

Directions: In this section, you are going to read a passage with ten statements attached to it. Each statement contains information given in one of the paragraphs. Identify the paragraph from which the information is derived. You may choose a paragraph more than once. Each paragraph is marked with a letter. Answer the questions by marking the corresponding letter on **Answer Sheet 2**.

Evil Genius

- A) A few years ago I found myself teaching a university class on evil. It was for third-year criminology students to help them contextualize theory and research within controversial current topics. It was a huge success. The debates were heated and interesting. I could see people's views change within the course of a single lecture. Over the past 13 years, as a student, lecturer and researcher, I've enjoyed discussing the science of evil with anyone willing to listen. What I like most is destroying the cliché(陈词滥调) of good and evil, and replacing them with scientific insight. We need a more informed way of discussing behavior that at first we cannot, or should not, begin to understand.
- B) Without understanding, we risk dehumanizing others, writing off human beings simply because we don't comprehend them. We must try to understand what we have labeled evil. We tend to think evil is something that other people are. We think of ourselves as "good people", and even when we do morally wrong things, we understand the context of our decisions. With others, however, it is far easier to write them off. If their actions deviate(偏离) substantially from what we consider acceptable, we may label them evil. We need to be careful with this. Calling someone evil is often similar to saying they cannot change, and perhaps aren't even a human at all. However, when you actually go monster-hunting, and you look deeply at the people behind shocking behavior, you may be surprised.
- C) As a child I used to love the Scooby-Doo cartoons. Arriving in their "Mystery Machine", the gang would have to find a monster who was terrorizing a neighborhood. They would run around looking for clues and at the end unmask the bad guy. It was always a normal person in a costume. There were no monsters. Like the Scooby crew, we may find ourselves hunting for an easy fix, one word for people who do bad things. But if we take a good look, the word "evil" is insufficient—there are no simple explanations for why humans do bad things: instead there are many, and they are all marvelously different.
- D) Evil is typically referred to when there is deviance from social norms: formal deviance is the violation of laws, like theft, murder, and attacks, while informal deviance involves violations of social norms, like lying. Evil behavior is typically thought to embrace one or both forms. However, deviance can also describe a behavior that simply differs from the norm.
- E) Perhaps this is where we can find the good side of our bad side. Deviating from the norm can make us villains(恶棍), but it can also make us heroes. A child deviates from social pressures when they stand up for another child being bullied in school. A soldier deviates when they choose not to follow orders to kill an innocent civilian. An employee in a big tech company deviates when they expose its wrongdoings.
- F) Creativity is also a deviation. Here, too, things are complex. Thinking creatively has given us modern medicine, technology and modern political structures, but it has also given us poison and nuclear weapons. Great benefit and great harm can come from the same human tendency.

- G) In a research paper, *Evil Genius*, published in 2014, the behavioral scientists Francesca Gino and Scott Wiltermuth wanted to examine whether people who behave unethically in one task are more creative than others on a subsequent task, even after controlling for differences in baseline creative skills. The unethical behavior they chose was dishonesty.
- H) Over five experiments, researchers gave participants tasks in which they could cheat. In one study, they were given matrices(矩阵) and had to find two numbers that added up to 10. Participants were asked to self-report how well they did at the end of the study: 59% cheated by saying that they solved more matrices than they actually had.
- I) After each task, the researchers measured participants' performance on the Remote Associates Test. This shows participants three words at a time that appear to be unrelated, and the person has to think of a fourth word that is associated with all of them. For example, you might get "Fox, Man, Peep", or "Dust, Cereal, Fish". In order to find the linking words ("Hole" for the first, "Bowl" for the second) you need to be creative. The more you get right, the more creative you are thought to be because you have come up with uncommon associations.
- J) For every one of the five studies, they found the same thing—participants who cheated in the first task did better on the creativity task. Why? Like other forms of unethical behavior, lying means breaking rules. It involves being deviant, going against the social principle that people should tell the truth. Similarly, being creative involves "thinking outside the box", deviating from expectations. They involve similar thought patterns, so stimulating one stimulates the other. Can we learn from this? Perhaps. To be more creative, we could try lying in a controlled environment. Find online logic games and cheat at them, play Scrabble(拼字游戏) with a dictionary, or write a story about something that is untrue? Such tasks can get our brains thinking flexibly, beyond our normal comfort zone. This is not a call to become a compulsive(强迫性的) liar, but a controlled liar.
- K) In addition to benefits for creativity, deviance can be a good thing in other ways. Even Philip Zimbardo, the author of the Stanford prison experiment, who showed how easily we can be led to behave badly, believes that the future of deviance research may lie more in understanding extreme pro-social behavior, such as heroism. Like evil, we often view heroism as only a possibility for outliers—for people who are abnormal. But Zimbardo asks: "What if the capability to act heroically is also fundamentally ordinary and available to all of us?" Some say we should never meet our heroes, lest they disappoint us when we find out how normal they are. But this should be liberating, not disappointing. We are all capable of behaving like outliers. It's time for us to understand deviance, and realize its potential for good as well as for harm.
36. A behavior that does not conform to social norms may be described as being deviant.
37. Various experiments found that participants who cheated in the initial task performed better in the creativity test.
38. People may be simply considered evil if their behaviors are morally unacceptable to us.
39. The research published by two scientists was intended to examine the relationship between dishonesty and creativity.
40. The author's lectures sparked lively discussions in his class.
41. The researchers tested the participants' creativity by asking them to play a word game.

42. It is time we realized that deviance may be capable of doing both good and harm to individuals and society.
43. The reasons for people's evil behaviors can be explained in more ways than one.
44. The math task in one experiment was designed to test participants' tendency to cheat.
45. Some creative ideas have turned out to do harm to human society.