Chapter 7

Move Slow and Nurture Things: Wise Creativity and Human-Centred Values in a World that Idolizes Disruption

Danah Henriksen and Punya Mishra

Abstract

Creativity is a critical skill across disciplines and contexts, and it is an important trait for humans to survive and thrive, personally and collectively. The fast-paced culture of business innovation has sought to promote and reward creativity as a coveted thinking skill. Creativity in and of itself, however, is a value-neutral construct, because novel and effective ideas may also have negative consequences. This darker aspect of creativity has come to the forefront in many recent cases, particularly in contexts involving digital and networking technologies, where the rapid pace of technological change does not encourage the kind of deliberative thinking necessary for nuanced and ethical business decisions. The authors consider why education is essential for expanding the ethical capacity of creative agency in business, describing the need to bring creativity and ethics together in educational opportunities and cultural values. The authors explore the idea of 'wise creativity' and the need to infuse more human-centred learning from the arts and humanities into business fields. Further, the authors suggest better practices for creative business education, such as: infusing real-world ethics learning into business education and professional development; infusing the liberal arts curriculum in business; offering opportunities for arts-based approaches in business learning; and instilling genuine mindfulness training in business education environments. The authors' focus is on a shift away from a culture that values creativity purely as an instrumental approach for greater profitability, and towards one that values wise and humanizing creativity for good business practices that consider societal and individual wellbeing.

Keywords: Creativity and technology; business education; dark side of creativity; business values and ethics; wise creativity; arts and humanities

> I have seen the power of the market… But when it becomes the
> only language, when it becomes the only way of thinking about
> the right thing to do, it leaves us with a very impoverished sense of
> how to live together. (Giriharadas, 2018)

Creativity is a critical skill across disciplines and contexts, and is seen as an important trait for humans to survive and thrive, personally and collectively. In a more instrumental way, creativity is often regarded as the engine driving our economy and societal growth – since most of the inventions and advancements that have moved society forward throughout history have sprung from creative thinking (Sternberg, 2006). The fast-paced culture of business innovation, in particular, has sought to promote and reward creativity as a coveted thinking skill and trait (Cook, 2016). And certainly creativity, driven by human-centred values, is critical for societal innovation and progress.

Creativity is commonly defined as the capacity to come up with solutions to problems that are both *novel* and *effective* (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). In this two-fold definition, creativity requires novelty because it results in something unique or relatively original giving rise to something that did not exist before. That said, a novel solution or approach alone is not enough. The products of creativity must also work well or must be valued within the context from which they emerge (Cropley, 2003). A creative solution must be effective, in that the solution achieves and meets expectations or requirements, works well within its context or presents value to others. A creative product in the arts might look very different from a creative mathematical proof, or from a creative business venture – however, all would have these two elements of novelty and effectiveness.

However, creativity in and of itself is a value-neutral construct, because a novel and effective idea may have good or bad consequences. It is important to acknowledge and accept this value-neutrality alongside the fact that society needs creative thinking to solve problems or spark improvements, advancements and ideas (Moran, Cropley, & Kaufman, 2014). But this entails important implications for creative ethics, and for educating people to act with wisdom in thoughtful creative action and decision-making (Baucus, Norton, Baucus, & Human, 2008). We argue that it is important to acknowledge and recognize the potential of a darker side of creativity, since creativity untethered from wisdom and deeper ethical foundations may have unintended and possibly negative consequences. This darker side can be seen in a range of recent cases across business settings, particularly in contexts where the rapid pace of technological change has not encouraged the kind of deliberative thinking needed for nuanced and ethical business decisions. It is for this reason that creativity should not be viewed uncritically and business education should become a site for the kinds of human-centred thinking and wisdom that are typically grounded in deep and genuine engagement with the arts and humanities.

We explore here this notion of creativity in business in the context of the idea of 'wise creativity' (Craft, 2008), and the need to infuse more human-centred learning from the arts and humanities into fields of business. This becomes increasingly important in a world that tends to overvalue pure disruption, instrumental

innovation and the bottom line, allowing less space for deliberative and contemplative action as well as truly human-centred and wise business decisions.

We begin by providing a context for our argument, considering why education is essential for expanding the ethical capacity of creative agency in business, and then we describe the need to bring creativity and ethics together in business educational opportunities and cultural values. We look at the darker side of creativity in entrepreneurship and business, with specific concerns relating to new digital and networking technologies. We propose the approach of wise creativity in education (Craft, 2008; Walsh, Chappell, & Craft, 2017) which implies ethics in innovation practices, and calls for a mindset shift away from value-neutral creativity to creativity that is suffused with higher aspirations towards growth and change. Finally, we consider potentially better practices moving us forward, focusing on the implications for business education. We offer several core suggestions for promoting wise creativity in business education, including: infusing real-world ethics learning into education settings; infusing the liberal arts curriculum in business; offering opportunities for arts-based interventions in business; and instilling genuine mindfulness training in business education or professional development.

In essence, we argue for a shift away from a culture that values creativity purely as an instrumental approach for greater profitability, and towards one that values wise and humanizing creativity. In what follows, we provide context by considering the need for this perspective shift.

Background and Context for Change

We live in a world of seemingly exponential change. Across business and industry, recent decades have seen an explosion of new technologies, tools and products, and growth moving faster than at any time in history (Lowe, Dwivedi, & d'Alessandro, 2019). This has also sparked an increasingly fast-paced attitude to growth in industries, and a culture of constant motion in business spheres (Kupp, Marval, & Borchers, 2017). Innovation-centred companies such as Google, Facebook, Microsoft and Apple position creativity as central to their corporate vision. This is evidenced by an upbeat support for creativity in their mission statements, a strong emphasis on creative design, and product development processes geared towards rapid innovation and prototyping.

In more recent years, technology industries and titans of business have adopted the mantra of 'move fast and break things' – a mantra coined by Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg in the statement: 'Move fast and break things. If you aren't breaking things, you aren't moving fast enough' (Blodgett, 2010). This philosophy has spread throughout global business, permeating the same digital industries that have engineered our current global context, which is often drenched in information technology but untethered to deeper humanistic values (Young, McLeod, & Brady, 2018). While this mindset of pressing towards growth and fast innovation is frequently viewed as having net positive effects, it can also be problematic for the character of creativity and humanism in business, and for the wellbeing of society overall. Indeed, moving fast and breaking things has led to the exacerbation of existing fault lines in society, leading to a range of global negative consequences.

Alongside affirmative discourses about the creative potential of digital tools, networks, design thinking and innovation in business, there are growing concerns about the negative effects for humanity, particularly with respect to the effects of the digital industry and technology (Tarafdar, D'Arcy, Turel, & Gupta, 2015). The significance of this 'dark side' of technology is under debate, but it constitutes a notable tension point in business, academic, societal and cultural contexts.

Certainly, rapid innovation has a place in business and industrial contexts. Yet when this type of thinking is not moored in educational opportunities or organizational culture with explicit ties to a deeper ethical foundation, it can overstep its bounds. This leads to societal problems or unintended consequences from which it is difficult to pull back. By diving into new creations without a thoroughgoing grounding in human-centred values – such as those espoused in the arts, philosophy or ethics, for example – business leaders, programmers, designers and engineers are essentially building on ethical quicksand without a truly human-centred foundation.

Research in the field of psychology reveals that the very attitudes, skills and mindsets that are the hallmark of creativity can be harnessed just as easily for wrongdoing as for good. Studies have shown that the propensities and mindsets that make a person creative in positive ways can also have negative consequences and, in fact, creative people are more likely to cheat – because they are able to come up with solutions that go beyond the traditional (Gino & Ariely, 2012).

Gino and Ariely (2012) have conducted research suggesting that creative people can, in some ways, be more susceptible to behaving unethically. They have found that the very cognitive flexibility which helps people make creative leaps in thinking can also make them less likely to follow ethical behavioural patterns. Moreover, Vincent and Goncalo (2014) argue that the high esteem in which creative people are held in our society may actually give them a greater sense of entitlement than the average person. In essence, they can come to believe that the normal rules do not apply to them, which in turn may lead to unethical behaviour. These two key findings (cognitive flexibility concerning rules and regulations, combined with a sense of entitlement) can prompt the kind of actions that undermine the notion that creativity is always inherently good. As Vincent (2015) writes:

> It's like a self-fulfilling loop: while individuals who self-identify as creative may feel more entitled, it's possible that this entitlement will cause them to take creative risks that they otherwise may have shied away from.

These individual aspects of the darker side of creativity can be exacerbated by institutional and social contextual factors and pressures. The contextual factors often include economic or institutional concerns that build on these negative aspects of creativity and indeed can sometimes enhance the darker aspects of creativity – as opposed to mitigating negative tendencies and expanding on the ability not only to think well but to act wisely. For instance, an organization that

favours moving fast and breaking things focuses of necessity on short-term gains, and thus marginalizes those individuals within the organization who seek to go deeper and factor in the long-term or ethical consequences of certain business decisions. These individuals, facing significant social pressure, may then submit to the broader organizational will or may choose to leave the organization, in either case having little impact on its future trajectory or culture.

This complex interplay can best be seen in the manner in which highly profitable technology companies have chosen to behave. An inordinate emphasis on profitability combined with a sense of creative entitlement and the ability to think flexibly can lead to profitability – but sometimes at great cost to other individuals and society. As Farhad Manjoo has argued, companies such as Uber create a 'moral stain', wherein original good ideas are ruined by what he describes as a deeply misguided start-up culture. The original idea for Uber offered a 'radical new urban vision' that had the potential to:

> reduce the need for car ownership and increase the utilization of each car. It could make transportation cheaper and far more environmentally friendly, and it might create sustainable jobs for many drivers. (Manjoo, 2019)

This, *par excellence*, was a creative idea – novel and potentially effective. But things did not pan out as originally envisaged. As Manjoo (2019) writes:

> In the years since, Uber skirted laws and cut corners to trample over regulators and competitors. It accelerated the start-up industry's misogynistic and reckless hustle culture. And it pushed a frightening new picture of labor – one in which everyone is a contractor, toiling without protection – our hours and our lives ruled by uncaring algorithms in the cloud. Uber, and to a lesser extent, its competitor Lyft, has indeed turned out to be a poster child for Silicon Valley's messianic vision, but not in a way that should make anyone in this industry proud. Uber's is likely to be the biggest tech I.P.O. since Facebook's. It will turn a handful of people into millionaires and billionaires. But the gains for everyone else – for drivers, for the environment, for the world – remain in doubt.

A similar argument has been made against Facebook and other social media giants whose intense technological creativity has not been matched with an ethical effort to make decisions that work for the broader good. It is clear that these tools, as they have penetrated all aspects of our lives and every part of the globe, have caused immense social harm. Examples of negative consequences abound: from Twitter bots that seek to manipulate elections, to fake news that exacerbates existing social schisms; from the misuse of personal data for corporate gain, to increased cases of depression and social isolation that seem to arise as a result of increased or constant immersion in these interfaces.

Clearly, these companies have been remarkably creative in finding ways to spread their influence, taking advantage of our psychological propensities in order to manipulate us into becoming part of their profit-making ventures. That said, most of these companies did not start with such negative consequences in mind. For instance, social media and Internet giants such as Google, Facebook and YouTube began with strong egalitarian values – to capture and make readily available all the information in the world (Google); to provide a space to connect people (Facebook); and to establish a site for people to share their creativity through video (YouTube). Over time, as these sites began to grow and sought to monetize their technology through advertising, they realized that it had become important to make their sites 'sticky'; that is, to make people stay longer on their sites so that they could gather more information from them and use it to steer advertising to them in specific, targeted ways. These sites, though technically 'free', have been able to trade on the private information of their users, often in misleading or opaque ways, to increase their profits. Hence the dictum 'If you are not paying for something, you are not the customer, you are the product' (Garson, n.d.).

As competition between such companies heated up, a few of them (Facebook, YouTube and Twitter being three obvious examples, though many others have demonstrated similar behaviour) realized that one way of making their sites sticky was to court controversy. Thus, certain sites, apps or social media platforms began, through their recommendation algorithms, to suggest increasingly controversial content, because such stories triggered powerful psychological impulses and gathered more clicks and shares. Thus it seems that these companies moved away from their original goal of being sites of connection, creativity and sharing, towards a model that takes advantage of human weaknesses to further separate people by creating polarized information bubbles that are difficult to break out of. Tristan Harris, a design ethicist who has written extensively about these issues, argues that these product designers '…play your psychological vulnerabilities (consciously and unconsciously) against you in the race to grab your attention' (Harris, 2016).

It becomes clear that the initial egalitarian instincts of the founders of these organizations floundered when confronted with the complexity of the human and social world. Despite their creativity in developing the new tools, and their avowed commitment to human-centred design, they fundamentally lacked an understanding of human history, psychology, sociology and culture (in all its glories and flaws). It is not surprising that one of the founders of Facebook recently argued for breaking it up under the notion that it is wrong to give any particular individual (Zuckerberg) or organization (Facebook) that much global power (Hughes, 2019).

A Framing for Creativity and Ethics in Business Education

We have provided multiple examples of how a narrowness of vision and a paucity of human and educative experience might have adversely affected companies like Facebook or Twitter. Again, we do not suggest that the creative

entrepreneurs who started these companies were intentionally acting unethically, or that their vision of these platforms originally encompassed an understanding of the negative consequences they might spawn. Yet their creativity was unchecked by the types of human-centred learning – from history, the arts, sociology, psychology, governance and ethics – that could and should be integral to business education.

For instance, one of Zuckerberg's mentors, big-data billionaire Peter Thiel, has actually offered opportunities for future innovators to drop out of school, offering a fellowship that 'gives US$100,000 to young people who want to build new things instead of sitting in a classroom' (Thiel Foundation, n.d). Such mistrust for the value of formal education in favour of immediate innovation gratification makes sense only if education is judged purely in terms of a utilitarian purpose (i.e. the view that the point of education is to become a more productive worker, to get a job or launch a start-up). While we maintain that there is nothing wrong with being productive and finding a good job – indeed these things are important – the purpose of education goes much deeper. Education supports the very fabric of what it means to be human, through higher learning. It affords the opportunities to learn to think critically and empathetically, to have in-depth understanding and develop new knowledge, to build social and emotional skills, to develop tools for ethicality and citizenship, and to contribute creative and human-centred value (not *just* productivity, growth and corporate innovation) to the world around us.

Despite the concerns raised above, it is clear that creativity is essential to humans and human civilization and, like most psychological constructs, it is malleable and influenced by education and learning. Creativity is about the production of novelty and effectiveness, and these components are essential for the creation of any new ideas, artefacts, processes or ventures in business. This is why introducing human-centred foundations, such as those found within the philosophical groundings of the arts and humanities, is essential. Education and the arts have significant power to influence empathy, ethics, compassion and the social–emotional dimensions of the mind (Jeffers, 2009).

One of the most foundational educational philosophers, John Dewey (1903), argued that a fundamental reason for education was to develop the kinds of skills and tendencies that build a healthy democracy and citizenship. He viewed this principle as permeating every context for education or educative experience, and so, from this perspective, business education and professional development are not exempt from that purpose. In fact, the principle might be even more crucial in business education and culture, given that the goal there is to prepare people to work, lead, manage, innovate and create products, processes and solutions that span industries and society. But this kind of foundation does require a guiding framework, to offer a central spine from which educational experiences in the humanistic disciplines can branch.

This raises the question of how we can frame creativity and innovation to ensure that they do not run amok and tread upon the societal values that should be reflected across business and industry. Here, we consider a frame for creativity in education that may have particular value in business contexts.

Wise and Humanizing Creativity

Creativity in academic and popular literature is often defined using the criteria of novelty and effectiveness (e.g. the ability to create things that have some element of originality and that work well or serve a useful purpose) (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). Creativity is also highly contextual and is a judgement that individuals, groups or societies make about how novel and effective an idea or product is (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Some scholars have noted that ethicality cannot and should not be divorced from the creator, the creative process or the judgement of creative products. For instance, Cropley (2003) asserted that novelty and effectiveness were indeed essential criteria, but he also suggested that ethicality be used as a dimension, for a three-part definition:

(1) novelty (a product/artefact or idea that is in some way(s) unique from others, or that diverges from the familiar);
(2) effectiveness (creative things 'work well'; they have some use or purpose that may be aesthetic, artistic or spiritual, or even practically valuable); and
(3) ethicality ('creative' is not generally a word that describes cruel or destructive behaviour, crimes, warmongering, etc.) (Cropley, 2003, p. 6).

That said, most definitions of creativity do not draw directly on ethics, and most creativity research does not address ethicality. This is not because of a lack of belief in ethicality among researchers, but rather is a consequence of the fact that most academic research on creativity has focused on cognitive aspects of individual creativity (Runco & Chand, 1995). Such work has aimed to explain the thought processes underlying creativity or cognitive styles in creative thinking rather than delving into the complex ethical dimensions of creativity. Interestingly, the field of design does emphasize ethical learning in relation to creativity, perhaps because design work and problem-solving deal directly with the real-world products of creativity (Tonkinwise, 2004), and so there is an unavoidable awareness of the ethicality and implications of creative products for the people they serve.

Design scholar and theorist Richard Buchanan argues that there are vital implications in everything we create and in every design or decision that makes its way into the world. Buchanan stresses that while design itself is morally neutral the designer is not, and he draws on historical examples of creativity divorced from ethics:

> The Holocaust was one of the most tragic, prominent products of design in the 20th century. It was designed thoroughly, but with a horrifying ethical foundation. And the fault lies in the people; Albert Speer and his surrounding henchmen. Design and creativity are neutral tools. But people need to know when and how to use and when not to use them. (Henriksen, 2019, p. 26)

With regard to educating people for creativity, Buchanan suggests that learning in any field is interdisciplinary and should draw on a range of inspirations

and types of knowledge (Henriksen & Mishra, 2018). He suggests that a portion of every instance of creative learning should draw on ethics, referencing Caroline Whitbeck's (2011) work on ethics in engineering research. Whitbeck's book explores the grammar of ethics, and the proposition that creative work itself is a kind of ethical action. While ethics is typically thought of as the judgment of past actions, for Whitbeck it is the design of future actions that becomes ethical in a profound way.

All of this becomes increasingly deserving of attention in the context of a world in which digitality heightens the speed of business innovation and decision-making. Scholars such as Tufekci (2017) note the ethical tensions produced by technological capabilities that allow for information control and the manipulation of consumers and society. Because creativity is a broad and ethically-neutral construct, it is contingent on humans to learn to use it in ethical and appropriate ways.

In this sense, the work of Craft (2008) concerning 'wise creativity' offers a useful construct for educating people to think, work, act and be creative as learners in any discipline. This may be especially useful in an area as broad as business, which connects to human-centred products and processes across a range of industries. Craft (2008) defined wise creativity as creativity that 'involves our taking appropriate actions, which recognise multiple forms of understanding and knowledge, and take account of multiple needs and perspectives' in ways that raise 'questions about collective responsibility and thus about the nature of "trusteeship" in the 21st century, especially for professionals' (p. 9). This work refers to creativity as being not solely about pure market value, but as taking account of social responsibility and both the short-term and long-term effects of its enaction. In the simplest terms, this is appropriate and responsible creative activity with forethought. Craft, while recognizing that creativity inevitably intersects with the market in products and services, views purely marketized creativity as socially destructive – because the negative potential of creativity disconnected from ethics is as unlimited as the positive potential. She notes that:

> Where the market is seen as a deity to which all else is harnessed, other 'goods' – such as the environment itself, or human resource-fulness, compassion or kindness (which are not seen as valuable) – in market terms, become undermined; potentially disastrous at local, national and global levels. (2008, p. 9)

While this idea is contextualized as being critical for education overall, it is perhaps more so in the context of business education. When we consider the concern about marketized creativity, there may be no place more pressing to address this than with students who will ultimately take what they learn into the world and apply it in the creation and management of businesses, markets, systems, products, processes and more. All of this will contribute to the design and operation of the business structures, environments and products by which consumers around the world will live and die.

There is a need, then, to inject a creative ethos that speaks not to pure unadulterated competition, but rather to competition accompanied by social stewardship

and a sense of the collective wellbeing of others. The cultures and educational environments of business and industry may be among the best positioned sites for promoting creativity that considers the public good alongside the bottom line. Walsh et al. (2017), in describing this type of wise creativity in ways that explicitly add a humanizing layer, argue that:

> wise humanising creativity (WHC) is creativity guided by ethical action, meaning it is mindful of its consequences and is empowering, offering far greater shared hope for the future than the competitive mentality that pervades most education systems. (p. 228)

Understanding how learning environments can foster wise or humanizing creativity illuminates the problem of a solely marketized rationale for creativity. It also provides new ways to consider education futures in business and other disciplines, as well as the implications for a theoretical understanding of creativity based on real-world challenges in which global business and industry clearly play a part. As overlapping areas of uncertainty produce major future challenges for society, educational settings must consider what kinds of creativity we should educate people for. Walsh et al. (2017) note that such challenges include: environmental change; resource depletion connected to economic globalization; changing spiritual, religious and political fundamentalist perspectives and relevant shifting socio-political values as these perspectives conflict with Western capitalism; and some of the more recent and extreme examples of technology transforming human existence (Craft, 2011, 2013).

Walsh et al. (2017) reflect that, while it can be argued that such radical change demands creativity, it can be hard for educators in any discipline to know what kind of creativity might be the most appropriate in managing uncertainty. Extreme marketization and global interconnectedness tend to uphold dominant individualistic Western perspectives, which today are often expressed through personal consumerism and acquisition. However, more voices are increasingly countering that dominant perspective. They suggest that what is perhaps most needed by learners going out into the world is a keen awareness of and engagement in a wise and humanistic co-creativity, in which shared values are articulated and honoured.

Using such a philosophy as a collective creative ethos is different from the highly driven, competitive, individualistic culture of some business education programmes and from many organizational contexts. Yet if humanity is to thrive and address the challenges and uncertainty that lie before us, it is just this kind of creative ethos that is needed. In business education, this means considering how to help students and educators create opportunities to 'authentically engage in possibility thinking or the transformation from "what is" to "what might be", as they co-create viable solutions to problems they articulate' (Walsh et al., 2017, p. 229).

In fact, the notion of transforming *what is* to *what might be* resonates deeply with Herbert Simon's (1969) definition of design as the process of transforming existing situations into preferred ones. Simon (1969) (a Nobel Laureate economist who founded design as a professional field) produced a definition of design

work that reflects its applicability to human-centred creativity across disciplines, including business:

> Everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones. The intellectual activity that produces material artifacts is no different fundamentally from the one that prescribes remedies for a sick patient or the one that devises a new sales plan for a company or a social welfare policy for a state. (p. 130)

This suggests that there is an argument in favour of students and professionals in business spheres being encouraged to think of themselves as creative designers and problem solvers. When this view is combined with the notion of wise creativity, it becomes clear that there is a need to infuse ways of thinking that are more humanistic, leading and innovating for creativity in business. The approaches to achieving that goal are as unlimited as the different permutations or ways to develop creativity and teach human-centred disciplines. In what follows, we offer a few possible educational approaches and consider the implications in order to conceptualize how wise creativity might be infused into existing business education and professional development. The possibilities we identify are by no means all-encompassing or as important as the broader notion of infusing wise creativity – they are intended as illustrative ideas that may help to enact this broader notion.

Wise Creativity in Business Education: Implications and Approaches

Wise creativity, or a more humanized approach to creativity, is denoted by Walsh et al. (2017) as a kind of creative activity that pays 'more attention to developing compassion, tolerance, highly developed interpersonal skills and respect for difference' (p. 231). The authors are careful to note that creativity is not always fun and positive, and they acknowledge the potential tensions and conflicts of creative direction and control, such that difference is not buried within dialogues. These tensions are issues that students may naturally learn to navigate within varied disciplines of the humanities – such as philosophy, the fine arts, literature and, notably, ethics.

While there may be many possible approaches to bringing more powerful learning into business education or professional development, we touch on just a few here, including: infusing real-world ethics teaching and learning into educational settings; providing broader connections to the liberal arts curriculum in business; offering opportunities for arts-based interventions in business; and introducing genuine mindfulness training into business education or professional development.

Real-world Ethics Training in Business

Certainly, many business educational programmes and settings do address ethics. However, research has shown that these programmes often have little or no impact on individual behaviour (Jewe, 2008; Seshadri, Broekemier, & Nelson, 1997).

Whether embedded in a college course that students are required to take, or in a mandatory online module imposed on middle management, or in interminable presentations by human resources departments that employees trudge through, for most people the dilemmas discussed in such training appear to be far removed from their daily lives (Waples, Antes, Murphy, Connelly, & Mumford, 2009). This is partly because many of the ethical issues of business are often opaque to employees, managers and leaders, deeply engrained as they are in systems or broader accepted ways of practice. Thus, individual decisions are often wrapped up in established protocols that may render ethical issues obscure to people or, worse, seen as something that is 'not their problem'. For instance, those who work in industries with the greatest ethical violations may not even have an awareness of their role as an individual within the broader system.

This circumstance has two key consequences. First, more needs to be done to bring the ethical dimensions of work-lives to the forefront of the thinking of business learners and practitioners. Merely providing learners and employees with the information or rules is not enough. Business programmes and organizations must actively seek to confront learners with real and relevant situations wherein creative mistakes were made, engage them in dialogue about these situations and point to an appropriate response or range of responses (McWilliams & Nahavandi, 2006). By initially giving people some foundational basis for training in ethics philosophy and dialogue, business education might set the stage to then engage learners in discussion about the whole spectrum of ethical conundrums and quandaries that might occur or might have occurred in the real world, and allow them to debate the relevant concerns and nuances. This approach requires a level of honesty and transparency which is often hard to provide, but which inevitably engages people in understanding how confusing and sometimes conflicting the grey areas concerning creative innovation may be. Second, learners need to be made aware of the broader systems in which they function and to be provided with a sense of agency, understanding that it is their responsibility to make sure the organization as a whole functions not only creatively, but also ethically (Meyerson, 2008). By confronting ethical grey areas and systemic examples, and then engaging in discussion about personal responsibility and ethics in ways that explicitly look at a systems perspective, business learners and employees might be more apt to lead both ethically and creatively from wherever they sit in an organization.

Connections to the Liberal Arts Curriculum in Business

The liberal arts curriculum is often derided as being too broad in today's specialized world, and thus as not preparing students directly for jobs in the future. The data are mixed, in that research shows that although specialized curricula, such as those in engineering or business, do tend to lead to higher-paying jobs it is also true that liberal arts graduates often have highly productive and influential careers (Hill & Pisacreta, 2019; Jaschik, 2019). However, the point we are making here is somewhat different. We are suggesting that a specialized degree (specifically in business) needs to include a powerful dose of the liberal arts experience.

The liberal arts experience focuses on a range of skills that allow the learner to think critically within and across disciplinary boundaries. Typically, students choose a major but also take courses in philosophy, art and sociology, mathematics and physics – thus preparing to be learners throughout their lives. In addition, there is a strong focus on written and verbal (and increasingly multimodal) communication. More important, underlying a liberal arts curriculum is a strong sense of values, including that of developing independent judgement to become a productive and informed citizen both in local contexts (organizations, communities, etc.) and of the world. Such a curriculum emphasizes rigour, reflection and application through personal integrity, and affords creativity grounded in recognition of the existence of a multiplicity of perspectives and viewpoints that can be (and often are) in conflict with each other. This, combined with a knowledge of history, brings with it a sense of humility about the efficacy of simple 'one-shot' solutions and an awareness of the complex ways in which ideas and interventions can play out in the world.

All of these aspects are of critical importance to the business graduate. An infusion of liberal arts curricula would complement domain-specific learning by adding nuance, complexity and ambiguity. At one level, engaging in and with other disciplines lays the foundation for creativity since research shows that creative ideas often emerge as a result of the collision between perspectives within a discipline and perspectives from outside it (Henriksen & Mishra, 2014). Thus broad training in the arts and humanities can provide a richer matrix of ideas that probe, interrogate, critique and question shibboleths and received wisdom in the student's primary domain of business. This sensitivity to multiple perspectives on the same problem may prevent people from focusing entirely on the short term in business decisions, or may make them more receptive to alternative perspectives and more aware of the possible unintended consequences of decisions.

Opportunities for Arts-based Learning in Business

The use of arts-based learning methods in business has grown in recent decades; however, such methods are still not the norm for many business education programmes or organizations. Yet engagement with the arts can be extremely helpful to those in the business sphere – not for the purposes of seeking great technical artistry or skill, but for promoting the kinds of thinking that align with wise creativity (Homayoun & Henriksen, 2018). Arts-based methods involve the incorporation of techniques and processes derived from the arts in business education and training settings. Although there is a common misconception that business and the arts have little to do with each other, the emergence of arts-based methods reveals ways in which business can learn from the arts, and successful artists often share common characteristics with effective creative managers or leaders. With this in mind, business fields might seek to develop and grow their creative capacity through providing more ongoing connections to the arts. Importantly, the arts also bring a humanistic and empathetic tendency to reflection, and encourage a careful and nuanced level of observation and introspection. These outcomes can provide strong support for the kinds of wise creativity in business that we are

seeking. Within the broader aim of cross-fertilizing ideas between business and the arts, Formica (2017) notes that the most essential and challenging problems in management are not technical, but human-centred; and the arts can help to expand our capacity to understand such concerns.

Taylor and Ladkin (2009) identify multiple processes or goals of arts-based methods in business settings, any of which might be thoughtfully adopted in business education and training to foster a broader and more nuanced understanding of situations and outcomes as well as the learner's own personal development and identity. These authors suggest that the act of using art becomes a way to promote reflection through projection, to reveal inner thoughts and perceptions that may not be otherwise accessible, and to understand the 'essence' of a situation more thoughtfully. They note that 'the primary function of art is to objectify experience so that we can contemplate and understand it' (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009, p. 58).

In this conception, making or using art becomes a way of reflecting on our own experience and of understanding it in the past and present, as well as contemplating the possible outcomes of future actions and decisions. It is not hard to see how such an approach could support the idea of wise creativity among innovators and leaders across business functions. Infusing the arts into business training can be a way to strengthen creative identity, because art objects which people create, or with which they engage, can help reveal thoughts and experiences and increase perceptional capacities. In this way, business students and professionals will be able to expand their capacity to project varied viewpoints; such empathetic capacities vary and are coloured by past experiences and environmental factors, but they are susceptible to growth and are essential for wiser forms of creative thinking.

While the practice of arts-based learning in business is growing, there is a need for a better understanding of how it might be used to support students, employees and leaders in their development of wise creativity. We suggest that this is a ripe and rich area of exploration for business programmes and professional development or training to enhance employees' creativity in ways that will also promote reflection, introspection, empathy and, thus, greater wisdom.

Infusing Mindfulness Training into Business

One of the challenges of building wise creativity into the complex, competitive arena of global business and industry is of cultivating leaders and employees with the kind of awareness that breeds wisdom. This means not only an awareness of what is, but an awareness of what could or should be in the possibilities that abound for innovation and the systems within which we work. Towards achieving this, we suggest that an infusion of genuine mindfulness training into business education and professional development could be important.

Mindfulness has been simply and clearly defined as a practice of 'non-judgmental, moment-to-moment awareness' (Kabat-Zinn, 1990, p. 2). Although it stems from ancient Eastern spiritual traditions, it has been an object of contemporary secular focus as a methodology for training ourselves to become more non-judgementally aware of our minds. As human society veers towards a more chaotic, techno-centric, around-the-clock, globally-connected and often

distracted way of being, mindfulness has been seen as an antidote to internalized unrest. Its usefulness for well-being and self-awareness has led to an increase in its use by individuals as well as by businesses and organizations (Shonin, Van Gordon, & Griffiths, 2015). However, despite its popularity, it is often voiced merely as a buzzword or a trend, or used in very time-delimited approaches by corporations in the hope of increasing employee productivity and concentration (Jackson, 2018). This kind of instrumentalized mindfulness is not necessarily bad, but it is not aligned with deeper and more authentic practices of mindfulness that involve the cultivation of wisdom through greater awareness of the self and the world around us. Meditation or other mindfulness practices are often the means by which such awareness and wisdom are developed.

Rather than seeking shallower, popularized mindfulness interventions in short or limited bursts, we suggest that leaders, business education programmes and organizational cultures should seek to understand and infuse a more authentic (though still secular) perspective on mindfulness into relevant learning experiences. Legitimate mindfulness training usually involves at least a few hours a week (some formal training and some practice in one's own time) for interventions of at least 7–8 weeks. This has been demonstrated in the well-established Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction curriculum developed by Jon Kabat-Zinn at the University of Massachusetts Medical School. Moreover, mindfulness principles and ethicality should come to permeate the culture within which they exist.

Many universities or schools already offer this training through specific coursework, though it is not typically found in business schools as much as in health and wellness programmes; and mindfulness training is rarely a required learning experience for students or professionals. Yet what such training offers is the development of a more thoughtful mindset, through development of skills and ongoing practice, to attain a sharper awareness of one's own automatic and often unconscious thinking processes. This can in turn help to increase awareness of one's biases, limitations, problematic thought patterns and more – bringing these forward in a non-judgemental way can enable one to act with wiser insight. In fact, Lampe and Engleman-Lampe (2012) note that, while most traditional approaches to teaching ethics in business curricula do not work (indeed, business students have the highest rates of cheating across programmes), mindfulness training may be the best way to:

> educate students about how the mind works in ways that can help or hinder making ethical decisions […] giving business students the knowledge and skills necessary to follow ethical intentions through to ethical behavior. (p. 99)

They note that mindfulness meditation increases personal awareness, improving cognitive and emotional regulation which correlates with more ethical decision-making.

A common misconception in popular culture about mindfulness is that it is only about relaxation and focus, but the practice is much deeper and more unflinchingly honest. It is not a means of taking people out of their thoughts and experiences, but of making them more self-aware of those thoughts and

experiences. It allows a person to observe thoughts, desires and instincts, and then create sufficient space from them to act from a wiser place.

Importantly, when this notion is paired with an extensive body of research that affirms a positive relationship between mindfulness and creativity (Lebuda, Zabelina, & Karwowski, 2016), it becomes clear that mindfulness practices and mindful business cultures may hold a key to promoting wise creativity. By quieting judgements and internalized restrictions on thinking, mindfulness can allow creative ideas to flow more freely (Penman, 2015). At the same time, it can promote more ethical and wise decision-making. All of this suggests that it offers one useful tool or methodology for the emergence of wise creativity across business and industry.

Conclusion

We have attempted to identify, by way of examples in the worlds of technology and business, some of the (possibly unintended) negative consequences of an unbridled focus on creativity lacking in strong ethical foundations. We have suggested ways in which we can interrogate the idea of creativity without undermining its importance in our daily and professional lives. This is a somewhat nuanced view of creativity that seeks to address its value-neutrality (i.e. the notion that a creative process or output is neutral with respect to issues of social good or ill) by proposing the idea of wise creativity as a potential solution. We have also explored a range of possible ways to support and nurture wise creativity, particularly in the area of business education. To conclude, we offer an interesting 'what if' story that, albeit in a somewhat tongue-in-cheek fashion, is designed to illustrate the points we have made in this chapter.

This scenario emerges from a recent article by author, professor and media theorist Douglas Rushkoff (2019), who asked a provocative question: 'What if Mark Zuckerberg had stayed in school?'. Rushkoff imagines what would have happened if, instead of dropping out of Harvard halfway through his studies to pursue the development of Facebook, Zuckerberg had reaped the benefits of two more years of a liberal arts education, gaining important historical, cultural, economic and political context for his work. But, of course, Zuckerberg chose not to do so. Based on the criteria for lean start-up success, education had served Zuckerberg's purpose by providing enough pure programming and computer science knowledge for him to build a minimum viable product. Rushkoff (2019) suggests that society is now paying the price for his impatience:

> Looking back through Harvard's course catalogs for 2005 and 2006, one finds a bounty of offerings, from sociology and psychology to philosophy and literature, that would have challenged the assumptions underlying Silicon Valley dogma and might just have given Zuckerberg the insight he needed to build a platform that promoted human cognition and connection, and even democracy itself, instead of undermining them.

Rushkoff explores the notion that Zuckerberg could have taken classes that might have changed his thinking, and thus changed the recent history of technology in society. He suggests he could have taken Greg Mankiw's 'Principles of Economics' class and recognized the growth-based economic operating system beneath every Silicon Valley venture, which ultimately turns users into products or into data fodder for algorithms. He might have taken Literature and the Arts with literary critic Helen Vendler, studying poetry as the history and science of feeling, which could have helped him predict his platform's bias for emotional insensitivity and consider how to curtail its use of language as a weapon. Or Zuckerberg could have been informed by Steven Pinker's course, 'The Human Mind', which might have allowed him to consider human consciousness from an ethical foundation before subverting and training society's collective psyche via Facebook's algorithms.

This thought experiment unwinds with an exploration of how varied opportunities to learn across the arts and humanities might have imbued Zuckerberg with a different business ethos, thereby improving the overall ethos of Facebook. Whether or not these imagined educational 'sliding doors' are true is unknowable; nor is the knowability as important as the underlying concept – that ideas drawn from the arts, humanities and other humanistic disciplines should play a critical role in business learning, education and experience, to create a socially beneficial ethical ripple effect on how people function in society. These experiences outside Zuckerberg's core interest (programming, entrepreneurship, etc.) might have made him less prone to 'move fast and break things' and perhaps more able to 'move slow and nurture things'. The world, for all of us, could have been a very different place.

References

Baucus, M. S., Norton, W. I., Baucus, D. A., & Human, S. E. (2008). Fostering creativity and innovation without encouraging unethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *81*(1), pp. 97–115.

Blodgett, H. (2010). Mark Zuckerberg, moving fast and breaking things. *Business Insider*, 14 October 2010. Retrieved from https://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Mark-Zuckerberg-Moving-Fast-And-Breaking-Things-2461393.php

Cook, P. J. (2016). Leading innovation, creativity and enterprise. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *48*(6), pp. 294–299.

Craft, A. (2008). Trusteeship, wisdom and the creative future of education? *UNESCO Observatory: Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Research in the Arts*, *1*(3), pp. 1–20.

Craft, A. (2011). *Creativity and education futures: Learning in a digital age*. London, UK: Trentham Books.

Craft, A. (2013). Childhood, possibility thinking and wise humanising education futures. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *61*, pp. 126–134.

Cropley, A. J. (2003). *Creativity in education & learning*. Bodmin, UK: Routledge Falmer.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York, NY, USA: HarperCollins.

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in education. *The Elementary School Teacher*, *4*(4), pp. 193–204.

Formica, P. (Ed.). (2017). *Entrepreneurial renaissance: Cities striving towards an era of rebirth and revival*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Garson. (n.d.). *You're not the customer; you're the product*. Retrieved from https://quotein-vestigator.com/2017/07/16/product/

Gino, F., & Ariely, D. (2012). The dark side of creativity: Original thinkers can be more dishonest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), p. 445.

Giriharadas, A. (2018). *When market is our only language*. K. Tippet, interviewer [Audio file]. Retrieved from https://onbeing.org/programs/anand-giridharadas-when-the-market-is-our-only-language-nov2018/

Harris, T. (2016). *How technology is hijacking your mind – From a magician and Google design ethicist*. Retrieved from http://www.tristanharris.com/essays/

Henriksen, D. (2019). Expanding the paradigm: Bringing designerly perspectives into creativity scholarship. *Creativity Studies*, *12*(1), pp. 15–33.

Henriksen, D., & Mishra, P. (2014). Twisting knobs and connecting things: Rethinking technology & creativity in the 21st century. *TechTrends*, *58*(1), p. 15.

Henriksen, D., & Mishra, P. (2018). Creativity as invention, discovery, innovation and intuition: An interview with Dr Richard Buchanan. *TechTrends*, *62*(3), pp. 215–220.

Hill, C. B., & Pisacreta, E. D. (2019). *The economic benefits and costs of a liberal arts education*. Essay commissioned by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Retrieved from https://mellon.org/resources/news/articles/economic-benefits-and-costs-liberal-arts-education/

Homayoun, S., & Henriksen, D. (2018). Creativity in business education: A review of creative self-belief theories and arts-based methods. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *4*(4), p. 55.

Hughes, C. (2019). It's time to break up Facebook. *New York Times*, 9 May 2019. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/09/opinion/sunday/chris-hughes-facebook-zuckerberg.html

Jackson, K. T. (2018). Interpreting the virtues of mindfulness and compassion: Contemplative practices and virtue-oriented business ethics. *Humanistic Management Journal*, *3*(1), pp. 47–69.

Jaschik, S. (2019). *The economic gains (yes, gains) of a liberal arts education*. Washington, DC: Inside Higher Ed., 15 February 2019. Retrieved from https://www.insidehigh-ered.com/news/2019/02/15/study-documents-economic-gains-liberal-arts-education

Jeffers, C. S. (2009). Within connections: Empathy, mirror neurons, and art education. *Art Education*, *62*(2), pp. 18–23.

Jewe, R. D. (2008). Do business ethics courses work? The effectiveness of business ethics education: An empirical study. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, *2*, pp. 1–6.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: A practical guide to mindfulness, meditation, and healing*. New York, NY, USA: Delacorte.

Kupp, M., Marval, M., & Borchers, P. (2017). Corporate accelerators: Fostering innovation while bringing together startups and large firms. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *38*(6), pp. 47–53.

Lampe, M., & Engleman-Lampe, C. (2012). Mindfulness-based business ethics education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, *16*(3), p. 99.

Lebuda, I., Zabelina, D. L., & Karwowski, M. (2016). Mind full of ideas: A meta-analysis of the mindfulness–creativity link. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *93*, pp. 22–26.

Lowe, B., Dwivedi, Y. K., & D'Alessandro, S. (2019). Consumers and technology in a changing world. *European Journal of Marketing*, *53*(6), pp. 1038–1050.

Manjoo, F. (2019). The Uber I.P.O. is a moral stain on Silicon Valley. *New York Times*, 1 May 2019. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/01/opinion/uber-ipo.html