

## BRIEF REPORT

## Sticky Tradition Impedes Selection of Creative Ideas

Moritz Reis<sup>1</sup>, Anna Foerster<sup>1, 2</sup>, Ingo Zettler<sup>3, 4</sup>, Wilfried Kunde<sup>1</sup>, and Roland Pfister<sup>1, 2, 5</sup><sup>1</sup> Institute of Psychology, University of Wuerzburg<sup>2</sup> General Psychology, Trier University<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen<sup>4</sup> Copenhagen Center for Social Data Science (SODAS), University of Copenhagen<sup>5</sup> Institute for Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience (ICAN), Trier University

Creativity is a driving force for human development and has fascinated scholars for centuries. Surprisingly little is known about the cognitive underpinnings of putting creative ideas into action, however. To shed light on this part of the creative process, we tracked how hand movements unfolded when choosing between either a traditional or a creative use of a given object. Participants could freely decide between both options (Experiment 1,  $N = 51$  adults) or were prompted to select a specific use (Experiment 2,  $N = 51$  adults). Temporal as well as spatial measures of action unfolding revealed behavior to be strongly biased toward traditional options when choosing an available, more creative option eventually. Creative behavior thus comprises two obstacles: not only coming up with new ideas, but also overcoming a lasting bias toward using old ones.

**Public Significance Statement**

We show that creativity takes more than just coming up with an original idea. Even after deciding on creative options, human behavior is strongly biased toward traditional approaches. This lasting effect of established beliefs and procedures might explain why creative ideas are often discarded rapidly and why so many innovative projects might fail in an early stage. Focusing on ways to overcome the sticky nature of tradition thus has direct implications for the design of environments and interventions that should promote creative ideas and behavior.

**Keywords:** creativity, innovation, cognitive control, motion-tracking, response dynamics

**Supplemental materials:** <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001490.supp>

Creativity is the driving force of social upswing and scientific discovery (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010). Promoting creative ideas thus is a key goal for academia, organizations, and society at large (Andriopoulos, 2001; Cropley, 1997; Heinze et al., 2009). Creativity does not come easy, however, and the constraints of the human cognitive system that hamper innovation have been puzzling (Beaty et al., 2016).

Coming up with original solutions is traditionally construed as the evident obstacle for creativity (Adams et al., 2021; Amabile, 1988). As observed in so-called functional fixedness problems, creative insight is hampered by established associations to known objects (Duncker, 1945; McCaffrey, 2012). In line with such reasoning, participants performed better in these tasks when being blindfolded (Glucksberg, 1964), suggesting that diversion of attention can help

This article was published Online First October 5, 2023.

Moritz Reis  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1547-8109>

Some of the data and ideas appearing in this article have been previously presented at the 22nd meeting of the European Society of Cognitive Psychology (ESCoP) in Lille, France; at the 65th Conference of Experimental Psychologists (TeaP) in Trier, Germany; and at the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Psychonomic Society (Psychonomics) in Boston, United States. Roland Pfister received funding from the Heisenberg Programme of the German Research Foundation (PF853/10-1). The authors declare no conflict of interest. Preregistrations, raw data, materials, and analysis syntax are available on the Open Science Framework (OSF repository: <https://osf.io/mwyp7>).

Moritz Reis served as lead for conceptualization, methodology, and writing—original draft. Wilfried Kunde served as lead for funding acquisition. Moritz Reis and Roland Pfister contributed equally to formal analysis and visualization. Anna Foerster and Roland Pfister contributed equally to conceptualization and methodology. Anna Foerster, Ingo Zettler, Wilfried Kunde, and Roland Pfister contributed equally to writing—review and editing. Wilfried Kunde and Roland Pfister contributed equally to supervision.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Moritz Reis, Institute of Psychology, University of Wuerzburg, Roentgenring 11, 97070 Wuerzburg, Germany. Email: [moritz.reis@uni-wuerzburg.de](mailto:moritz.reis@uni-wuerzburg.de)

to countermand retrieval of the traditional object use (see also Tucker & Ellis, 2001).

Here, we propose that biases toward traditional options go beyond the generation of unconventional ideas and may extend toward the selection and implementation of a creative solution. As previously shown, idea generation is necessary but not sufficient for successful creative behavior (e.g., Rietzschel et al., 2010), and people sometimes even fail to select creative ideas when choosing from a pool of potential options (Faure, 2004). By precisely targeting the crucial role of idea selection within the creative process, this research closes an important gap in theorizing on creativity.

Seeing creativity as comprising a tug-of-war between traditional and original solutions suggests that creativity might be linked to executive functions, that is, cognitive control (e.g., Beaty et al., 2016; Benedek et al., 2012; De Dreu et al., 2012; Radel et al., 2015). This link is not simple, however, but remarkably nuanced (Chrysikou, 2018). On the one hand, overly strong control seems to hamper idea production so that disrupting executive functions was found to improve performance in open-ended object-use tasks (Chrysikou et al., 2013). On the other hand, cognitive control facilitates the evaluation and selection of generated solutions (Mayseless et al., 2015). Moreover, exercising cognitive control to overcome a lasting bias toward traditional options might constitute another distinct constraint in creative cognition. Crucially, this bias might even be effective after the decision to choose a creative option has already been made.

To test this hypothesis, we created a response–dynamics paradigm (McKinstry et al., 2008; Pfister et al., 2016) in which participants could choose between creative or traditional uses for given objects. Participants chose one out of two uses for a visually presented object by moving a mouse cursor toward a left or right target area on the computer screen. In Experiment 1, participants could freely decide between both options while in Experiment 2, they were prompted to select a specific use. Movement trajectories while selecting a target position are a prime measure to detect potential attraction toward specific response options (Dale & Duran, 2011; Duran et al., 2010; Freeman & Ambady, 2009; Song & Nakayama, 2008, 2009; Spivey et al., 2005; Wirth et al., 2020). We predicted responses to show residual attraction to the traditional use, even when aiming toward the creative solution, whereas any bias toward the opposing response option should be less pronounced when opting for the traditional use. Two preregistered experiments (51 adult participants each) yielded converging evidence for this hypothesis. Experiment 1 is reported in full below, whereas detailed information for Experiment 2 is presented in the [online supplemental materials](#). All procedures performed in this study were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Institute for Psychology of the Julius-Maximilians-University of Würzburg (GZEK 2021-52).

## Method

### Transparency and Openness

Raw data, materials, and analysis syntax are available on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/mwyp7>). Both studies were preregistered (Experiment 1: <https://osf.io/6cy5m>; Experiment 2: <https://osf.io/vfwst>).

## Experiment 1

### Participants

Because a priori estimates of potential effect sizes were not available in the literature, we based our sample size calculations on a small effect size of  $d_z = 0.40$ , resulting in 51 participants for a power of  $1 - \beta = 80\%$  ( $\alpha = .05$ , two-tailed testing; calculated with the `power.t.test` function in the statistics package of R, Version 4.0.3). We excluded data of participants with <10 valid trials per condition ( $n = 15$ ), which led to a final sample size of 36 participants. Participants indicated their gender identity by selecting one of the following four options: female, male, diverse, and prefer not to say (15 females, 20 males, one preferred not to answer; age:  $M = 28.9$ ,  $SD = 14.3$  years). Effective power for the final sample was  $1 - \beta = 80\%$  for effect sizes of  $d_z \geq 0.48$ .


Participants were recruited via Prolific. They reported 15 different nationalities in total, among which Poland ( $n = 10$ ), South Africa ( $n = 7$ ), and the United Kingdom ( $n = 3$ ) were mentioned most frequently (responses were entered in a free-response box).

### Materials and Procedure

For our stimuli, we used pictures of 20 objects, each with one creative and one traditional use (see [Table S1 in the online supplemental materials](#)). These uses were selected based on extensive pilot work to ensure that they fulfilled a widespread definition of creativity (Runco & Jaeger, 2012) in terms of originality and effectiveness (see the [online supplemental materials](#) for details).

Experiment 1 was conducted online and programmed with `lab.js` (Henninger et al., 2022; Kieslich & Henninger, 2017). All participants received detailed instructions beforehand and provided informed consent. The study was programmed against a reference screen size of  $800 \times 600$  px and scaled to match the individual display resolution of each participant. All distances reported in the following refer to this reference screen size. Before each trial, participants indicated whether they intended to choose the creative or the traditional use for the following object (see [Figure 1](#)). The corresponding screen showed two boxes containing the statements “traditional task” and “creative task.” The order of both boxes was determined randomly for each participant, but it was constant across the entire session. Participants indicated their choice by clicking on the corresponding box. Next, participants had to click on a small black square in the middle of the screen to center the position of the mouse cursor. The following screen displayed a home area ( $60$  px  $\times$   $60$  px) in the bottom center and two target areas ( $230$  px  $\times$   $30$  px) in the upper left and upper right side of the screen, respectively. The middle of the target area showed a bold uppercase letter, which indicated the chosen use for the given trial (“C” for creative use, “T” for traditional use). One use was shown in each target area, while the position of the traditional and the creative use was determined randomly in each trial. The target object was presented in the middle of both target areas (bounding box:  $100$  px  $\times$   $100$  px). To start each trial, participants had to click on the home area. Only then the target object appeared, and participants were to move the mouse cursor to the chosen use as fast as possible. We measured the time from target stimulus onset until the mouse cursor had left the home area (initiation time, IT). To get rid of potential dwelling time within the target areas, movement time (MT) was defined as the time from leaving the home area until approaching the center of one of both target areas to <20 px. Movement trajectories were tracked by

**Figure 1**  
Trial Procedure



*Note.* Participants indicated whether they wanted to select a traditional or a creative use for an upcoming object. They then had to click on a small, black square in the middle of the screen. This click made two potential uses within the target areas appear, accompanied by a home area in the bottom center of the screen. Moving the mouse cursor to the home area made the object appear between both target areas. Finally, participants had to move the cursor to the chosen use as fast as possible and had to click on the corresponding option. The bold letter in the home area indicates the chosen task. Golf club image adapted from pixabay.com, by V. Hamilton, 2023 (<https://pixabay.com/de/illustrations/golf-sport-spiel-verein-ball-holz-8131316/>). In the public domain. T = traditional task; C = creative task. See the online article for the color version of this figure.

sampling  $x$ - and  $y$ -coordinates of the mouse cursor. We did not present any feedback and the next trial started directly after participants had clicked on one of both target areas.

There were two blocks of 40 trials each. Every item was presented twice per block in randomized order. At the end of the experiment, participants conducted the divergent association task (DAT) as a measure of verbal creativity (Olson et al., 2021). Therein, participants had 4 min to come up with 10 words as different from each other as possible, regarding all uses and meanings.

### Data Analysis

We preprocessed trajectory data using custom R scripts. To account for varying screen sizes, we scaled all trajectories to a uniform display resolution so that the distance from the center of the home area and each target area was 100  $x$ -units ( $xu$ ) on the  $x$ -axis and 200  $xu$  on the  $y$ -axis. We mirrored all left-going movements at the vertical midline and then time-normalized the trajectories from movement onset to reaching the target area to 101 points using linear interpolation. To compensate for varying click times, we appended the last coordinate of the movement after time normalization. The area under the curve (AUC) was determined as the signed area between these points and a straight line from startpoint to endpoint of the scaled movement (in  $xu^2$ ). We did not analyze error trials (i.e., selecting the creative use when intending to select the traditional use and vice versa), trials with less than three data points (as otherwise no meaningful trajectory could be determined), as well as trials with extremely high or low values for one of the measures (IT > 3,000 ms, MT > 5,000 ms, AUC > 30,000  $xu^2$ , and AUC < -20,000  $xu^2$ ).<sup>1</sup> Trials following error trials were included in the analyses because of the unexpectedly high number of erroneous responses. After applying these fixed filters, we additionally excluded trials in which IT, MT, or AUC deviated more than

2.5  $SD$ s from their corresponding cell mean. In total, we excluded 26.42% of all trials (see Table S2 in the online supplemental materials).

For each measure (choice frequency, IT, MT, AUC), we calculated a two-tailed  $t$ -test comparing trials in which the creative use was selected to trials in which the traditional use was selected. Note that the analysis of choice frequencies is based on data before any exclusions. To investigate potential changes across the duration of the study, we computed an exploratory repeated-measures analysis of variance for each dependent variable, with item use (creative vs. traditional) and experimental block (first vs. second) as within-subject factors. Finally, we calculated the difference of “creative use” and “traditional use” trials for each dependent variable (positive differences indicate higher values for creative than traditional uses) and correlated these differences with the individual DAT score.

### Experiment 2

For Experiment 2, we collected a new sample of 51 participants. The stimuli, experimental procedure, criteria for data exclusions, and all analyses were similar to Experiment 1, except that we asked participants to select a specific item use in each trial (see the online supplemental materials for details).


## Results

### Experiment 1

Figure 2A shows the resulting movement trajectories and choice frequencies (share of trials in which the creative or traditional use

<sup>1</sup> Note that the latter selection criteria were not preregistered. Visual inspection of the raw data, however, suggested this procedure because such outlier data might distort the following exclusion criterion of  $\pm 2.5$   $SD$ s (see Van Selst & Jolicoeur, 1994).

**Figure 2**  
Study Design and Main Results



*Note.* (A) Experimental setup, choice frequencies of the selected uses (pie chart), and time-normalized movement trajectories. Participants could choose between a creative use (here: “Dig a hole”) and a traditional use (here: “Eat a soup”) for a given item (here: spoon). When opting for the creative use (dark line, red line in color online version), trajectories were biased more strongly toward the traditional option than in the reversed case (light grey line, grey line in color online version). Thin lines represent the average trajectories of each single participant for both item use conditions. (B) IT and MT for creative and traditional responses. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals of the paired differences (Pfister & Janczyk, 2013). (C) Effect sizes ( $d_z$ ) for the comparison of “traditional use” and “creative use” trials for choice frequencies (choices), IT, MT, and AUC. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals of the standardized means. Spoon image adapted from pixabay.com, by J. Maja, 2017 (<https://pixabay.com/de/photos/1%C3%B6ffel-freigestellt-besteck-essen-2287295/>). In the public domain. IT = initiation time; MT = movement time; AUC = area under the curve; CI = confidence interval. See the online article for the color version of this figure.

was eventually selected by mouse click) for creative and traditional solutions. Choice frequencies indicated a consistent preference for selecting traditional over creative responses (see Table S3 in the online supplemental materials; creative:  $M = 36.69\%$ ,  $SD = 19.57\%$ ; traditional:  $M = 63.31\%$ ,  $SD = 19.57\%$ ),  $t(50) = 4.86$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d_z = 0.68$ , 95%  $CI_{SM}$  [0.37, 0.98]. Furthermore, participants committed significantly more errors for creative responses by clicking on the traditional option than vice versa (see Table S2 in the online supplemental materials; accuracy: overall:  $M = 79.17\%$ ,  $SD = 20.53\%$ ; creative:  $M = 65.40\%$ ,  $SD = 36.04\%$ ; traditional:  $M = 91.68\%$ ,  $SD = 8.14\%$ ),<sup>2</sup>  $t(50) = 5.36$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d_z = 0.75$ , 95%  $CI_{SM}$  [0.44, 1.06]. Importantly, this bias endured when assessing how each response was enacted. Even when participants decided on the creative option, movement initiation and execution showed a persistent influence of the traditional use as shown in Figure 2B. That is, movements toward creative uses were initiated slower,  $t(35) = 2.55$ ,  $p = .015$ ,  $d_z = 0.42$ , 95%  $CI_{SM}$  [0.08, 0.76], and performing the movement required more time compared to trials in which the traditional use was selected,  $t(35) = 4.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d_z = 0.69$ , [0.32, 1.05]. Most notably, trajectories for creative responses were torn toward the traditional use more strongly than vice versa (see Figure 2A). This resulted in a significantly larger area between the trajectory and a straight line from startpoint to endpoint of the movement for creative responses compared to traditional ones (AUC; creative:  $M = 10,423.65 \text{ xu}^2$ ,  $SD = 2,657.30 \text{ xu}^2$ ; traditional:  $M = 9,457.05 \text{ xu}^2$ ,

$SD = 2,584.25 \text{ xu}^2$ ),  $t(35) = 2.57$ ,  $p = .015$ ,  $d_z = 0.43$ , 95%  $CI_{SM}$  [0.08, 0.77]. Figure 2C shows effect sizes for the comparison of creative and traditional responses for each measure.

Table S4 in the online supplemental materials shows means and standard deviations for IT, MT, and AUC for each item use condition and both blocks within the experiment. For none of our dependent variables, the effect of item use condition changed significantly during the experiment (see the Results in the online supplemental materials). Moreover, the difference between “creative use” and “traditional use” trials did not correlate with the individual DAT score for any dependent variable (see Figure S1 in the online supplemental materials),  $|r| \leq .23$ ,  $|r| \leq 1.38$ ,  $ps \geq .177$ .

## Experiment 2

Regarding all analyses, the pattern mirrored the results observed in Experiment 1. Thus, ITs and MTs were longer for creative than for traditional solutions and AUCs indicated movements to be deflected toward traditional options when eventually clicking on a creative one ( $ps \leq .035$ ). Moreover, a direct comparison of both experiments did not reveal any systematic difference in the strength of these effects. Detailed results are available in the online supplemental materials.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that in contrast to our preliminary studies, participants were instructed to respond as fast as possible.



## Discussion

Why do human agents hardly ever deviate from their established beliefs and procedures? In two experiments, we studied this question by tracking hand movements while participants chose between traditional or creative uses for given items. We found a consistent preference for traditional over original options. Crucially, even when going for the creative solution eventually, behavior was strongly torn toward the traditional approach as revealed by spatial and temporal features of the corresponding movement trajectories. This effect held true irrespective of whether participants voluntarily decided on the creative solution or whether they were externally instructed to go for the creative approach.

The present observations highlight a distinct obstacle to creative behavior that is at work even after creative solutions have become known. We suggest that this obstacle is rooted in the human predisposition to follow various kinds of rules and norms by default (Baum et al., 2004; Pfister et al., 2016). This includes arbitrary rules and official regulations, but importantly social norms arising from traditional beliefs and procedures. Deviating from any kind of rule or norm thus seems to require substantial cognitive control to suppress dominant action tendencies (Beaty et al., 2016; Pfister et al., 2019).

The strength of this bias is further highlighted as this effect did not differ between initial and later choices of the same behavior and was not related to verbal creativity in the DAT. However, this task focuses on idea generation and relies on verbal material, whereas our experiments address idea selection and object-directed interactions. The absence of a relation between both measures, thus, highlights that idea generation and selection constitute mainly independent stages within the creative process (Faure, 2004).

A consistent pull toward traditional ideas might further explain why people often reject creative solutions of other agents, particularly in organizational contexts (Staw, 1995). Along the same lines, the sticky nature of tradition can lead to a hasty discarding of an original idea in face of any problems, therefore playing a major role in the frequent and rapid failure of innovative approaches (Asplund & Sandin, 1999; Cozijnsen et al., 2000). Critically, it is precisely these innovations that have brought significant progress to society in the past and that will also be necessary for future development. The present results highlight that adopting an agent-centered perspective on creative cognition helps understanding and thus promoting creative ideas and behavior.

## Constraints on Generality

Our results provide compelling evidence that human behavior is strongly torn toward traditional approaches. At the same time, not all individuals seem to experience such a cognitive bias against creativity, with substantial interindividual variation in average trajectories (see Figure 2A). Because the target population of our study were adult internet users, who are fluent in English, future research should address interindividual and cross-cultural differences as well as potential relations to other facets of creativity like convergent thinking and creativity in object use. A further limitation might be that the presented uses were externally provided and not generated by the participants themselves, which might play a role as own ideas might be judged as more creative than ideas brought up by other people.

## References

- Adams, G. S., Converse, B. A., Hales, A. H., & Klotz, L. E. (2021). People systematically overlook subtractive changes. *Nature*, 592(7853), 258–261. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03380-y>
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 123–167. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007708612713>
- Andriopoulos, C. (2001). Determinants of organisational creativity: A literature review. *Management Decision*, 39(10), 834–841. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740110402328>
- Asplund, M., & Sandin, R. (1999). The survival of new products. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 15(3), 219–237. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007708612713>
- Baum, W. M., Richerson, P. J., Efferson, C. M., & Paciotti, B. M. (2004). Cultural evolution in laboratory microsocieties including traditions of rule giving and rule following. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25(5), 305–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.05.003>
- Beaty, R. E., Benedek, M., Silvia, P. J., & Schacter, D. L. (2016). Creative cognition and brain network dynamics. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(2), 87–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.10.004>
- Benedek, M., Franz, F., Heene, M., & Neubauer, A. C. (2012). Differential effects of cognitive inhibition and intelligence on creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(4), 480–485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.014>
- Chrysikou, E. G. (2018). The costs and benefits of cognitive control for creativity. In R. E. Jung, & O. Vartanian (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the neuroscience of creativity* (pp. 299–317). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316556238.018>
- Chrysikou, E. G., Hamilton, R. H., Coslett, H. B., Datta, A., Bikson, M., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2013). Noninvasive transcranial direct current stimulation over the left prefrontal cortex facilitates cognitive flexibility in tool use. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4(2), 81–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17588928.2013.768221>
- Cozijnsen, A. J., Vrakking, W. J., & van IJzerloo, M. (2000). Success and failure of 50 innovation projects in Dutch companies. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 3(3), 150–159. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060010322301>
- Cropley, A. J. (1997). Fostering creativity in the classroom: General principles. In M. Runco (Ed.), *The creativity research handbook* (pp. 83–114). Hampton Press.
- Dale, R., & Duran, N. D. (2011). The cognitive dynamics of negated sentence verification. *Cognitive Science*, 35(5), 983–996. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2010.01164.x>
- De Dreu, C. K., Nijstad, B. A., Baas, M., Wolsink, I., & Roskes, M. (2012). Working memory benefits creative insight, musical improvisation, and original ideation through maintained task-focused attention. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(5), 656–669. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211435795>
- Duncker, K. (1945). On problem-solving. *Psychological Monographs*, 58(5), 1–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093599>
- Duran, N. D., Dale, R., & McNamara, D. S. (2010). The action dynamics of overcoming the truth. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 17(4), 486–491. <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.17.4.486>
- Faure, C. (2004). Beyond brainstorming: Effects of different group procedures on selection of ideas and satisfaction with the process. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 38(1), 13–34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2004.tb01229.x>
- Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2009). Motions of the hand expose the partial and parallel activation of stereotypes. *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1183–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02422.x>
- Glucksberg, S. (1964). Functional fixedness: Problem solution as a function of observing responses. *Psychonomic Science*, 1(1–12), 117–118. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03342819>

- Heinze, T., Shapira, P., Rogers, J. D., & Senker, J. M. (2009). Organizational and institutional influences on creativity in scientific research. *Research Policy*, 38(4), 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2009.01.014>
- Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61(1), 569–598. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100416>
- Henninger, F., Shevchenko, Y., Mertens, U., Kieslich, P. J., & Hilbig, B. E. (2022). Lab.js: A free, open, online study builder. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(2), 556–573. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01283-5>
- Kieslich, P. J., & Henninger, F. (2017). Mousetrap: An integrated, open-source mouse-tracking package. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(5), 1652–1667. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-017-0900-z>
- Mayseless, N., Eran, A., & Shamay-Tsoory, S. G. (2015). Generating original ideas: The neural underpinning of originality. *Neuroimage*, 116(1), 232–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.05.030>
- McCaffrey, T. (2012). Innovation relies on the obscure: A key to overcoming the classic problem of functional fixedness. *Psychological Science*, 23(3), 215–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611429580>
- McKinstry, C., Dale, R., & Spivey, M. J. (2008). Action dynamics reveal parallel competition in decision making. *Psychological Science*, 19(1), 22–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02041.x>
- Olson, J. A., Nahas, J., Chmoulevitch, D., Cropper, S. J., & Webb, M. E. (2021). Naming unrelated words predicts creativity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(25), Article e2022340118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022340118>
- Pfister, R., & Janczyk, M. (2013). Confidence intervals for two sample means: Calculation, interpretation, and a few simple rules. *Advances in Cognitive Psychology*, 9(2), 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10053-008-0133-x>
- Pfister, R., Wirth, R., Schwarz, K. A., Steinhauer, M., & Kunde, W. (2016). Burdens of non-conformity: Motor execution reveals cognitive conflict during deliberate rule violations. *Cognition*, 147, 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.11.009>
- Pfister, R., Wirth, R., Weller, L., Foerster, A., & Schwarz, K. A. (2019). Taking shortcuts: Cognitive conflict during motivated rule-breaking. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 71, 138–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.06.005>
- Radel, R., Davranche, K., Fournier, M., & Dietrich, A. (2015). The role of (dis)inhibition in creativity: Decreased inhibition improves idea generation. *Cognition*, 134, 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.09.001>
- Rietzschel, E. F., Nijstad, B. A., & Stroebe, W. (2010). The selection of creative ideas after individual idea generation: Choosing between creativity and impact. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712609X414204>
- Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092>
- Song, J. H., & Nakayama, K. (2008). Target selection in visual search as revealed by movement trajectories. *Vision Research*, 48(7), 853–861. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2007.12.015>
- Song, J.-H., & Nakayama, K. (2009). Hidden cognitive states revealed in choice reaching tasks. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(8), 360–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2009.04.009>
- Spivey, M. J., Grosjean, M., & Knoblich, G. (2005). Continuous attraction toward phonological competitors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(29), 10393–10398. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0503903102>
- Staw, B. M. (1995). Why no one really wants creativity. In C. M. Ford, & D. A. Gioia (Eds.), *Creative action in organizations: Ivory tower visions and real world voices* (pp. 161–166). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243535.n21>
- Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (2001). The potentiation of grasp types during visual object categorization. *Visual Cognition*, 8(6), 769–800. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506280042000144>
- Van Selst, M., & Jolicoeur, P. (1994). A solution to the effect of sample size on outlier elimination. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 47(3), 631–650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14640749408401131>
- Wirth, R., Foerster, A., Kunde, W., & Pfister, R. (2020). Design choices: Empirical recommendations for designing two-dimensional finger-tracking experiments. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(6), 2394–2416. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01409-0>

Received January 5, 2023

Revision received July 26, 2023

Accepted August 9, 2023 ■