

Diverse Insights Revealing Nuances of the Culture-High Ability Nexus: An Interdisciplinary Search

Don Ambrose¹; Valerie K. Ambrose²

¹Rider University; ²Shasta College, USA

Abstract

Discovering the cultural dimensions of high ability is analogous to a large-scale creative problem-solving initiative. Just as the early phases of the creative-problem-solving process require broad-scope searches through diverse data sources, understanding the culture-giftedness nexus requires broad-scope excursions through interdisciplinary scholarly sources that can enable deeper understanding of culture. Here, we engage in such an excursion and borrow insights from leading thinkers in cultural anthropology, English studies, political science, ethical philosophy, and history, and use these insights to generate new ways of thinking about the cultural aspects of giftedness. The foreign concepts analyzed include anti-anti-relativism, mythological archetypes, the artificial reification of culture, distant proximities that influence personal identity, ethnocentrism and particularist morality, differing views of nature, and the influence of critical communities and motley coalitions in a globalized world.

Keywords: Interdisciplinary; giftedness; culture; ethnocentrism; morality; ethics; globalization.

The creative problem-solving process requires problem solvers to engage in a broad search for all relevant data even before defining the problem, let alone formulating and implementing a solution (Isaksen, Dorval, & Treffinger, 2011; Treffinger, Isaksen, & Dorval, 2006). Analogously, scholars who want to understand the nature and nuances of the cultural dimensions of high ability also should engage in very broad explorations that will turn up hidden information about culture. Part of this broad, exploratory process should entail excursions through multiple academic disciplines in search of research findings, theoretical perspectives, and philosophical constructs that might be relevant to theory, research, and practice in high-ability fields such as gifted education and creativity studies.

Admittedly, such a search will take us far and wide, and add convolutions to already complex considerations of the giftedness-culture nexus. Unlike scholars of centuries past who could become polymaths without too much difficulty because the inchoate academic disciplines of those eras encompassed much less knowledge than we have today, scholars in high ability fields could become swamped by large masses of data and constructs from foreign disciplines. The rapid growth of knowledge in the 20th and 21st centuries makes this problem a likelihood.

Nevertheless, ignoring insights from foreign disciplines is unwise because much can be gained from interdisciplinary work. First, interdisciplinary searches for insights about culture can turn up discoveries in fields such as cultural anthropology, political science, history, and ethical philosophy that could reframe some of the ideas we have about giftedness, talent, and creativity. Second, discoveries about concepts and inquiry methods that are influential in foreign disciplines but differ from predominant constructs and methods in our own field can break us free of dogmatic thought frameworks. Dogmatic insularity is one of the most difficult and ubiquitous barriers hindering academic progress and high-ability fields certainly are not immune to its clutches (see Ambrose & Sternberg, 2012; Ambrose, Sternberg, & Sriraman, 2012). Third, very complex problems and issues require syntheses of insights from multiple disciplines (Ambrose, 1998, 2005, 2009a, 2015, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c; Ambrose & Sternberg, 2016a, 2016b; Mäki & MacLeod, 2016; Midgley, 1998; Nicolescu, 1996, 2002; Sternberg & Ambrose, 2021; Suresh, 2013). Here are some examples:

- The study of ancient cultures is enriched by the mutual corrections generated when historians' studies of ancient scripts come together with archaeologists' studies of material artifacts (see Chippendale, 2000; Lowenthal, 2000).

- The growing field of bioarchaeology draws together and synthesizes insights from chemistry, geology, physics, biology, forensic science, and archaeology to shed light on human origins and long-range human development (see Larsen, 2000, 2010, 2015). Of course, access to these synthesized insights would be impossible from within the borders of a single discipline.
- The interdisciplinary field of cognitive science combines contributions from psychologists, linguists, neuroscientists, philosophers, artificial intelligence researchers, and anthropologists, among others (see Baumgartner & Payr, 1995; Cowan, Pines, & Meltzer, 1999; Johnson, 2009; Rose, 1998; Spivey, 2008; Thagard, 2012).
- The interdisciplinary field of complexity theory brings together chemists, physicists, mathematicians, biologists, political scientists, philosophers, urban planners, and economists, among others, to generate understanding about the ubiquitous phenomenon of the complex adaptive system (Ambrose, Sriraman, & Pierce, 2014; Cowan, et al., 1999; Miller & Page, 2007; Morowitz, 2004; Pullman, 1996).

Scholars who wish to understand ancient cultures, human origins and development, cognitive processes, and complex adaptive systems must grapple with immense complexity and that is why the more insightful among them gravitate toward interdisciplinary exploration and collaboration. It would be difficult to argue convincingly that high ability (operationally defined here as any blend of outstanding giftedness, talent, and creativity) is significantly less complex than the phenomena addressed in the examples above. Consequently, we feel justified in carrying out a broad interdisciplinary search, which can be viewed as the mess-finding and data-finding phases of creative problem solving applied to the task of discovering more about the cultural dimensions of high ability.

Our intent here is not to be comprehensive. That is virtually impossible in an interdisciplinary search addressing a highly complex topic. Instead, the insights provided in the subsequent subsections are only examples provided to illustrate the potential of expanding cultural awareness through interdisciplinary borrowing. Additional examples can be found in Ambrose (2009a).

Moving Beyond the Notion of Brains in a Vat

Consistent with the enthusiasm for brain-based learning in general education, professionals in the field of gifted education have been borrowing insights from neuroscience to shed light on various dimensions of high ability. For example, a special issue of the *Roeper Review* attracted leading scholars of cognitive neuroscience who addressed:

relationships between brain structure and human intelligence, neuropsychological profiles of savants, functional brain patterns of mathematical processing in gifted adolescents, and functional brain patterns of fluid analogizing to a proposed, expanded model for locating studies of twice-exceptional individuals within medical models of disability. (Kalbfleisch, 2008, p. 160)

Such interdisciplinary work is noteworthy and sorely needed in our field. At the same time, Robert Sternberg (2008) published a counterpoint article in the same issue warning about excessive adherence to the reductive-mechanistic approach to understanding high ability.

Consistent with Sternberg's analysis, the eminent cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz (2000) argued that the growing field of cultural psychology provides a helpful counterweight to reductive, neurobiological assumptions about human thought and action. The field of cultural psychology breaks from predominant thinking in psychology and cognitive science, which portrays cognition as emergent from intra-cranial electrochemical processes. Of course, these processes are foundational to cognition but the excessive emphasis on intra-cranial dynamics marginalizes attention to context. Geertz and Sternberg contend that context matters. Geertz put it simply: "Our brains are not in a vat, but in our bodies. Our minds are not in our bodies, but in the world" (p. 205). We must remember that cultural context plays a big part in the development and dynamics of the gifted mind. Culture is not a mere overlay on the fundamental mechanics of the brain but instead it is intricately intertwined with, and largely constitutive of, cognitive processes.

Paying heed to findings in cultural psychology, scholars in our field can gain much from excursions into Geertz's discipline of cultural anthropology. For example, many gifted but iniquitous

leaders throughout history have been culturally insular, viewing belief systems foreign to their own as less worthy (see Foss, 2006). Moreover, Persson (2012) insightfully revealed implicit, cultural insularity in the scholarship of gifted studies. But if we borrow an insight from cultural anthropology we can move somewhat beyond dogmatism. Intrigued by the phenomenon of cultural insularity and concerned about the shortsightedness of those who claim to possess immutable truths while denigrating cultural relativism, Geertz (2000) came up with the notion of *anti-anti-relativism*. He based this idea on the phenomenon of anti-anti-communism, which arose during the McCarthy era in the United States. In reaction against anti-communist McCarthyites who claimed that anyone who opposed their dogmatic overreaction to the communist threat within American borders must be pro-communist, anti-anti-communists showed their displeasure with *both* extremes--fanatical right-wing McCarthyism and the communist totalitarian regimes of the era. Along similar lines, Geertz argued that anti-anti-relativists could stake out a similar middle ground between extreme, academic anti-relativists who adhere strongly to a favored set of cultural values and relativists who portray all cultural systems as being of equal value.

If we follow Geertz's advice, we will look for ways in which conceptions of giftedness can be shaped neither by dogmatic cultural anti-relativists nor relativists. The former will be prone to confining definitions of giftedness within the tenets of a particular culture while the latter will be unable to perceive ethical problems in the behavior of gifted individuals whose minds are shaped by cultures that tolerate or encourage unjust or exploitative behaviors.

Mythological Archetypes and Hidden Artistic Talent

Leeming (1990, 2004, 2013), a scholar of English studies, has carried out intensive analyses of mythology, showing that its impact on culture is difficult to overestimate. For example, he concluded that much of the devastating, long-term conflict in the Middle East derives from cultural dogmatism, which is rooted in the mythologies embedded in the three monotheistic religions. To the extent that gifted political and religious leaders initiate and sustain these conflicts, we can conclude that the mythological dimensions of culture can warp the behavior of gifted leaders and their followers with calamitous consequences.

One other insight from Leeming's work is particularly relevant to high ability. According to his analyses, creative artists are most effective when they tap into the archetypes or myths of a culture (Leeming, 1990, 2013). When we apply this insight to gifted education, we can hypothesize that gifted young artists growing up in a society dominated by a culture different from their own will have trouble gaining recognition for their work and will not be identified as highly talented. Their misdiagnosis as "less talented" will derive from two problems: (a) their own lack of immersion in the mainstream culture, which prevents them from accessing the mythological archetypes of that society, and (b) the inability of adults in the society to perceive their brilliant cognitive and aesthetic connections with deeper mythologies of the minority culture.

This raises questions about the consensual assessment technique, which is used to identify creative ability (see Amabile, 1983; Baer & McKool, 2009; Hennessey & Amabile, 1999; Hickey, 2001). Unless the experts employing the technique are steeped in the minority culture that nurtured the development of these talented young people, the expert evaluators will be missing an important dimension of the expertise needed in the evaluative process. Consequently, they will be much less "expert" as evaluators than they appear to be even though they may be recognized as "experts" by their professional peers in the relevant artistic domain. The sad result is that gifted young artists from a culture that is a minority in a particular nation might be ignored by the talent-screening mechanisms of that nation.

Culture as Reified and Bounded

According to political scientist Seyla Benhabib (2002, 2017), both conservative and progressive thinkers tend to make the same conceptual error in arguments over the drawbacks or merits of multiculturalism. Conservatives tend to argue against multiculturalism because they believe that recognizing and embracing the values of other cultures will undermine the security of their own, and

this will lead to instability. Progressives tend to argue in favor of multiculturalism because they want to shield minority cultures from domination by the mainstream sociocultural system in a society. Both of these arguments are preservationist in the sense that they are aimed at protecting and preserving one or more cultures from intrusion by competitors.

Benhabib argued that both of these opposing perspectives on cultural dominance are based on simplistic portrayals of culture itself. Both conservative and progressive cultural preservationists oversimplify culture by assuming that a particular culture is internally homogenous and can be defined clearly. As such, its borders can be delineated with precision. Benhabib used the term *reductionist sociology of culture* to designate this conceptual error of cultural oversimplification.

One of Benhabib's primary purposes in the analysis was to warn against accepting simplistic cultural interpretations that might be used to legitimize the hoarding of power by cultural insiders. If powerful ideologues can oversimplify our notions of culture they can manipulate us into accepting their marginalizing of "outsiders" who don't perfectly fit the reified pattern that they establish as the ideal for a nation or region. They can establish repressive demands for conformity.

Implications for the field of gifted studies include the danger that a particular group of ideologues can define what giftedness is or is not, making selection and education of those with high ability conform to a reified set of unfairly favored cultural values that do not accurately reflect the cultural nuances of the region. In actuality, the dominant culture and the minority cultures in that region are much more flexible and fluid, evolving over time by borrowing ideas from one another and from outside the region. The cultural dimensions of giftedness are far more adjustable than we assume they are.

Globalization and Dynamic Tensions in Identity Formation

As the phenomenon of globalization has brought the world together through ever-tighter integrative communication networks, the problem of cultural and ethnic conflict has been magnified. While new developments in information technology and the increasing internationalization of corporations have generated these integrative, international connections, individuals and populations throughout the world also are inclined to align themselves with the tenets of a particular cultural identity. The result is the dynamic tension of *distant proximities*--the simultaneous magnetic outward pull of international, global influences (most notably the attraction of Western trends and commercial products) and the inward pull of local identity and the social cohesion and security it provides (Rosenau, 2003, 2015).

Implications for the gifted can include turbulence and angst in identity formation. Before the globalization of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, gifted individuals did not have to wrestle much with cultural identity because they tended to automatically align their belief systems and aspirations with the tenets of their home cultures. Now they must make decisions about the extent to which they tie their identities to local, cultural traditions or the competing Western cultural forces of globalization.

Ethnocentrism, Particularist Morality, and Demonization

Conflict based on cultural dogmatism has been a major problem throughout human history and persists into the 21st century. According to critical thinking experts, the gifted are not immune to dogmatism, including its cultural variety (Elder & Paul, 2012). Actually, the moral influence of an individual in the world can be mapped onto a conceptual model of moral-ethical impact (see Ambrose, 2009b), which synthesizes aspects of morality based on constructs from the following:

- Conceptions of universalist morality, relational altruism, quasi-altruism, amorality, particularist morality, immorality, and malevolence (from the field of ethical philosophy).
- The Presby-Arendt continuum (from ethical philosophy), which portrays the degree of freedom or constraint individuals enjoy or suffer in a particular society. The continuum ranges from free consent, to manipulation and propaganda, to coercion and constraint, and finally to violent repression.

- The degree of influence the individual has within a society. This influence can be “earned” through talent, intelligence, and creativity (insights here can be gleaned from gifted education and creative studies), or “unearned” through birth into the networks of privilege in a highly stratified society controlled by an elite (insights here can be gleaned from economics, sociology, and history).

Based on conceptions drawn from this model, an individual with benevolent or malevolent dispositions and little talent, creativity, or intelligence can do very good or very harmful things within a small circle of influence but likely will have little impact on the world (also see Sternberg et al., 2022). Conversely, an individual with benevolent or malevolent dispositions and very strong talent, creativity, or intelligence has the power to exert much more beneficent or harmful impact on the world. This is especially the case if the individual of high ability is a member of an elite in a stratified society because the networks of privilege can magnify one’s influence on the world exponentially. Consequently, the moral responsibility of gifted individuals, especially those who come from privileged backgrounds, is higher than that of individuals with less ability.

Given these notions of moral impact and responsibility, attending to the cultural dogmatism influencing gifted minds becomes more important. Cultural traditions often have the disturbing effect of confining an individual’s benevolent actions narrowly to members of his or her own identity group while making it more likely that the individual will engage in malevolent acts toward outsiders, up to and even including genocide (see Chirot, 2012; Chirot & McCauley, 2006; Moore, 2000). Otherwise kind individuals and groups are capable of horrific acts toward those they deem impure or polluting. The “impurity” comes from the outsiders’ differences in terms of political, religious, or other cultural beliefs.

Yet another set of concepts from ethical philosophy applies to this analysis. Gewirth (1998, 2009) distinguished between particularist and universalist morality. Those adhering to particularist morality typically have no problem extending kindness and generosity to others, as long as those others are from their own identity group. However, in interactions with individuals or populations beyond their own identity group, particularists tend to see the outsiders as less worthy and subject to anything from dismissive exclusion to exploitation and extermination. In contrast, universalists cannot draw strong distinctions between their identity groups and outsiders. While they might favor those who share their identity to some extent, when crises occur and outsiders need help universalists feel compelled to provide generous assistance, even when such action poses danger to themselves. Political philosopher Kristen Renwick Monroe (Martin & Monroe, 2009; Monroe, 1996, 2003, 2004, 2011) also has done considerable research on these dynamics.

There are implications here for those attempting to understand the cultural dimensions of high ability. Aspects of culture such as religious beliefs and sociopolitical and ideological values usually are the most important factors in distinguishing one’s identity group from outsiders. If gifted individuals subscribe to particularist identity frameworks they will be inclined to apply their impressive talents and thinking skills to malevolent ends when crises magnify the differences between identity groups. They could use their intellectual abilities to build convincing justifications for malevolent actions toward outsiders. Those with leadership talents could encourage large numbers of followers to attack and destroy outsiders as did the malevolent leader, Adolf Hitler, who showed himself willing and able to catalyze the Holocaust (see Koonz, 2003; Popper, 2005).

In contrast, the powerful talents and cognitive capacities of gifted individuals with universalist tendencies can be employed for the protection of vulnerable outsiders and in the healing of divisive, intercultural conflicts within and beyond national borders. Nelson Mandela’s universalist approach to the healing of inter-cultural conflict in the aftermath of the dismantling of South African apartheid is an iconic example (see Popper, 2005).

Differing Cultural Interpretations of Nature

The musty, archival mining of historians also can contribute valuable insights about the cultural dimensions of high ability. For example, Coates (1998) carried out in-depth analyses of the ways in

which various cultures conceive of the natural world and its interactions with society. Ultimately, he developed the following categorizations (among others) of nature as a:

- Principle, quality, or essence that shapes the ways in which events unfold in the world
- Physical place, which is separate from humanity
- Guiding inspiration, which can serve as a source of authority for human action

While these differing conceptions of nature appear benign or non-influential on the surface they actually can exert powerful influence over entire societies moving them in one direction or another over long periods of time. In addition, they can shape cultural conceptions of talent, intelligence, and creativity. In terms of influence on entire societies, Coates argued that the current, predominant Western view of nature as a physical place separate from humanity is actually a minority view when placed in the context of history. Most other civilizations have seen themselves as much more integrated with nature than do Western societies in the 20th and 21st centuries. A consequence of this notion of separation from nature is that nature is to be exploited as a resource. Arguably, many gifted, creative young people grow up to become influential corporate leaders who see their mission as exploiting resources and the natural world (e.g., executives of major oil companies). Consequently, they apply their talents to the profitable extraction of resources while remaining dismissive of, or oblivious to, the long-term ethical implications of their work (e.g., the looming disaster of climate change).

Another example of the impact these differing perspectives on nature can have on societies and individuals comes from the ways in which Nazi Germany aligned with the idea of nature as a guiding inspiration and source of authority. Coates (1998) viewed this conception as underpinning the Nazi's belief that war was a natural state of being and the conquest of others was justifiable because their ideology was imbued with a natural worthiness. Many gifted and talented individuals in the Nazi regime were caught up in the fervor derived from this conception of nature.

Critical Communities and Motley Coalitions

Finally, some other dimensions of culture can come into play when gifted individuals perceive ethical problems and injustice in the larger society and attempt to correct them. Many gifted children are sensitive to moral issues (see Ambrose, Sriraman, & Cross, 2013; Hague, 1998; Lovecky, 1997; Piechowski, 2003a, 2003b; Roeper & Silverman, 2009; Seider, Davis, & Gardner, 2009; Silverman, 1993) so it is natural for them to perceive serious flaws in a culture or society before their less-able peers gain such awareness. Consequently, they often are in a tiny, fragmented, ethically sensitive minority and must push against enormous obstacles to effect any kind of societal change.

Fortunately, at least two rays of hope have become visible through the work of scholars from disciplines outside of gifted education and creative studies. Rochon (1998), a political scientist, showed how small groups of vibrant critical thinkers were remarkably effective in creating new idea systems and disseminating them throughout larger populations. In one example, he compared the state of race relations in pre-civil rights America as similar to the oppression of serfdom in the European Middle Ages. In spite of this daunting barrier, gifted thinkers and leaders in the civil rights movement generated new ways of thinking and transformed the minds of large swaths of the American population.

If we combine Rochon's notion of critical communities with anthropologist Anna Tsing's (2001, 2004) discovery of globally integrated *motley coalitions* there is enormous opportunity for ethically sensitive gifted individuals to have significant impact throughout the world, and to redress large-scale injustices. Tsing found that the integrated networks of globalization are making it possible for widely dispersed, concerned individuals to collaborate in attempts to solve problems of injustice in distant places. For example, when corporate forces were expropriating large tracts of Southeast Asian rainforest from indigenous populations and causing large-scale environmental devastation, motley coalitions of concerned individuals came together to combat the problem. These coalitions were comprised of cosmetics entrepreneurs, democratic reformers, representatives of indigenous peoples, union activists, and others, many of whom would never interact under any other circumstances.

Gifted individuals, especially those who are sensitive to large-scale ethical problems in the world, no longer have to feel like they are loners in the world. If they discover these findings about the power of critical communities and motley coalitions they will be better able to interact with like-minded peers around the world through the networks of information technology. In essence, these findings from political science and anthropology, combined with the newfound power of global integration, offer the gifted the opportunity to shift and transform their cultures for the better.

Conclusion

This interdisciplinary exploration just scratches the surface. There are many more theories and research findings in disciplines relevant to cultural understanding that could be accessed to give us additional insight about the cultural dimensions of high ability. While cultural anthropologists, political scientists, ethical philosophers, historians, and scholars of English studies likely do not think much about the field of gifted education, there is much in their work that can be borrowed and applied to theory, research, and practice in our field. We intend to continue the exploration, and invite others to engage in similar conceptual expeditions.

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 357-376.
- Ambrose, D. (1998). A model for clarification and expansion of conceptual foundations. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 42, 77-86.
- Ambrose, D. (2005). Interdisciplinary expansion of conceptual foundations: Insights from beyond our field. *Roeper Review*, 27, 137-143.
- Ambrose, D. (2009a). *Expanding visions of creative intelligence: An interdisciplinary exploration*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ambrose, D. (2009b). Morality and high ability: Navigating a landscape of altruism and malevolence. In D. Ambrose & T. L. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 49-71). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Ambrose, D. (2015). Borrowing insights from other disciplines to strengthen the conceptual foundations for gifted education. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*, 3(2), 33-57.
- Ambrose, D. (2017a). Interdisciplinary exploration supports Sternberg's expansion of giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 39, 178-182.
- Ambrose, D. (2017b). Interdisciplinary invigoration of creativity studies. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 51, 348-351. DOI: 10.1002/jocb.205
- Ambrose, D. (2017). Large-scale interdisciplinary design thinking for dealing with 21st-century problems and opportunities. In F. Darbellay, Z. Moody, & T. Lubart (Eds.) *Creativity, design thinking, and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35-52). Singapore: Springer.
- Ambrose, D., & Ambrose, V. K. (2013). Adult lost prizes missing aspirations, a 21st-century education, and self-fulfillment. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity* 1(1), 75-86.
- Ambrose, D., Sriraman, B., & Cross, T. L. (Eds.). (2013). *The Roeper school: A model for holistic development of high ability*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Ambrose, D., Sriraman, B., & Pierce, K. M. (Eds.). (2014). *A critique of creativity and complexity: Deconstructing clichés*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Ambrose, D. & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2012). *How dogmatic beliefs harm creativity and higher-level thinking*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ambrose, D., Sternberg, R. J., & Sriraman, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Confronting dogmatism in gifted education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ambrose, D., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2016a). *Giftedness and talent in the 21st century: Adapting to the turbulence of globalization*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
- Ambrose, D., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2016b). *Creative intelligence in the 21st century: Grappling with enormous problems and huge opportunities*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
- Baer, J., & McKool, S. (2009). Assessing creativity using the consensual assessment. In C. Schreiner (Ed.), *Handbook of assessment technologies, methods, and applications in higher education* (pp. 65-77). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Baumgartner, P., & Payr, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Speaking minds: Interviews with twenty eminent cognitive scientists*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2017). The struggle over culture: Equality and diversity in the European public sphere. *Postfilosofie*, 2(77-96).
- Chippendale, C. (2000). Archaeology's proper place. *Archaeology*, 53, 67-68.
- Chirot, D. (2012). Dogmatism and genocide. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *How dogmatic beliefs harm creativity and higher-level thinking* (pp. 33-36). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chirot, D., & McCauley, C. (2006). *Why not kill them all? The logic and prevention of mass political murder*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Coates, P. (1998). *Nature: Western attitudes since ancient times*. London: University of California Press.
- Cowan, G. A., Pines, D., & Meltzer, D. (Eds.). (1999). *Complexity: Metaphors, models, and reality*. Reading, MA: Perseus.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2012). Dogmatism, creativity, and critical thought: The reality of human minds and the possibility of critical societies. In D. Ambrose & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *How dogmatic beliefs harm creativity and higher-level thinking* (pp. 37-49). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Foss, C. (2006). *The tyrants*. London, England: Quercus.
- Geertz, C. (2000). *Available light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gewirth, A. (1998). *Self-fulfillment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gewirth, A. (2009). *Self-fulfillment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hague, W. J. (1998). Is There Moral Giftedness? *Gifted Education International*, 12, 170-174.
- Hennessey, B. A. & Amabile, T. M. (1999). Consensual assessment. In M. A. Runco & S. R. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of creativity* (Vol. 1, pp. 346-349). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hickey, M. (2001). An application of Amabile's consensual assessment technique for rating the creativity of children's musical compositions. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 234-244.
- Isaksen, S. G., Dorval, K. B., & Treffinger, D. J. (2011). *Creative approaches to problem solving: A framework for innovation and change* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Johnson, M. (2009). What cognitive science brings to ethics. In D. Ambrose & T. L. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 147-150). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Kalbfleisch, M. L. (2008). Introduction to the special issue on the cognitive neuroscience of giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 30, 159-161.
- Koonz, C. (2003). *The Nazi conscience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Larsen, C. S. (2000). *Skeletons in our closet: Revealing our past through bioarchaeology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Larsen, C. S. (Ed.). (2010). *A companion to biological archaeology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Larsen, C. S. (2015). *Bioarchaeology: Interpreting behavior from the human skeleton* (vol. 69). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Leeming, D. A. (1990). *The world of myth: An anthology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Leeming, D. A. (2004). *Jealous gods and chosen people: The mythology of the Middle East*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Leeming, D. A. (2013). *Medusa: In the mirror of time*. London, England: Reaktion Books.
- Lovecky, D. V. (1997). Identity development in gifted children: Moral sensitivity. *Roeper Review*, 20, 90-94.
- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Archaeology's perilous pleasures. *Archaeology*, 53, 62-66.
- Mäki, U., & MacLeod, M. (2016). Interdisciplinarity in action: Philosophy of science perspectives. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 6(3), 323-326.
- Martin, A., & Monroe, K. R. (2009). Identity, moral choice, and the moral imagination: Is there a neuroscientific foundation for altruism? In D. Ambrose & T. L. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 73-87). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Midgley, M. (1998). One world, but a big one. In S. Rose (Ed.), *From brains to consciousness: Essays on the new sciences of the mind* (pp. 246-270). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, J. H., & Page, S. E. (2007). *Complex adaptive systems: An introduction to computational models of social life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Monroe, K. R. (1996). *The heart of altruism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Monroe, K. R. (2003). How identity and perspective constrain moral choice. *International Political Science Review*, 24, 405-425.
- Monroe, K. R. (2004). *The hand of compassion: Portraits of moral choice during the Holocaust*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Monroe, K. R. (2011). *Ethics in an era of terror and genocide: Identity and moral choice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Moore, B., Jr. (2000). *Moral purity and persecution in history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Morowitz, H. J. (2004). *The emergence of everything: How the world became complex*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolescu, B. (1996). Levels of complexity and levels of reality: Nature as trans-nature. In B. Pullman (Ed.), *The emergence of complexity in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology* (pp. 393-417). Vatican City: Pontifical Academy of Sciences.
- Nicolescu, B. (2002). *Manifesto of transdisciplinarity*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Persson, R. S. (2012). Cultural variation and dominance in a globalised knowledge-economy: Towards a culture-sensitive research paradigm in the science of giftedness. *Gifted and Talented International*, 27(1), 15-48.
- Piechowski, M. M. (2003a). Emotional and spiritual giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *The handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 403-416). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Piechowski, M. M. (2003b). From William James to Maslow and Dabrowski: Excitability of character and self actualization. In D. Ambrose, L. M. Cohen & A. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Creative intelligence: Toward theoretic integration* (pp. 283-322). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Popper, M. (2005). *Leaders who transform society: What drives them and why we are attracted*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pullman, B. (Ed.). (1996). *The emergence of complexity in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology*. Vatican City: Pontifical Academy of Sciences.
- Rochon, T. R. (1998). *Culture moves: Ideas, activism, and changing values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Roeper, A., & Silverman, L. (2009). Giftedness and moral promise. In D. Ambrose & T. L. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 251-264). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Rose, S. (Ed.). (1998). *From brains to consciousness: Essays on the new sciences of the mind*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Distant proximities: Dynamics beyond globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2015). *People count!: Networked individuals in global politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Seider, S., Davis, K., & Gardner, H. (2009). Morality, ethics and good work: Young people's respectful and ethical minds. In D. Ambrose & T. L. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 209-222). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Silverman, L. (1993). The moral sensitivity of gifted children and the evolution of society. *Roeper Review*, 17, 110-116.
- Spivey, M. (2008). *The continuity of mind*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2008). The world rests on a turtle, but on what does that turtle rest? A reply to Haier and Jung. *Roeper Review*, 30, 196-198.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Ambrose, D. (Eds.). (2021). *Conceptions of giftedness and talent*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sternberg, R. J., Ambrose, D., & Karami, S. (Eds.). (2022). *The Palgrave handbook of transformational giftedness for education*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Thagard, P. (2012). *The cognitive science of science: Explanation, discovery, and conceptual change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Treffinger, D. J., Isaksen, S. G., & Dorval, K. B. (2006). *Creative problem solving: An introduction* (4th ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Tsing, A. L. (2001). The global situation. In J. W. Scott & D. Keates (Eds.), *Schools of thought: Twenty-five years of interpretive social science* (pp. 104-138). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tsing, A. L. (2004). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

About the Authors

Don Ambrose, Ph.D., is professor of graduate education at Rider University in Lawrenceville, New Jersey, and editor of the *Roeper Review*. He serves on the editorial boards of most of the major journals in the field of gifted education and for several book series. He has initiated and led numerous interdisciplinary scholarly projects involving eminent researchers and theorists from creative studies, gifted education, general education, cognitive science, ethical philosophy, psychology, political science, economics, law, history, urban planning, sociology, theoretical physics, nuclear engineering, and critical thinking. Some of his recent books include: *Palgrave handbook of transformational giftedness for education* (with Robert J. Sternberg and Sareh Karami); *Conceptions of giftedness* (with Robert J. Sternberg); *Creative Intelligence in the 21st Century: Grappling with Enormous Problems and Huge Opportunities* (with Robert J. Sternberg); *Giftedness and Talent in the 21st Century: Adapting to the Turbulence of Globalization* (with Robert J. Sternberg); *How Dogmatic Beliefs Harm Creativity and Higher-Level Thinking* (with Robert J. Sternberg); *Confronting Dogmatism in Gifted Education* (with Robert J. Sternberg and Bharath Sriraman); *Expanding Visions of Creative Intelligence: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*; *Imagitronics; Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds* (with Tracy L. Cross); *The Roeper School: A Model for Holistic Development of High Ability* (with Bharath Sriraman and Tracy L. Cross); and *A Critique of Creativity and Complexity: Deconstructing Clichés* (with Bharath Sriraman and Kathleen Pierce). Projects currently under construction include books introducing new creative and critical thinking strategies based on constructs derived from various academic disciplines. He has done invited keynote presentations throughout the world and earned international and national awards from The International Center for Innovation in Education (ICIE), the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), and the American Creativity Association.

Valerie K. Ambrose, Ph.D., is Reading Instructor at Shasta College in Redding, California, USA. She served as Co-Director of the Commission for Adult Basic Education and Literacy (CABEL) for the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. Her work as a literacy practitioner has taken place in a variety of contexts and with students of varying backgrounds in different parts of the United States. Her areas of research interest are adult literacy, marginalized populations, 21st-century opportunities and challenges, collaboration, and positive psychology. She has won two national awards for scholarship: the 2013 Commission on Adult Basic Education Scholarship Award and the 2013 College Reading and Learning Scholarship Award.

Addresses

Dr. Don Ambrose;

Rider University, 2083 Lawrenceville Rd. Lawrenceville, NJ 08648, USA.

e-Mail: ambrose@rider.edu

Dr. Valerie K. Ambrose;

Shasta College, 11555 Old Oregon Trail, Redding, CA 96003, USA.

e-Mail: valerie.k.ambrose@gmail.com