The Ethics
of Creativity

Edited by
Seana Moran,
David Cropley and
James C. Kaufman

The Ethics of Creativity

This page intentionally left blank

The Ethics of Creativity

Edited by

Seana Moran
Clark University, USA

David Cropley
University of South Australia, Australia

James C. Kaufman
University of Connecticut, USA

For BK

SM

For MJC

DHC

For Ron Beghetto: friend and colleague,
and one of the most creative and ethical people I know!

JCK

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Figures and Tables

Figures

Tables

Acknowledgments

Notes on Contributors

Mark Coeckelbergh teaches philosophy in the Philosophy Department at the University of Twente, The Netherlands, and is managing director of the 3TUCentre for Ethics and Technology. He is the author of *Liberation and Passion*, *The Metaphysics of Autonomy*, *Imagination and Principles*, *Growing Moral Relations*, *Human Being @ Risk*, and numerous articles in the ethics of technology in information technologies and robotics, medicine and healthcare, and related to the environment.

Arthur Cropley received his PhD from the University of Alberta in 1965. He taught at universities in Australia, Canada, and Germany, retiring in 1998. He then worked as an adjunct professor at the University of Latvia for 12 years, from which he received an honorary doctorate in 2005. He has published 27 books and has received several awards from international associations. In 2008, he was made an Officer of the Order of the Three Stars by the President of Latvia.

David H. Cropley is Deputy Director of the Defence and Systems Institute (DASI) and Associate Professor of Engineering Innovation. He completed a PhD in measurement systems engineering at the same institution in 1997, and a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education from the Queensland University of Technology in 2002. His research interests lie in systems engineering, creativity and innovation in engineering processes, and the nexus of creative problem-solving and engineering. In 2013, he co-authored *Creativity and Crime: A Psychological Analysis*.

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi is the C.S. and D.J. Davidson Professor of Psychology at the School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences and the Peter F. Drucker Graduate School of Management, and co-Director of the Quality of Life Research Center. He is also emeritus professor of human development at the University of Chicago and holds honorary doctor of science degrees from several universities. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and a foreign member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Charlotte Dixon is a doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Her research interests in the sociocultural psychology of artistic creativity grew from her work as a documentary and press photographer. She has an MFA from the Yale University School of Art. She teaches both still- and time-based media at Maine Media College and works with regional museums and schools to develop visual arts and culture curricula for K-12 educators.

Anthony Finn has led 15 collaborative international research programs with universities, government laboratories, and research institutes from Australia, the USA, the UK, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia. He graduated from Cambridge University in 1988. He has published two books and ninety book chapters, journal articles, conference papers, and research reports. He is on the editorial board of four academic journals and has received several international awards for scientific achievement and innovation. His research interests largely focus on autonomous and unmanned vehicle systems and their applications.

Howard Gardner trained in developmental psychology and neuropsychology; he has studied and written extensively about intelligence, creativity, leadership, the arts, and professional ethics. Recent books include *Good Work*, *Changing Minds*, *The Development and Education of the Mind*, *Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons*, and *Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed*. His latest co-authored book, *The App Generation: How Today's Youth Navigate Identity, Intimacy, and Imagination in a Digital World,* was published in October 2013.

Jack A. Goncalo received his PhD in Business Administration from the University of California, Berkeley. His research on creativity highlights the importance of individualism for sparking creative thought and for facilitating the free exchange of ideas in groups. His work spanning the fields of management and psychology has been published in *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Management Science*, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, and *Psychological Science*. He co-edited the book *Research on Managing Groups and Teams: Creativity in Groups*.

Daniel J. Harris is a doctoral candidate at the University of Nebraska Omaha. He is in the Industrial Organizational Psychology program. His research focuses on malevolent creativity, destructive leadership, and their personality-based antecedents.

Helen Haste is Professor Emerita of Psychology at the University of Bath. She is also a visiting professor at the University of Exeter and at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Her research interests lie in the development of moral, social, and political values and citizenship; the role of metaphor in cognition, dialogue, and culture; and the relationship between science and society, particularly media and cultural images of science. She is a fellow of the Academy for Social Sciences in the UK.

Reuben Hersh is Professor Emeritus of Mathematics at the University of New Mexico. He is the co-author (with Philip J. Davis) of *The Mathematical Experience* and *Descartes Dream*, and of *What Is Mathematics, Really?* and *Loving and Hating Mathematics* (with Vera John-Steiner). His writings include many articles and some mathematical poetry.

Vera John-Steiner is Regents' Professor Emerita of Education and Linguistics at the University of New Mexico. Her research includes creativity, collaboration, cultural historical theory, and psycholinguistics. She co-edited Vygotsky's *Mind in Society*, an influential text in the human sciences. In *Notebooks of the Mind*, which received the William James Award in 1990, she explored the diversity of thought and creative endeavors. In *Creative Collaboration*, she documented the impact of working partnerships. Recently, she co-authored *Loving and Hating Mathematics* with Reuben Hersh. She has received many honors and has taught and lectured in Latin America, Europe, and the United States.

James C. Kaufman is Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Connecticut, researching creativity. Previously, he taught at the California State University, San Bernardino, where he directed the Learning Research Institute. He received his PhD from Yale University in 2001. He has written and edited 24 books, including *Creativity 101*, *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity*, *Essentials of Creativity Assessment*, *The International Handbook of Creativity*, and *The Psychology of Creative Writing*. He is the Series Editor of the Psych 101 series from Springer.

Qin Li is a doctoral candidate at Claremont Graduate University. Her field of research is positive developmental psychology, aiming for enhanced understanding of the creative process in order to develop methods of creativity enhancement. She examines creativity in relation to talent development, affect, mental illness, and expertise. She has presented her work at the American Psychological Association Conference,

the Western Psychological Conference, and the Society for Research in Child Development.

Gina Scott Ligon is Assistant Professor at the Department of Psychology, University of Villanova. Her research focuses on creativity and leadership, with a particular emphasis on the intersection of malevolent creativity and destructive leadership in extreme ideological organizations.

Alexandra E. MacDougall is a doctoral candidate at the University of Oklahoma. She is in the industrial and organizational psychology program and her research interests include ethics and leadership.

Seana Moran is Research Assistant Professor at the Department of Psychology, Clark University. She received her doctorate in human development and psychology from Harvard University. Her research focuses on the intersections of creativity, morality/ethics, life purpose, and wisdom as individuals strive to contribute to their communities. She co-edited *Multiple Intelligences Around the World* and several volumes of the *Creative Classrooms* series, and co-authored *Creativity and Development*. She has published numerous articles and received several grants, awards, and fellowships.

Kellen Mrkva is a doctoral candidate at the University of Colorado—Boulder. He is in the graduate program for social psychology and studies morality, emotion, and decision-making with his advisor Leaf Van Boven. He completed his undergraduate work at the University of Notre Dame, where he worked with Darcia Narvaez, studying moral identity, moral judgment, and charitable donations.

Michael Mumford is the George Lynn Cross Distinguished Research Professor of Psychology and he directs the Center for Applied Social Research. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Georgia in 1983 in industrial and organizational psychology and psychometrics. He is a fellow of the American Psychological Association (Divisions 3, 5, 10, 14), the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the American Psychological Society. He has written more than 300 articles on creativity, leadership, ethics, and planning.

Darcia Narvaez studies moral development with a particular focus on early-life effects of the evolved developmental niche on the

neurobiology underpinning moral functioning. She has developed interventions for moral character development, including integrating moral character skill development into academic instruction. She emphasizes "moral complexity" and the importance of both deliberative and intuitive processes in ethical expertise. She has co-authored or co-edited eight books. Her latest authored book is *The Neurobiology and Development of Human Morality: Evolution, Culture and Wisdom*. She is editor of the *Journal of Moral Education*.

James Noonan is a doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. His research addresses effective learning environments for teachers. He worked for eight years at a Boston-based non-profit organization where he developed curricula and teacher training programs aimed at developing the civic and social competencies of young people.

David R. Peterson is a doctoral candidate at the University of Oklahoma. He is in the industrial and organizational psychology program. His research interests include creativity, leadership, and ethics.

Roni Reiter-Palmon is Issacson Professor of I/O Psychology and Director of the I/O Psychology graduate program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). Her research focuses on the cognitive stages of creativity as well as the influence of personality and individual differences on creativity and leadership.

Ruth Richards is Professor at the School of Psychology and Interdisciplinary Inquiry, Saybrook University. She has studied creativity in educational, clinical, social action, and spiritual contexts, authored numerous papers, and edited or contributed to two books: *Eminent Creativity, Everyday Creativity, and Health* (with Mark Runco) and *Everyday Creativity and New Views of Human Nature*. In 2009, she won the Arnheim Award for Lifetime Achievement from Division 10 of the American Psychological Association. She examines whether creative process can bring people to greater health, offering new ways to be present with themselves, each other, and life's possibilities.

Robert J. Sternberg received his PhD from Stanford University and holds 13 honorary doctorates. He is the President of the University of Wyoming as well as President of the Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences and a past President of the American Psychological Association. He is the author of close to 1,500 articles, books,

and book chapters. He was a professor for 30 years at Yale University, and also has served as Provost at Oklahoma State University and the Dean of Arts and Sciences at Tufts University.

Kirsi Tirri is Professor of Education and Research Director of the Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki, Finland, as well as a visiting scholar with the Stanford Center on Adolescence. She has been the President of the European Council for High Ability and the President of the International Studies Special Interest Group in the American Educational Research Association. Her research interests include moral and religious education, gifted education, teacher education, and cross-cultural studies.

Lynne C. Vincent is a postdoctoral researcher at the Owen Graduate School of Management, Vanderbilt University. She received her PhD in Organizational Behavior at Cornell University. Her research explores the relationships among creativity, morality, and ethics, especially addressing the effects of the creative identity on behavior and how creativity can mitigate the effects of negative experiences, such as social rejection. Her research has been published in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* and *Psychological Science*.

Thomas A. Zeni is a doctoral candidate at the University of Oklahoma. Enrolled in the industrial and organizational psychology program, his research interests include leadership and ethics.

Introduction: The Crossroads of Creativity and Ethics

Seana Moran
Clark University, USA

> *"New is better." "Innovate faster." "Change the world."*

"More creativity!" seems to be the current mantra for success. Institutions, cities, and nations seek globally for people who will "break the mold," "cultivate disruption," or "hack the future" to provide competitive advantage and "stay ahead of the curve." Several higher education institutions have augmented their traditional strengths of general and professional knowledge by promoting the "twenty-first-century skills" of creativity and collaboration.

Amid the frenzy, some skeptics have a clarion call for us: Where is this leading? How will it proceed? Who is watching the effects over time, such as who will benefit and who might be harmed? As news reports of subprime lending or overused antibiotics imply, what seems good in the short term can contribute to catastrophes later on. As discussions of pollution and climate change suggest, what is good for producers and direct users may have adverse consequences for communities at large. These questions and situations address ethics, which describes moral norms and codes of conduct that provide direction for behaving properly. Ethics applies to situations that involve relations among people or the effects that our behavior may have on others or some greater good.

Numerous recent examples of creative ideas or products let loose in society have resulted in destructive consequences, some which continue to spread. Financial derivatives contributed to the "great recession" starting in 2008, which destabilized jobs and financial markets worldwide. Social media services launched in the mid-2000s have spawned an accumulation of "Big Data," which is eroding privacy and increasing a culture of constant surveillance (Debatin et al., 2009). The jury is still out for hydraulic "fracking" and for genetic modification in medical

therapies and food production. But the controversies revolve around whether we are being mindful or careless of these technologies' consequences regarding our water supply, food nutrition, and, ultimately, the health of ourselves, other living organisms, and future generations (Sandel, 2007). In short, how ethical is our creativity?

Other recent events signal that our ethical frameworks may require updating, if not transforming. Established rules based on old assumptions may not work any more. New computers and machines that kill can reduce the perceived human cost of warfare (or, later, perhaps law enforcement), because fewer soldiers or officers die in the line of duty. Yet, we are faced with ethical quandaries (see Finn, this volume): Will drones make military action more common and acceptable by making it "easy"? Who is responsible for the killings? How are they responsible? Similarly, internet-based classified listings sites or car-sharing sites or lodging rental sites have spawned a person-to-person commerce infrastructure that allows individuals to buy, sell, or rent various assets without institutional middlemen. These burgeoning opportunities bring up new ethical questions: How can "government" (whoever that may be) regulate when there are no clear mechanisms for enforcement? How are standards of quality, transparency, and monetary transactions to be maintained? If situations go awry, how will responsibility be allocated? In other words, should we intentionally think about ethics in creative ways to address the changing ways in which people can affect each other's wellbeing?

Creativity as novel, useful contributions to culture—is it "good"?

Most of the insightful, well-known scholars who contributed chapters to this volume start with the current standard definition of creativity as the introduction of a novel idea or product that is eventually deemed useful by a community to be widely used by the current generation and perhaps taught to future generations (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). Systems models of creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988, 1999; Moran, 2009a, 2010e; Moran & John-Steiner, 2003; see also Noonan & Gardner and Moran, this volume) emphasize how creativity involves both a cognitive-emotional process of coming up with the novelty, *and* a social process that requires others' recognition and acceptance of the novelty, either through powerful, expert gatekeepers or social diffusion (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Rogers, 1983[1962]; Sosa, 2011; Sosa & Gero, 2004; Stein, 1993; Subotnik, Jarvin, Moga, & Sternberg, 2003).

There is evaluation and acceptance of the novelty on the part of other people: Copernicus, Einstein, Edison, Marie Curie, Martha Graham, Shakespeare, and Gandhi did not become the historically important individuals they are without others buying into their contributions.

Creativity has tremendous power as a driving engine of cultural change (Glaveanu, 2011; Moran & John-Steiner, 2003; Valsiner, 2000): not only materially in a new product or in making money, but also culturally through changing assumptions and beliefs, and socially because once a critical mass of people accepts the novelty, the group is a force to be reckoned with. At creativity's most transformative impact, what was initially creative becomes the new norm. Although products that fit well with the existing social milieu are more easily adopted (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988), over time, radical creativity—and even the slower accumulation of smaller adaptations—can transform a culture's foundations (Moran & John-Steiner, 2003). For example, Einstein's idea of relativity is not just a physics concept any more; it also affects people's general worldviews that perspective and stance matter, and this notion has rippled into psychology, literature, movies, and law.

Despite the promise of creativity, we are ambivalent about, and even biased against, creativity (Moran, 2010c; Mueller, Melwani, & Goncalo, 2012; see also A. Cropley, this volume). We do not want non-stop creativity—incessant tax law changes, or airport screening technologies, or software update downloads, for instance, tend to irritate people. Furthermore, as consumers, most of us prefer reliability and safety, rather than creativity, in our commercial airline pilots or surgeons or farmers. Experimentation may be considered acceptable in the military (for pilots), clinical trials (for medicine), and agricultural research universities (for food; Moran, 2009a). We tend to prefer that creativity be put into "self-contained" endeavors removed from everyday life—like skunkworks, or labs, or test chambers—rather than directly into the mainstream culture (Jaques, 1955; Stacey, 1996).

This volume's authors address as their common purpose, but from different perspectives, the question: What is going on at the crossroads of creativity and ethics? History and everyday life show that creativity and ethics go hand in hand. Innovations to improve living conditions, a morally laudable aim, can stimulate far-reaching effects on social relations that alter the obligations of individuals to each other and the wider society. For example, the introduction of electricity and household appliances in the twentieth century improved the daily lives of working women who could afford the appliances, because they formerly had to work "double shifts" in the workplace and at home.

Yet, for upper-middle-class women, who previously sent their laundry to be cleaned, the impact was less positive because the new appliances made these tasks "do-it-yourself" chores (Tenner, 1996). The longer-term repercussions of electricity freeing up women's time, some argue, contributed to boredom and a search for new meaning (Friedan, 1963), women's liberation, entry into the paid workforce, and increased demand for childcare and other domestic support industries. The ethics of what women were supposed to be doing in society, and relationships of women to other cultural members, changed along with the technology.

Where do we start?

This volume organizes several perspectives that have broached the crossroads of creativity and ethics. When launching a new investigational arena, especially one that aims to integrate two formerly separate conceptual spaces, metaphors can help (see Moran, 2009b). Although metaphors are not theories, many creative thinkers start with metaphors to give structure to their thinking: Newton used the metaphor of the universe as a clock, Darwin of diversity as a tree, Einstein of a light beam as a train. The use of a familiar, concrete object or symbol with understood properties can aid the development of understanding the properties of the less familiar concept—and, importantly, create pathways to advance thought.

Given this volume's aim to stimulate further research at the crossroads of creativity and ethics, in this introduction I consider five metaphors for how to characterize this intersection: a magnet, a ripple, whirls of smoke, a map, and dough. The goal of this metaphor-based discussion is not to verify and document which metaphor is "right," but rather to provide scaffolding to stimulate thoughtfulness, perspective-taking, and wider horizons of possibilities for reading the chapters that follow. Which metaphor resonates the most with you? Disturbs you? Intrigues you? As you read different chapters, what metaphor(s) seem implicit in the authors' arguments? What are further implications that arise from using any of these metaphors as a basis for further research?

Magnet: Creativity *or* ethics

A magnet has two poles that attract and repel, creating fields and boundaries of influence around each pole. With this metaphor, ethics is viewed as one pole, representing stable rules that help people know

what to approach and avoid in advance, such as "give the bigger half of the candy bar to the other person," "keep your promises," and "don't cheat." Creativity is viewed as the other pole, representing flux, change, and disruption. Creativity and ethics are separate domains. They do not directly interact. Individuals and groups are attracted to one or the other pole. If they prefer stability, they are pulled toward ethics; if they are more flexible or prefer change, they are pulled toward creativity. In scholarship in the mid-twentieth century, ethics thinkers and creativity thinkers similarly kept to their respective poles, scoping their work not to attract attention to the other.

Ethics governs social interactions, where people directly affect each other. Creativity reigns in the symbolic realm of ideas, artifacts, and meanings (Moran & John-Steiner, 2003). The symbolic realm only indirectly affects people's interactions, so it often is not considered within the purview of ethics. Creativity is often associated with play, self-expression, art, and theoretical sciences. These domains usually are not conceptualized as prosocial or moral—they are isolated, special, "lone genius" domains removed from the "everyday world" (cf. Hersh, 1990).

Since the magnet's two poles stay apart, creativity is viewed as amoral; the rules are at the other ethical pole, and thus do not apply at the creativity pole. At the ethics pole, much of the time, given that most people tend to be relatively loss avoidant (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1989), ethics tends to reject the radically new, although adaptive novelties could be attractive if they are easy to use (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). The psychological biases of behavioral economics reinforce the notion that most people prefer the stable ethics pole, as people tend to make decisions based on what they already recognize, what others around them do, or what is most available in their immediate environment, rather than through experimentation or radical departures from the status quo (Gigerenzer, 2008, 2010; Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1989). The creativity pole tends to require more effort because there is more uncertainty, and people must discern among the wider possibilities, which can be considered less efficient (Hirsh, Mar, & Peterson, 2012).

What does this metaphor of the magnet look like in real life? For example, Einstein, whose equations are the backbone of nuclear weapons, is not held morally responsible for the atomic bomb. He is placed on the creative pole. His symbolic creation that paved the way for unleashing energy in the atom is too far removed from the social impact of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Similarly, Renaissance artists' invention of three-dimensional perspective in painting, and Picasso's flattening of

three-dimensional perspective in the early twentieth century, are not considered moral acts, only creative acts. More recently, a news item told the story of a subway incident. One man suffered a seizure and fell onto the tracks. A train was coming. Another man jumped down to save the first man. Instead of pulling the man up, because he was convulsing, the hero laid on top of the other man and held him down as flat as possible until the train passed over them. This was described as a moral act, but not a creative one.

Although this metaphor still underpins much creativity research, this characterization of the creativity–morality interaction—which is no interaction at all—is unsatisfying. It sidesteps the issues. Why are Einstein and the painters not held responsible for the consequences of their work? Einstein himself recognized the repercussions of his equations (Butcher, 2005; see John-Steiner & Hersh, this volume). Why is the frame-breaking solution of the man in the subway not recognized as creative? By not considering the other "pole" of the magnet, we not only limit ourselves to considering solely what already exists (ethics without creativity), we also set up a future fraught with hazards born from our own myopia (creativity without ethics).

Ripple: Creativity *in* ethics

A ripple is energy flowing outward through a fluid, often in concentric circles. With this metaphor, creativity and ethics interact. Ethics is the placid but flexible fluid into which a creative contribution can be introduced. People take for granted the "calm waters" of ethical norms until someone throws a creative "stone" into them and "makes waves." Creativity is considered deviance (Becker, 1963; Stebbins, 1966, 1971): novelties that "rock the boat" are wrong and resisted, unless there is sufficient power behind their introduction to maintain momentum. Implicitly, ethics is still based on rules, and there is inertia: the "ethical waters" want to stay calm so they retain a strong, stability-oriented, defensive resistance to change.

However, ethics is fluid and has some flexibility to absorb small disturbances without upheaval. That flexibility means that rule-breaking is allowed under specific conditions. In the real world, this equates to special circumstances: It is okay to kill someone in self-defense. It is okay to tell a white lie to spare someone's feelings. It is okay to be creative in specific fields, like art. Crime and corruption are rule-breaking with malevolent intent; creativity falls into the category of rule-breaking with good intent. The intention of the creator determines the novelty's moral

valence (Runco, 1993), but that intention must come with sufficient force, or at a specific angle (as with skipping stones), to have a ripple effect. The moral import of an idea or product is not recognized unless it is big enough to "make a splash," whereas most new ideas drown in indifference. People do not pay attention to the ethical entailments until the idea or product has created a wide circle of ripples.

At first, creators may be labeled rebels or troublemakers who disturb the calm (Moran, 2009a). They are rejected and sometimes resented (Monin, Sawyer, & Marquez, 2008). However, if enough cultural members "ride the wave," using the same social convergence biases (Gigerenzer, 2008) that normally tend to tamp down difference and disturbance in a culture, the ethics of the culture can converge on a new state of calm. Rather than mimicking the currently accepted "right way" (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1989), these biases can reinforce a shifted morality (Moran, 2009a) introduced with a "transformational imperative" (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, & Gardner, 1994). One simulation study (Sosa & Gero, 2005) showed that even a very small number of individuals in a culture, still using the recognition heuristic (Gigerenzer, 2008) but intentionally picking the option that is *not* the most quickly recognizable, could lead to a sea change in the community. The challenge for a creator is not figuring out some complex judgment process or criteria, but keeping the idea alive long enough for it to get through most people's "familiarity screening" (see Blair & Mumford, 2007). The novelty must be not so new as to cause anxiety, but rather an adaptation that can harness the current Zeitgeist and infrastructure (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). Creativity is other-focused and prosocial (Grant & Berry, 2011) by helping others see the not yet familiar as familiar (Moran, 2009c). Creativity impels movement, making use of the fluidity of ethics.

Smoke: Creativity *and* ethics

Smoke from a lit candle whirls and dances with the air currents, making visible the concept of turbulence. Unlike the generally regular, concentric pattern of ripples, the smoke and air create irregular patterns, chaotic flows, and agitation. When a novelty (the smoke) is introduced, it puts into motion what was already in the air; that is, the ideas that were already in the culture. The new idea can cause a cascade of changes in meaning (Bruner, 1990)—not only of facts, but sometimes of values. After the new idea is introduced, practitioners not only have to learn the new idea but also rethink their current notions.

The novelty reorganizes conceptual structures (Caughron et al., 2009; Mumford et al., 2010).

Whereas ethics was considered a stabilizing property of the culture in the ripple metaphor, with the smoke metaphor ethics is no longer taken for granted as universal and stable. Ethics is a domain, just like art, science, and business are domains, and creativity can arise *in* the moral domain and change it (Gruber, 1993). Scholars using this metaphor talk of "moral relativism," not across cultures but within cultures (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Maffesoli, 1991; Wolfe, 2001). This metaphor highlights different perspectives and value systems that may be at play: not creativity imposed on or into ethics, but creativity and ethics affecting each other. The focus is the strategy for changing values and mores themselves. The dynamic is not a centripetal force to bring "deviants" into an ethical frame, but rather a turbulence of creativity and ethics interacting, often in unexpected patterns (Chonko, Wotruba, & Loe, 2003).

Scholarly work applicable to this metaphor is found more in the morality literature than the creativity literature. Some researchers started looking at "moral exemplars"—Martin Luther (Erikson, 1958), people who saved the Jews during the Second World War (Oliner & Oliner, 1988), and various others (Colby & Damon, 1992; Moran & Gardner, 2006). These moral exemplars seemed similar to exemplary creators, as described in Gardner (1993) or Csikszentmihalyi (1996), except their efforts changed *social* relations rather than *symbolic* artifacts. They changed the way people thought about each other and about social institutions.

These intentional moral creators did not heed the uniformity of a "calm waters" ethics, but rather were idealists who harnessed a particular situation (Bierly, Kolodinsky, & Charette, 2009) to bring about "creative disruption" not only in business (Vedres & Stark, 2010) but across society (Florida, 2012). These disrupters are the innovators and early adopters in diffusion of innovation studies (Rogers, 1983[1962]), the open-to-experience individuals in personality studies (Cassandro & Simonton, 2010; McElroy & Dowd, 2007), the entrepreneurs in business studies (Hall & Rosson, 2006), and the outsiders in sociological studies (Becker, 1963).

A common description of creativity in this metaphorical frame is "fruitful misalignment." The values, purposes, standards, and practices of the domain are no longer headed toward the same aim (Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, & Damon, 2001; Moran, 2010d). Instead, the ideas from each (the "particles" in the smoke and air) are bouncing off each other. The world feels unsettled. There are still rules, but questions

arise about what the rules are, what they should be, and even about the "game of the rules" (Horton & Freire, 1990; Scott, 1990). This turbulence affects both more conventional roles (such as managers; Chonko, Wotruba, & Loe, 2003) as well as other creative roles (such as entrepreneurs; Hall & Rosson, 2006).

An example is the manner in which the slave trade was finally abolished in Britain. After abolition bills failed in Parliament repeatedly over 15 years, a bill was introduced indirectly, not to abolish slavery altogether but rather to prevent the importation of slaves by British traders into territories belonging to foreign powers. The abolitionists harnessed existing laws and ethical norms in the legal field, to intersperse their "smoke" with the law's "air" and alter the meanings of existing statutes. The bill passed, which created momentum for later bills to abolish slavery completely.

Other examples include astronomers Copernicus and Galileo, who both supported a heliocentric model of the solar system and encountered tremendous opposition from religious leaders. At the time, the Church was the "air" of moral authority. Galileo was condemned to house arrest. A sun-centered system was not an astronomical issue, but a moral one about humanity's place in the universe. Both astronomers hesitated at times to publish (as did Darwin with the theory of evolution, which also affected humanity's place in the universe). Similarly, Martin Luther King, Rosa Parks, and other exemplars of the Civil Rights Movement aimed to change social relations. The 1960s were extremely turbulent times. Despite the non-violent tactics of the freedom riders and other change agents, many people were harmed or died trying to change America's moral views.

Even today, young people with aims to change the world find their creative ambitions difficult to sustain (Moran, 2010a). Especially at a life stage focused on socialization into the existing culture, there are more forces *against* these ambitions than *for* them (see A. Cropley, this volume). Especially for high school students, most of these would-be world-changers reverted to more standard "get a job and have a family" goals after two years (Moran, 2010a).

The turbulence is felt by the creators themselves as well. Trying to diversify a community's ethics can be a lonely place, as they may start out as a "minority of one" (Torrance, 1991, 1993). Furthermore, the fruits of their efforts may bring great benefits to the community in the long term, but the costs of being different are borne primarily by the creators (Putnam, 2007). A study of moral rebels shows how they endure shunning, ridicule, and other shaming techniques for doing the

right thing (Monin, Sawyer, & Marquez, 2008). There are few social supports for diversifying or trying to change the moral domain (Haidt, Rosenberg, & Hom, 2003; Rozin et al., 1999).

Map: Creativity *of* ethics

A map spatially depicts what we know and do not know about our world. It gives us guidance where to proceed and where to avoid. Ethics codes are often considered maps for behavior, especially where the boundaries of proper behavior lie. Ethics draws the lines between "good" (known) and "bad" (unknown) lands. Creativity involves moving from the known areas of the map to the unknown. Perhaps the most fitting maps for this metaphor are the "here be dragons—beware!" maps of the Middle Ages. Still with a defensive, loss-avoidant, uncertainty-fearing foundation, this map metaphor portrays the areas ripe for creativity, but at least these opportunities are on the map! Creativity is no longer denied or shunned; it is moved offshore.

This metaphor of the creativity–ethics intersection abides mostly in venturing: seeking the "good" amid the dangerous unknown, primarily through meaning-making and exploration (Bruner, 1962, 1990), then bringing back the "bounty" to the mainland. There is a stronger sense of valuing possibilities than in the metaphors previously discussed. Ethics not only considers "what is" but could also consider "what could be," albeit cautiously.

Creativity is no longer viewed as uncontrollable in relation to a stable rule. Rather, it is a way of harnessing or controlling what could be—for those who take or support the risk of setting sail. The dragons in the map are the future, and the future is going to be encountered at some point. The belief is: perhaps we should have an agentic say in what that future will be. This perspective can be heard in mottos like Gandhi's "be the change you want to see in the world" or "invent the future."

Creators leave their cozy, familiar homes of today and seek fortunes "out there." It is a mindset shift from "small worlds" where the number of connections quickly becomes inclusive and the parameters of a problem space can be specified or assumed in advance (Granovetter, 1983; Watts & Strogatz, 1998) to "large worlds" that are not limited to the here-and-now, where uncertainty is part of the way things are and small changes can lead to big effects (Albert & Barabási, 1999). "Small worlds" with clusters and cliques help mediocre performers most, but "large worlds" open up increased possibilities for innovators to succeed

as well (Guimerà et al., 2005; Uzzi & Spiro, 2005). Thus, this metaphor provides a more creativity-friendly territory by creating a bigger world to explore, at least for the brave who venture forth.

Part of the reason this metaphor depicts creativity in a more friendly light is because the upheavals occur far from mainstream society. Thus, this metaphor may exemplify Stacey's (1996) and Jaques' (1955) notions of how communities handle anxiety about uncertainty through "shadow systems" that set aside some resources for courageous explorers yet do not affect everyday life. Many institutions tend to be conservative and cordon off creativity for safety reasons into, for example, special gifted classes in education, clinical trials in medicine, or test kitchens for nouvelle cuisine.

Maps to the unknown give creators license to set aside conventional social roles or identities and avail themselves of other possibilities—just as American westward expansion provided for explorers and homesteaders. Creators discover Foucault's (1984) heterotopia, a "different place" outside of normal functioning. Then they make that place palatable to the less venturous by updating the map, removing the frightening dragons, and "filling in the gaps" with landmarks of which the less venturous can make sense.

An example from the Bible is the story of King Solomon and the dispute between two women, each claiming that the one baby is hers. Conventional moral wisdom offered to Solomon options such as he, as king, could unilaterally decide which woman got the baby, or could hold a trial. But he did something creative by using what was known (mothers love their babies and do not want them harmed) as a launchpad to venture into what was unknown (who the real mother was). He posed a threat to cut the baby in half. This gutsy move brought to the surface new meanings in formerly uncharted waters (Connell & Moran, 2008).

The map metaphor particularly highlights the need for creators to provide directions for others in the culture to understand and make use of their novelty; that is, to make their creations easier to accept. For example, creativity can direct attention to an ethical issue through symbolic means when the social structure is such that the issue cannot be approached directly without conflict or potential harm. Dorothea Lange's photographs (see Dixon & Haste, this volume) or Bono's concerts for Africa make human suffering more palatable to address because they mediate the troublesome emotions through art or music. Graphic artist Shepard Fairey's OBEY stickers and street art (see Noonan &

Gardner, this volume), as well as the Pixar movie *Up!*, call attention to the mindless acceptance of propaganda (see also John-Steiner & Hersh, this volume). These creative artifacts introduce the issues in a way that people can take in, without the message being too difficult to bear that they emotionally or intellectually shut down. Creativity develops additional possibilities for developing the mainstream by exploring terrain that others consider dangerous or off-limits.

Dough: Creativity *for* ethics

Dough combines flour, liquid, leavening, and flavorings. Different ratios of these ingredients provide a plethora of tasty results: cookies, breads, noodles, cakes, and pastry, to name a few. As a metaphor for the creativity–ethics intersection, what is important is that, once mixed, the ingredients cannot be removed. Unlike a salad, where tomatoes can easily be separated from lettuce, someone cannot separate the wheat flour from dough. The ingredients in dough have fundamentally changed each other's properties.

This metaphor differs considerably from the previous metaphors because ethics is not composed of rules. Rather, ethics represents a relationship. It is not imposing one's values on others, nor absorbing others' values. It is not a process of homogenization, but rather of embracing different perspectives. It is the perpetual coming-into-being of social relations that integrate differences. Think of cooking, where flavors and textures from a variety of ingredients contribute to a satisfying meal. This metaphor is about meaning-making chemistry: imagination embracing empathy (Johnson, 1993; Yaniv, 2012; also Narvaez & Mrkva, this volume).

This metaphor becomes all the more interesting when it embraces the "other" beyond traditional conceptions of creativity as a symbolic function and ethics as a social function. Creativity is also social—in collaboration, in interplay of ideas across minds, in judgments of value (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988; John-Steiner, 1997, 2000). Ethics is also symbolic—in rituals and documents and gestures (see Dixon & Haste, this volume). Creativity and ethics are both dimensions applicable to *every* situation and domain. What seems like only a "personal" choice not a "moral" decision (Turiel, 1983) may be a case of myopia. Overeating or smoking, for example, are personal lifestyle choices in the short term, but they have considerable ethical ramifications regarding public health, healthcare costs, and use of common resources like bus seats or road maintenance in the longer term.

Although only a few researchers consider this metaphorical foundation (Grant & Berry, 2011; Muhr, 2010), several practicing artists and social activists support it. The notion of embracing is often seen in "dialogue" approaches to engagement of diversity, difference, or the new (such as thedialogueproject.org; Calabria et al., 2008; D'Arlach, Sanchez, & Feuer, 2009) as well as in perspectives on mainstream culture from non-mainstream individuals (Scott, 1990). Theater of the Oppressed, for example, uses audience members as "spect-actors" to explore, analyze, and transform social reality (Boal, 1993). Crossroads Charlotte in North Carolina is a program that asks citizens to share stories depicting plausible futures for the city (www.crossroadscharlotte. org). Saffron in Chicago produced an original play written by teens, inspired by real-life events of immigrants and the working class, to provide perspectives on issues of equality and opportunity (Metz, 2005).

How might this metaphorical understanding of creativity–ethics play out in a situation? In the Bible, the story of Jesus and the Pharisees addressing the fate of an adulterous woman may be an example (Connell & Moran, 2008). Jesus says, "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone." This statement, which forced the Pharisees into an exercise in perspective-taking, shifted the relational fabric of the situation. The "other" (the woman) disrupted the Pharisees' belief in their self-righteousness. Once that shift has been made—once the two perspectives are mixed—the self-righteous perspective could not be "pulled back out" intact.

Another example comes from constitutional history. Constitutions are not rules per se, but rather they address how to make the rules of a society. They concern the wider dynamics of rulings, rather than rules-as-given and rule-breaking (Cua, 1978; Havel, 1997). The Constitution Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, tells the history of the development of the US Constitution as legislators over time interpreted it to make rules for changing the meaning of a "person" to include, for example, non-white races and women. More recent interpretations suggest that corporations, animals, and the whole planet are also "persons." Constitutions guide who or what is embraced that, afterward, would be difficult to unrecognize.

This metaphor highlights that creativity and ethics, as they interact, change the properties of each other. Rather than taking snapshots of creativity and ethics in a given situation, this metaphor emphasizes the dynamics of change itself. It provides a two-way "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978) in which creativity and ethics both are active participants (Moran, 2010b).