person with whom to talk. His interests are broad and deep, so a conversation may jump from psychology to baseball statistics to family to graphic novels to a cool research project to musical theater and back again. And perhaps more to the point, he is endlessly curious about the interests of his friends. Having a boring chat with James is simply impossible! He is a fascinating, captivating thinker.

Second, James's loyalty to friends and colleagues is legendary. In any professional setting, one usually has to watch their back, and higher education is no different. It's not common, but having someone you trust steal an idea, request help then never reciprocate it, etc., is not rare. You never have to worry about that with James. His colleagues and friends trust him implicitly – once James Kaufman is on your side, he stays there for life! I often advise my doctoral students and early career colleagues to find two types of friends: One who tells you the hard truth even when you don't want to hear it, and one who tells you that you are a good, valuable person regardless of how badly you screwed up. James is the unique friend to whom I can turn for both types

of support: When the sky darkens, he is the first one on the scene to lend support (and tell you it isn't your fault!), and when the clouds part, he is the first person to offer suggestions for how [to] solve the problem differently in the future (because it probably was your fault!).

Third, James's compassion and warmth are also obvious when he works with students. He is the most student-centered professor I have ever met. This was apparent when he taught at California State University, and I saw it firsthand when we worked together at the University of Connecticut. He goes out of his way to provide opportunities to students, frequently providing both undergraduates and graduate students with research and writing opportunities. This is most impressive to me because he doesn't think of it as "going out of his way," but rather as standard operating procedure. In addition, he is not judgmental when working with students – if they are dealing with difficult personal problems, professors often avoid them; James does the exact opposite, offering assistance and helping the students work through their struggles. He encourages students to believe in themselves as much as he believes in them, and the results are often amazing.

Finally, he is willing to help anyone at any time. If someone needs a professional favor, even a new acquaintance, James immediately steps up to provide assistance. He readily uses his vast, international network of researchers and friends to help people make connections, and as noted above, he is quick to offer a shoulder to cry on when personal issues go awry. I have personally experienced his generosity of spirit more times than I can count, and I have observed him provide assistance to others on many, many occasions.

Saying "finally" in the previous paragraph is not a great word choice, because I could go on at length about James's other impressive qualities. But these are four aspects of his character that immediately come to mind when I think about why he is able to have such an impactful career: He is both intelligent and creative, his loyalty is unconditional, he is devoted to students, and he will offer you the shirt off his back. For these and a million other reasons, I am grateful for his friendship. (personal communication, May 21, 2021)

Roni Reiter-Palmon, Ph.D. Professor and Director, Industrial/Organizational Graduate Program at University of Nebraska Omaha

I consider James more than a colleague. He is a good friend and a great collaborator. Working with him is so effortless, or at least it seems that way. He makes the work more fun, and his portion of the work is always so good that it takes little effort to get something great done! (personal communication, May 24, 2021)

David Cropley, Ph.D. Professor of Engineering Innovation at University of South Australia

I first got to know James Kaufman when I received an email from him, probably in 2004, inviting me to submit a chapter for a book he was editing (*Creativity Across Domains*). At that stage, I was relatively new to the field of creativity research, and replied to him asking if he had mistaken me for the

“other” Cropley (my father, Arthur Cropley, who really is a creativity researcher). However, James assured me that he meant me. His interest had been piqued by what was probably my only publication on creativity at that stage: a study of creativity in engineering students (I teach engineering).

It wasn't until about 2 years later that I was passing through LA that I tried to meet up with James face to face for the first time. I had a free day before flying back to Australia, and thought I'd rent a car and drive out to see him in San Bernardino. It wasn't until I was at the desk of the car rental company at LAX that I discovered I had misplaced my driver's license. No license, no car. I ended up retiring to a hotel room, and rang James. We ended up talking for an hour, and I resolved to try and make sure that my next visit would be in person.

I did end up meeting James, in LA again, a couple of years later, but it was in 2010 that I managed to organize a visit of several days. By this stage, James and I knew each other quite well, and I had also become more deliberately focused on creativity research. In fact, in 2008, James and I, along with Arthur, had published what has become quite a seminal paper, kicking off a wave of interest in what we called “Malevolent” creativity. That then led to an edited book on *“The Dark Side of Creativity”*, and this was the first time that I began to really experience James's unique qualities in the field of creativity.

James is a prolific generator of new knowledge in the field of creativity. I think this comes down to the fact that he is not only deeply knowledgeable about the field, but he is also an excellent writer, a fluent statistician, and perhaps above all, a skilled integrator. I mean this in the sense that he has created around himself a network of colleagues, spread around the world, that he connects together. James is able to join the right people together, for the right project, always contributing and adding value himself, as well orchestrating and curating. The proof of his effectiveness as a key focus of creativity research can be seen in the number of people who intersect with him: as co-authors, co-editors, or contributors. Of course, none of this would work as well as it does if James's own research was not of the highest calibre.

We also see evidence of his effectiveness in the students that he has attracted into his network. Wherever he has worked I have seen students gravitate to James. At California State University, San Bernardino, James created a loyal, dedicated, and highly competent cohort of Honours and Masters students. Many of these came from non-traditional (in a university sense) backgrounds – perhaps the first in their family to attend university, or having come to university through different, non-traditional pathways. However, it is not surprising to me that out of this cohort there are now half a dozen, or possibly more, PhD-qualified scholars spread around the United States. James attracts strong candidates, regardless of where he is, and turns these strong candidates into successful scholars.

The same is true not just of graduate students but of other researchers. My own career as a creativity researcher comes down to the influence, in equal measure, of my father, Arthur, and James. Without the collaboration and the connections to other researchers that James has facilitated, it's unlikely that I would still be working in this field. Over the years I have also stayed

with James, sometimes for several weeks, and he is an amusing, engaging and loyal friend. He is also honest and forthright as a colleague: he'll tell you if an idea is stupid or a waste of time, just as he will support good ideas. James is one of those people who is interesting to be around. In the end, the field of creativity research is immeasurably enhanced by having James Kaufman in it. (personal communication, May 25, 2021)

Allison Kaufman, Ph.D. Wife

James is a total introvert, but I think he's really talented at understanding people. He loves to mentor people because he sort of sees how they work and how to help them work their best - what motivates them and interests them or inspires them. How to fit the person to the project. It works that way with his projects too - the reason he edits so many books is that he loves putting them together - fitting the authors and topics together into the book so they create a story or demonstrate an idea. He sees how people and their ideas work in ways other people don't. (personal communication, May 22, 2021)

Nadeen Kaufman, Ph.D. Mother

When James was about seven years old he read Anne Frank's diary and became a bit obsessed with her. He decided to write his own novel about her... He wrote over seventy pages on lined paper with a pencil.

He wrote many short stories throughout the years, but in Middle School he began asking me for constructive feedback. For a few years I read everything he wrote (which included poetry) and corrected spelling and grammar. Sometimes I was amazed at how fully developed a character would be; his observations of people, their problems and desires, were astute.

In retrospect, I know that I was hard on him, expecting adult products. I'm sorry about that. He wasn't as interested in spelling and grammar as I was; he wanted feedback on the story itself. And there I was, red marker in hand.

Luckily, his creative drive was (and still is) powerful. In college he began focusing on playwriting and wrote the story and lyrics to the musical "Discovering Magenta" (which would later be performed off Broadway). But at the University of Southern California, it was incredibly exciting to be in the audience for a reading of the play, including the song lyrics, by an array of undergraduates. Memorably, Dr. John Horn was in the audience. (James "skipped his senior year of high school and went directly to USC at age sixteen).

At Yale for graduate work he continued playwriting and one of his professors played acting roles. That professor is now President of Yale University. This creativity continued steadily, leading to many professional productions. It's no wonder that he has written so many professional books and chapters. (personal communication, May 24, 2021)

Alan Kaufman, Ph.D. Father

I learned firsthand what it means to be the parent of a truly gifted and creative child. And Jamie was that, from a very early age. (James has always been Jamie to me, still is.). Nadeen and I often took him with us to conventions,

and always had to carry at least one large suitcase full of books for him, or else it would be a long 3-4 days for all 3 of us. As a 12 or 13 year-old, Jamie and I began to be a research team studying Major League Baseball. First we wrote research articles and started getting articles accepted by Baseball Digest, Baseball Research Journal (yes, there really is a BRJ!), and a half dozen other magazines. We even published one in Playboy—not an easy feat—and Jamie had to sneak that issue into school to show his friends. We actually published a few articles in psychology journals, using multiple regression to predict award winners or Hall of Fame candidates (I taught Jamie lots of statistical procedures using baseball stats). We presented papers at local and national Society of American Baseball Research (SABR) conferences. But mostly we collaborated on a book called *The Worst Baseball Pitchers of All Time*, first a 1993 edition published by McFarland, then a 1995 Revised Reprint for Citadel Press. Jamie was able to find the addresses of about 80 pitchers who qualified for our book (guys like “perfect game” Don Larsen who once had a season where he won 3 games and lost 21). Jamie insisted we write to them and ask them to fill out a questionnaire. He also wanted to ask for their phone numbers and have telephone interviews. I said that it was a fool’s errand, that no one would do that. But he convinced me; I agreed as long as we were upfront about what our book was about, “We are writing a book about pitchers who had terrible seasons, like you did in 1938 and 1941.” He agreed to my ground rules. And he was right! We got many completed questionnaires with great quotes. More than a dozen agreed to phone interviews. I called, got rapport, and teenage Jamie conducted hour-long interviews, one with 95 year old Milt Gaston, who was Babe Ruth’s teammate; one was 86 year old Si Johnson, who roomed with Dizzy Dean (“actually”, Si said, “it would be more accurate to say I roomed with Old Diz’s suitcase”). We had a great time first writing, then revising, the book. Jamie’s creativity was in full bloom. We awarded an annual Skunk Stearns Award to the worst pitcher of each season, starting in the 1870s (named after Bill Stearns, a truly awful old-time pitcher). Jamie coined the Asa Brainard Humpty Dumpty Award for pitchers who experienced fantastic success and then tumbled into oblivion. He named the award after the Cincinnati Red Stockings pitcher who led the first professional baseball team to an undefeated season in 1869, earning an audience with President Grant. The term “ace”—a team’s best pitcher—was named for old Asa. Then in 1874, in the first professional league, Brainard had a record of 5 wins and 22 losses for the Baltimore Canaries. And he deserted his infant son and wife (the woman who sewed the red stockings for the whole team), leaving them destitute. Humpty Dumpty Award indeed. Nice memories of Jamie! (personal communication, May 25, 2021)