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Researchers across disciplines have become increasingly interested in understanding why even people who care about morality predictably cross ethical boundaries. This heightened interest in unethical behavior, defined as acts that violate widely held moral rules or norms of appropriate conduct ([Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-33)), is easily understood. Unethical behavior creates trillions of dollars in financial losses every year and is becoming increasingly commonplace ([PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2011](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-22)).

One form of unethical behavior, dishonesty, seems especially pervasive ([Bazerman & Gino, 2012](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-4)). Like other forms of unethical behavior, dishonesty involves breaking a rule—the social principle that people should tell the truth. Much of the scholarly attention devoted to understanding why individuals behave unethically has therefore focused on the factors that lead people to break rules.

Although rule breaking carries a negative connotation in the domain of ethics, it carries a positive connotation in another well-researched domain: creativity. To be creative, it is often said, one must “think outside the box” and use divergent thinking ([Guilford, 1967](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-13); [Runco, 2010](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-23); [Simonton, 1999](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-26)). Divergent thinking requires that people break some (but not all) rules within a domain to construct associations between previously unassociated cognitive elements ([Bailin, 1987](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-1); [Guilford, 1950](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-12)). The resulting unusual mental associations serve as the basis for novel ideas ([Langley & Jones, 1988](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-17); [Sternberg, 1988](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-28)). The creative process therefore involves rule breaking, as one must break rules to take advantage of existing opportunities or to create new ones ([Brenkert, 2009](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-6)). Thus, scholars have asserted that organizations may foster creativity by hiring people slow to learn the organizational code ([Sutton, 2001](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-31), [2002](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-32)) and by encouraging people to break from accepted practices ([Winslow & Solomon, 1993](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-38)) or to break rules ([Baucus, Norton, Baucus, & Human, 2008](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-3); [Kelley & Littman, 2001](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-16)).

Given that both dishonesty and creativity involve rule breaking, the individuals most likely to behave dishonestly and the individuals most likely to be creative may be one and the same. Indeed, highly creative people are more likely than less creative people to bend rules or break laws ([Cropley, Kaufman, & Cropley, 2003](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-7); [Sternberg & Lubart, 1995](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-29); [Sulloway, 1996](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-30)). Popular tales are replete with images of “evil geniuses,” such as Rotwang in *Metropolis* and “Lex” Luthor in *Superman*, who are both creative and nefarious in their attempts to ruin humanity. Similarly, news articles have applied the “evil genius” moniker to Bernard Madoff, who made $20 billion disappear using a creative Ponzi scheme.

The causal relationship between creativity and unethical behavior may take two possible forms: The creative process may trigger dishonesty; alternatively, acting unethically may enhance creativity. Research has demonstrated that enhancing the motivation to think outside the box can drive people toward more dishonest decisions ([Beaussart, Andrews, & Kaufman, 2013](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-5); [Gino & Ariely, 2012](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-9)). But could acting dishonestly enhance creativity in subsequent tasks?

In five experiments, we obtained the first empirical evidence that behaving dishonestly can spur creativity and examined the psychological mechanism explaining this link. We suggest that after behaving dishonestly, people feel less constrained by rules, and are thus more likely to act creatively by constructing associations between previously unassociated cognitive elements.

**General Discussion**

There is little doubt that dishonesty creates costs for society. It is less clear whether it produces any positive consequences. This research identified one such positive consequence, demonstrating that people may become more creative after behaving dishonestly because acting dishonestly leaves them feeling less constrained by rules.

By identifying potential consequences of acting dishonestly, these findings complement existing research on behavioral ethics and moral psychology, which has focused primarily on identifying the antecedents to unethical behavior ([Bazerman & Gino, 2012](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full" \l "ref-4)). These findings also advance understanding of creative behavior by showing that feeling unconstrained by rules enhances creative sparks. More speculatively, our research raises the possibility that one of the reasons why dishonesty is so widespread in today’s society is that by acting dishonestly, people become more creative, which allows them to come up with more creative justifications for their immoral behavior and therefore makes them more likely to behave dishonestly ([Gino & Ariely, 2012](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/25/4/973.full#ref-9)), which may make them more creative, and so on.

In sum, this research shows that the sentiment expressed in the common saying “rules are meant to be broken” is at the root of both creative performance and dishonest behavior. It also provides new evidence that dishonesty may therefore lead people to become more creative in their subsequent endeavors.

Úkol č.2

**A)** Cropley, D. H., Kaufman, J. C. & A. J. Cropley (2003) *Malevolent creativity: A functional model of creativity in terrorism and crime. Creativity Research Journal, 20, 105–11*

Citace z cýzkumu: *Given that both dishonesty and creativity involve rule breaking, the individuals most likely to behave dishonestly and the individuals most likely to be creative may be one and the same. Indeed, highly creative people are more likely than less creative people to bend rules or break laws*

Úryvek z původního textu: Criminality may sometimes be a kind of accidental by-product of creativity: Because creativity requires deviating from the conventional, there is a permanent tension between being creative and producing products that go too far, sometimes to the point of breaking the law (whether or not other societies or later generations would approve of the law in question)

A second kind of link between creativity and crime is seen when creative individuals break the law, not as part of their creativity or as a direct result of their kreativity but, so to speak, on the side. A creative individual who committed a murder or robbed a bank would be an obvious example. The fact that the murderer was highly creative might help him or her to plan and carry out the crime in a novel way, but by and large the fact that the murderer was creative would be coincidental.

**B)** CROPLEY, Arthur a David CROPLEY. The dark side of creativity. *Creativity and Crime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, s. 116.

Citace z cýzkumu: The dark side of creativity can be refuted in several ways. The most fundamental argument is that it is parsimonious and therefore scientifically tenable to look at the creative process and at creative capacity (and potential) rather than at eventual creative products. The products are the results of the process and so more like symptoms (an appropriate word for malevolent creativity) than casual factors. Second is that the creative process is blind and only supplies original options and ideas. There are often deviant, but only in tense of being unusual and unconventional, not in any immoral or unethical manner. The morality or the options can be determined (and an influence, for that matter) only after ideas are produces, that is, after the generative process that is the engine for creative work.

Úryvek z původního textu: Given that both dishonesty and creativity involve rule breaking, the individuals most likely to behave dishonestly and the individuals most likely to be creative may be one and the same. Indeed, highly creative people are more likely than less creative people to bend rules or break laws.

**C**) [Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: Why experiments are often more effective than mediational ***analyses*** in examining psychological processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89, 845–851](https://www.google.cz/search?biw=1366&bih=653&q=Spencer,+S.+J.,+Zanna,+M.+P.,+%26+Fong,+G.+T.+(2005).+Establishing+a+causal+chain:+Why+experiments+are+often+more+effective+than+mediational+analysis+in+examining+psychological+processes.+Journal+of+Personality+and+Social+Psychology,+89,+845%E2%80%93851&spell=1&sa=X&ei=qBVtVJrzN4f5ywO36YDoBA&ved=0CBkQBSgA)

Citace z cýzkumu: “In Experiment 4, we tested whether caring about rules explained the relationship between dishonesty and creativity using a traditional mediation approach. In Experiment 5, we obtained further evidence for this mediating mechanism using a moderation approach”

Úryvek z původního textu:

If a psychological process can be easily manipulated but is difficult to measure, then we recommend a design that examines this psychological process by manipulating the process to moderate the relation between the independent variable and the dependent variable—what we call a moderation-of-process design. Such designs (e.g., when cognitive load interferes with controlled processing of information) can provide compelling evidence of a proposed psychological process when there is compelling evidence that the operational manipulation of the process does indeed have the proposed theoretical effect and when alternative explanations for the effect of the manipulation on the relation between the independent and dependent variable have been ruled out.

Prohlédnutí originálních zdrojů samozřejmě přispělo k lepšímu pochopení článků. Tímto způsobem jsem zatím ještě nijak zvláště nepracovala, ovšem u mnou preferovaných témat bude takovéto efektivní zpracování a uchopení informací nadále prvním voleným.