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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), is easily

understood. Unethical behavior creates trillions of dollars

in financial losses every year and is becoming increasingly

commonplace (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2011).

One form of unethical behavior, dishonesty, seems

especially pervasive (Bazerman & Gino, 2012). 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; Runco, 2010;

Simonton, 1999). Divergent thinking requires that people

break some (but not all) rules within a domain to construct

associations between previously unassociated cognitive

elements (Bailin, 1987; Guilford, 1950). The

resulting unusual mental associations serve as the basis

for novel ideas (Langley & Jones, 1988; Sternberg, 1988).

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). Thus,

scholars have asserted that organizations may foster creativity

by hiring people slow to learn the organizational

code (Sutton, 2001, 2002) and by encouraging people to

break from accepted practices (Winslow & Solomon,

1993) or to break rules (Baucus, Norton, Baucus, &

Human, 2008; Kelley & Littman, 2001).

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; Sternberg

& Lubart, 1995; Sulloway, 1996). 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; Gino & Ariely,

2012). 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). 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), 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.
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**ZDROJ: 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**

*CITACE: „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.“*

ORIGINÁL: 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.

**Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural borders and**

**mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad**

**and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,**

***96*, 1047–1061**

*„The correct solution involves using the box of tacks as a*

*candleholder: One should empty the box of tacks, tack it*

*to the wall, and then place the candle inside. Finding the*

*correct solution is considered a measure of insight creativity*

*because it requires people to see objects as capable*

*of performing atypical functions (Maddux & Galinsky,*

*2009).“*

Going back to the example of leftover food on a plate from the introduction, an

individual who has lived abroad can frame such a problem or

behavior in multiple ways, understanding that it has multiple

meanings depending on the cultural context (i.e., leftover food

could serve either as a complement or a criticism). Thus, individuals

who have adapted to multiple cultural contexts may be less

susceptible to *functional fixedness*, the inability to see objects

performing atypical or novel functions, as with the box of tacks in

the Duncker candle task. In addition, adapting to and integrating a

diverse set of ideas and behaviors may expose people to new ideas

and allow for individuals to more easily go through the process of

unconscious idea recombination, as well as conceptual expansion,

making it easier to be creative.

**Gino, F., & Ariely, D. (2012). The dark side of creativity: Original**

**thinkers can be more dishonest. *Journal of Personality and***

***Social Psychology*, *102*, 445–459.**

*„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*

*But could acting dishonestly enhance creativity in*

*subsequent tasks?“*

Divergent thinking refers to the ability of individuals to

develop original ideas and to envision multiple solutions

to a given problem. It involves thinking “without boundaries,”

or “outside the box” (Thompson, 2008, p. 226). Cognitive flexibility,

by contrast, describes the ability of individuals to restructure

knowledge in multiple different ways depending on

changing situational demands

Díky prostudování originálních prací jsem jednodušeji pochopil pravé myšlenky autorů. V tomto článků byly totiž vždy zjednodušeny a někdy jsem měl potíže s jejich pochopením. Poskytly mi doplňující informace ohledně tématu, které by mi po samotném přečtení tohoto článku ušly.
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**Geniální zloduch? Vědci radí: Chcete být více kreativní, podvádějte!**

Skupina badatelů z Univerzity v Jižní Kalifornii přišla se zajímavými výsledky svého výzkumu, které se můžou některým studentům náramně hodit. Podvádění už totiž není jen špatné nebo netolerovatelné, díky podvodům zvyšujeme vlastní kreativitu. Vše funguje za jednoho předpokladu, kterým je fakt, že kreativní myšlení má něco společného s neupřímností a podváděním. Tímto společným jmenovatelem je porušování pravidel. U neupřímnosti je porušování pravidel do očí bijící, u kreativity už to tak zjevné není, ale v podstatě je potřeba překročit nějaké hranice a vybočit z normálního směru uvažování. Sílu těchto dvou tvrzení ukazuje i jedno známé rčení: „Pravidla jsou od toho, aby se porušovala. “

K těmto domněnkám bylo tedy přistoupeno vědecky díky sérii pěti různých experimentů. Ty se od sebe lišily způsobem, kterým zjišťovaly souvislost těchto dvou proměnných. Například když měli účastníci možnost při testu vidět správné odpovědi přímo na monitoru a jediná možnost jak zamezit objevení se správné odpovědi na obrazovce byla stisknout na klávesu mezerník (jehož počet stisknutí byl tajně sledován). Tímto se určila jedincova tendence k podvádění, která byla poté porovnána s dotazníkem zjišťujícím kvalitu kreativity.

Z těchto výzkumů pak vzešly výsledky, které potvrzují, že nečestnost má významný vliv na úroveň lidské kreativity. To je dobrá zpráva pro všechny, kteří mají malý problém se zvládáním svého chování. Teď už je to nemusí trápit. Pokud ve svém životě potřebují být tvůrčí a kreativní, podle vědců stačí jednoduše zlobit.

To by také mohlo vysvětlovat, proč je tolik kontroverzních umělců, kteří rádi překračují hranice (i za pomoci alkoholu a drog) a jejich díla jsou slavná a originální. Takže pokud chcete být umělcem, toto je nejjednodušší cesta jak se jím stát.

Buďme tedy zvědavý, s jakými dalšími objevy vědci přijdou, co nového zjistí a jaké další předsudky zboří.